ABSTRACT

Purpose- The purpose of this paper is to examine how effect of Organizational Reputation on E-loyalty with the Roles of E-trust and E-satisfaction.

Design/methodology/approach- A quantitative approach was undertaken to analyze. The study used Structural Equation Modelling (SEM) operated by LISREL program to analyze the hypothesis. This paper tests the model by using data from 450 customers of Digikala firm in Iran.

Findings- Results indicated that organizational reputation affects e-satisfaction significantly and the impact of organizational reputation on e-trust is significant in the selected population.

Originality/value- This study emphasized on the impact of corporate reputation on increasing customer satisfaction, customer trust, and customer loyalty in the electronic commerce company. Hence, this paper investigates the interrelationships between reputation, trust, satisfaction, and loyalty as a unique context.
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INTRODUCTION

Loyalty is one of the most important drivers of business growth because profitable business growth cannot be achieved without customer loyalty. In particular, store loyalty is the most important factor contributing to retail business success. As a result, the concept of store loyalty has been investigated extensively during the past few decades (Jansone, 2006). In the realm of e-commerce, businesses are endeavouring to gain competitive advantage by communicating with their customers online (Lee & Lin, 2005). At the same time, this growth in online communication is an indication that customers are more willing to shop online than ever before and that e-commerce is a growing market.

It should be noted that online shopping is not facilitated simply by a business establishing a website; the quality of the goods sold and the
online shopping experience also affect online purchasing. In general, due to the newness and expansion of the Internet as a shopping channel and, given the competitiveness of the e-commerce environment, organisations must pay increasing amounts of attention to online channels. Indeed, the uniqueness of the online environment creates the opportunity shop online in a completely different way from shopping through conventional channels (San Martín et al., Camarero, & San José, 2011).

Moreover, given the growth of competition in the e-business environment, many companies are looking for ways to gain competitive advantage through their corporate reputations. Indeed, corporate reputation is considered a significant element for the success of electronic trade. Previous research has confirmed the strong relationship between positive corporate reputation and consumer loyalty. For instance, Jeng (2008) asserted that a good corporate reputation results in higher market share and better financial performance. Similarly, Porter (1985), Yoon et al. (1993), Robertson (1993), and Andreassen and Lindestad (1998) all suggested that a good reputation helps firms build stronger relationships with customers (Gorondutse et al., 2014).

Web-based shopping differs from conventional shopping in a number of significant ways. For example, an emphasis on e-services reduces the need for conventional retailing requirements, such as sales staff and the common, tangible components of the shopping experience. Thus, customers do not see the sellers, products, or stores directly, and online shopping requires reliance on third parties to process payments. Furthermore, customer service in the online environment is different from the typical physical encounters experienced in traditional retailing (Carlson & O’Cass, 2010). However, the lack of direct communication in online retailing is one factor that can cause poor outcomes for e-businesses. According to many researchers, positive organisational reputation can help mitigate this challenge. Indeed, trust is an essential prerequisite for the success of Internet shopping. Therefore, given the very highly competitive and changing e-commerce landscape (Jayawardhena & Wright, 2009), retailers must create and maintain satisfied and loyal customers and engender trust for their businesses to succeed in this new marketplace.

According to the relevant literature, building trust between shoppers and retailers in an online context is a key factor for success in electronic business. According to this argument, online retailers must first convince their target audiences that they are reliable so that the target customers have confidence purchasing from them over the Internet (San Martín et al., 2011). In this regard, researchers have frequently emphasised the impact of company reputation on customer satisfaction, trust, and loyalty. In this vein, the purpose of this paper is to investigate the interrelationships between company reputation and customer trust, satisfaction, and loyalty.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Organisational Reputation

An appreciable body of literature in economics, marketing, and organisational theory has examined the construct of company reputation. Many consumers are unwilling to purchase from companies online about which they have little information. Therefore, having a strong reputation is a valuable asset for an online business. In addition, economists have analysed company reputation and its relationship to price and product quality (Caruana & Ewing, 2010). Based on this related research, the concept of reputation can be discussed in relation to the concept of brand equity, which refers to the reliability and dependability of a company. On the other hand, the organisational literature emphasises reputation as a social identity and characterises it as the main, intangible asset of modern organisations, one that has a significant impact on organisations’
performance and significantly contributes to their survival (Aaker, 1996).

According to Fombrun and Shanley (1990), the attitudinal definition of organisation reputation holds that it consists of the net full of feeling or enthusiastic response as well as the general estimation in which a company is held by its constituents (Caruana & Ewing, 2010). Based on this perspective, we can define ‘reputation’ as a belief that a person or group has about a person or entity. This belief originates from the perspectives that other individuals have about the person or company in question and consolidates the expectations, norms, and values that support and form beliefs (Merlo et al., 2012).

According to Ranft et al. (2006), reputation has a significant and enduring effect on organisations and is often proactively manipulated and directed via impression administration tools and strategic use of media. On the other hand, from the viewpoint of Otubanjo and Chen (2011), we can define reputation as a functional phenomenon originating from the creation of a diversity of noteworthy properties that distinguishes companies, nurtures relationships, and makes businesses over time through the formal and informal lines of organisational relationships (Miremadi et al., 2011). According to Gotsi and Wilson (2001), corporate reputation should be regarded as a stakeholder’s general assessment of an organisation over time. Similarly, company reputation has been broadly described as the stakeholders’ assessment of how a company honours its commitments and complies with beneficiaries’ expectations. Likewise, based on organisational stakeholders, place of the corporation for internal and external stakeholders of the organisation could be measured by corporate reputation. For their part, Reuber and Fischer (2010) have defined organisational reputation as the overall attractiveness of a company to beneficiaries outside of the organisation. Indeed, although corporate reputation is recognised as a company-level resource, it also includes the cognitive assessment of an organisation held by external stakeholders. Customers are one of the important external stakeholders that good reputation of organization could be have considerable impact on their trust based on previous accomplished researches, satisfaction, and loyalty to the organization.

Accordingly, the role of reputation in an electronic context is more important and critical than a non-electronic and traditional environment. Because when people have little information and knowledge about a firm and seller, confirming that an e-seller has a good reputation can result in decreasing of consumer considerations about a purchase, rising customer commitment and trust, and encourage purchasing in web environment (Li et al., 2006). Also in many cases because of customers’ reluctance to pay off through internet, they know little about and difficulty of remembering even well-known websites, thus powerful organization reputation is an important and essential advantage to online retailers.

**Conceptual Framework And Hypotheses Development**

**Organizational reputation and e-Satisfaction**

In marketing literature, customer satisfaction is considered as being a function of customer expectations and achieved performance, or the obtained service quality, and is hence an intellectual assessment of the amount to which the consumer’s expectations concerning a specific service are achieved (Mossel & Valk, 2008).

The concept of satisfaction can be examined in two different approaches. The first approach looks at satisfaction as an impressive tendency sustained by economic situations, like the volume of revenue or profit margins obtained. The next approach can be also called non-economic satisfaction. In this approach, the emphasis is on psychological
variables, for instance an accomplishment of the promises made by business partner or the simplicity of interacting with the aforesaid partner (Casalo et al., 2008). Mittal and Kamakura argued that customer satisfaction is a necessary measure that enables us to predict their behavior and in this regard, there are two concerns: First, Satisfaction measures are likely to be positively biased; second, establishing the relationship between satisfaction and repurchase behavior has been elusive for many firms (as cited in Anderson & Srinivasan, 2003).

In general, the concept of satisfaction is associated with the post-purchase processes. Based on this, researches confirms the argument that a satisfying usage occasions that accumulated over time has a great impact on shaping customer favorable attitudes (Carlson & O’Cass, 2010).

E-satisfaction may be influenced by prior experience in connection with an electronic company (Cyr et al., 2008). E-satisfaction is described as emotional reaction to a service experience in an online context (Rodgers et al., 2005). The concept of satisfaction refers to the fulfillment of expectations as well as a positive and affective state in association with prior result in the interacting with the website (San Martín et al., 2011). The importance placed on on-line satisfaction and loyalty has increased because of the competitive nature of the on-line market, fueled by an increase in the number of on-line retailers and service providers (Rodgers et al., 2005).

Also Szymanski and Hise (2000) saw e-satisfaction as a general development reflecting the aggregate impact of an arrangement of discrete encounters with the administration supplier over a timeframe.

Today, organizations which have good reputation are assessed more positively than relatively unfamiliar organizations. In other words, paying little attention to performance, shopping at a reliable, trustworthy and famous company itself can bring about satisfaction. In this regard there are empirical inquires that have exhibited a positive impact of firm reputation on customer’s satisfaction is applied to rural tourism accommodations in Portugal (Loureiro & Kastenholz, 2011). Additionally, Walsh et al. (2006) study private energy customers of a large German utility, have emphasized on the strongly correlated relationship between corporate reputation and customer satisfaction. In same manner results of Helm (2007)’s study in German investors of a publicly traded company, demonstrated that individual investors’ satisfaction is significantly affected by the level of reputation as perceived by the investor. The relationship of reputation and satisfaction ought to be viewed more critically in online setting. In fact, organizational reputation has a critical importance and it can be claimed that a good firm reputation brings about positive customers attitudes and intended behavior from customers towards the e-service provider (De Ruyter et al., 2001).

Following this logic, therefore, we propose the following hypothesis:

The proposed hypothesis: Organizational reputation has not a significant positive effect on e-satisfaction

**H1:** Organizational reputation has a significant positive effect on e-satisfaction.

**Organizational reputation and e-trust**

Over the past decade, according to numerous reasons such as the impact of trust on many business arrangements and increases in their value added, the subject of trust in business has earned increasing scientific examination by researchers. In a knowledge based economy, services delivered to or received from trade partners often require “innovation and knowledge inputs” which provide complete contracts
prohibitive if not impossible, and trust—in receiving high quality inputs—then performs much better as a “contract” device than explicit and verifiable contract terms (Lukas & Schöndube, 2010). Trust can be considered as an expectation that trustees will not take part in opportunistic conduct. Having considered all these things, since uncertainty is a sine qua non of trust, trustors by definition confront the danger of trustees acting astutely (Laan et al., 2011). Also according to Morgan and Hunt (1994), the idea of trust can be characterized as the “confidence in the exchange partner’s reliability and integrity.” What is more, as indicated by Doney and Cannon (1997) the idea of trust can be characterized as “the perceived credibility and benevolence of a target.”

One of the principle purposes behind the significance of trust or confidence in an online business is the perceived degree of risk connected with internet purchasing (Anderson & Srinivasan, 2003). Trust can be characterized as a readiness to rely on an exchange partner in whom one has trust (Moorman, Zaltman, & Deshpande cited in Gupta & Kabadayi, 2010). Customer trust in an online context is characterized as e-marketer’s desire to approbate vulnerability in a transaction in online context based on affirmative presumptions regarding an e-marketer’s future behaviors (Kimery & McCord cited in Jiang et al., 2008). According to previous performed investigations, trust can be associated with or defined by such beliefs as competence, honesty, and benevolence (Coulter & Coulter, 2002; Doney & Canon, 1997).

Gwinner proposed trust as a confidence advantage appraised highly by consumers in long-term relational exchange with service firms (as cited in Kassim & Abdullah, 2010). Also in the online setting, a set of beliefs held by an online consumer about given specifications of the e-supplier, as well as the possible behavior of a supplier in online context in the next transactions and future can be considered as customer trust (Coulter & Coulter, 2002). In fact trust could be considered as a vital element in the development of the internet as a market place in online context. Also according to Lee and Lin (2005), trust can be regarded as a predictor of e-purchasing and as one of the factors affecting the customers’ attitudes towards purchasing in an online setting. Usually customers are more likely to share personal information when they develop trust with on-line vendors. This type of information has many benefits including providing the opportunity to form more sincere relationships with customers, offering appropriate and benefiting favorable: and tailored to customer preferences products and services, and as a result creating increased trust. Also based on previous studies, we can claim that the lack of trust is one of the major obstacles to customers’ utilization of online purchasing application (Ayo et al., 2010). On the other hand, in relation to the importance of trust in the online space, it could be argued that most buyers have concerns about disclosure of confidential information and delivery. This increases the importance of trust and shows that trust is one of the most important shopping prerequisites in an online setting. Thus, online customers may prefer to transact with online retailers on whom they can trust. So trust has important and inevitable role in online purchasing.

Generally in the many previous performed researches, organizational reputation has been considered as a variable that effects customers’ trust. In this relation according to the Ranft et al. (2006)’s viewpoint reputation can be seen similar to the consequence of a consistent procedure of credibility exchanges, in this way improving trust and commitment to the organization is important. Also, the significant impact of reputation on customer trust has been confirmed in the electronic financial advisers in the United
Kingdom (Johnson & Grayson, 2005), legal service web sites to consumers in such sensitive fields as law and medicine in the United states of America (McKnight et al., 2002). In the other hand the impact of organizational reputation, and trust of customers towards adopting travel e-services in Netherland (De Ruyter et al., 2001). The results indicate that perceived company reputation and willingness to customize products and services can significantly affect initial trust on online settings in the United States of America (Koufaris & Hampton-Sosa, 2004; Yoon, 2002). Also, the effect of reputation on trust an online auction market in the United States of America is well established in Ba and Pavlou (2002)’ research. So a firm with a good reputation has more opportunities to attracting more customers rather than a firm with a poor or no reputation.

Likewise a good reputation affects both the beginning of a relationship and the continuation of an established relationship. Indeed: the better the organization’s reputation, the higher the customer’s trust on the organization (Torres-Moraga et al., 2010).

Following this logic, therefore, we propose the following hypothesis:
The proposed hypothesis: Organizational reputation has not a significant positive effect on e-trust

**H2:** Organizational reputation has a significant positive effect on e-trust

**Organizational reputation and e-loyalty**
Creating and maintaining brand loyalty has been a vital concept of marketing theory and practice (Gommans et al., 2001). Accordingly to this, maintaining lasting relationships with customers is more important than reliance on occasional exchanges. Presently, the concept of brand loyalty has been expanded to contain online loyalty or e-loyalty (Valvi & Fragkos, 2012).

In the first marketing examinations, loyalty was conceptualized as a behavioral response over time. (Kumar & Shah, 2004). However, loyalty is not considered solely as repurchase behavior (Bodet, 2008). Because high levels of repeatedly purchasing behavior is not necessarily true loyalty and may reflect “spurious” loyalty. Hence several researches emphasize the importance of both behavioral and attitudinal aspects of loyalty. The traditional loyalty can be considered in the concept of e-loyalty in the online consumer behavior context. In e-commerce, loyal customers are considered extremely valuable. Cyr et al. (2008) defined e-loyalty as the intention to revisit a website or to make a transaction from it in the future. According to Anderson and Srinivasan (2003), loyalty in online setting is defined as the customer’s favorable attitude toward an electronic business resulting in repeat shopping behavior. Also e-loyalty is widely defined as customer’s desirable attitude and commitment towards the firm in online context that results in repurchase behavior (Srinivasan et al., 2002). So we can argue that e-purchasing can lead to many benefits for firms that sell in online context through long-term customers’ commitment and reduced costs of new customer acquisition (Reichheld & Schefter, 2000).

Generally, loyalty can be examined in terms of three approaches including behavioral, attitudinal, and integrated. While the behavioral loyalty refers to the customers’ tendency to repurchase and continue their past purchases, the attitudinal loyalty associated with affective and cognitive aspects of customers’ loyalty (Kumar & Shah, 2004). With the purpose of creating a new concept of loyalty, the new approach to customer loyalty is considered in the form of integrated viewpoint that is a combination of both behavioral and attitudinal approaches. In fact customer loyalty must be examined based on both behavioral and attitudinal features (Valvi & Fragkos, 2012).
Generally, it can be claimed with certainty that customers totally examine the reputation of the company before engaging in a purchase decision (Zeithaml, 2000). In fact the level of organization’s reputation could affect customer loyalty (Cretu & Brodie, 2007; Zins, 2001). In this regard, Resnick and Zeckhauser (2002) propose that the distinguished service firms with favorable reputations like eBay’s are currently flaunting the sound profits and a loyal customer base. According to Casalo et al. (2008)’s research, reputation have a significant and positive impact on e-loyalty. Also in another research Loureiro and Kastenholz (2011) have emphasized to rural tourism accommodations in Portugal on organizational reputation as one of the factors influencing customer loyalty and satisfaction. Besides according the results of Caruana and Ewing (2010)’s research it could be expected corporates can increase their customer e-loyalty through strengthening their reputation. Research was conducted among customers of two diverse online vendors, one dealing in books and the other in shares.

Following this logic, therefore, we propose the following hypothesis:
The proposed hypothesis: Organizational reputation has not a significant positive effect on e-loyalty

**H3:** Organizational reputation has a significant positive effect on e-loyalty

**E-trust, E-Satisfaction and E-loyalty**

Given the importance of customer loyalty for the profitability and survival of firms in an online context, antecedents such as trust (Harris & Goode, 2004) and e-satisfaction (Balabonis et al., 2006) have been identified in the literature that play a significant role in the online context to have loyal customers. Also in the other study, the results of Eid (2011)’s study showed that B2C e-commerce customer loyalty was weakly influenced by customer trust but was significantly affected by customer satisfaction. But other previously scientific performed examinations showed that trust had significant positive effect on the loyalty in both offline (Chaudhuri & Holbrook, 2001) and online (Pitta et al., 2006; Sirdeshmukh et al., 2002).

In about of satisfaction-loyalty link also Casalo et al. (2008) have supported the significant effect of satisfaction on e-loyalty. Likewise in the Yoon and Kim (2000)’s viewpoint the level of individual loyalty is dependent on the level of consumers’ satisfaction. Loureiro and Kastenholz (2011) have also supported the positive impact of satisfaction on loyalty in rural lodging units in Portugal.

In this regard, Evanschitzky et al. (2004) and Ghane et al. (2011) have emphasized on e-satisfaction as an important and influential concept in predicting customer loyalty in an online setting.

Following this logic, therefore, we propose the following hypotheses:
The proposed hypothesis: E-satisfaction has not a significant positive effect on e-loyalty

**H4:** E-satisfaction has a significant positive effect on e-loyalty

The proposed hypothesis: E-trust has not a significant positive effect on e-loyalty

**H5:** E-trust has a significant positive effect on e-loyalty

Based on the above, the conceptual model of research will be in the form of Figure 1.
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Table 1. Items of research constructs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>T value</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>e-Loyalty</td>
<td>When I need to make a purchase, this web site is my first choice</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>Srinivasan et al. (2002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I believe this is my favorite web site to buy the same kind of product</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I like shopping at this online retailer</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To me, this web site is the best retail web site to do business with</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I try to purchase at this online retailer whenever I need to make a purchase</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>As long as the present service continues, I doubt that I would switch to another web site</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I seldom consider switching to another online retailer</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e-Satisfaction</td>
<td>I am satisfied with the product of this online retailer</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>Fornell et al. (1996)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I am overall satisfied with this online retailer</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I am satisfied with the purchase experience at this online retailer</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e-Trust</td>
<td>I trust what this online retailer says about its products</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>Doney and Cannon (1997)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I trust the claims and promises this web site makes about a product</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This online retailer is reliable</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational</td>
<td>This web site is a large company that everyone recognizes</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>Jarvenpaa et al. (1999)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reputation</td>
<td>This web site is well-known</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This web site has a good reputation</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

METHODS

Statistical population of this survey includes all regular customers of Digikala that is one of online shopping stores of digital goods in Iran. Digikala is the largest ecommerce startup in Iran and the Middle East. In the sampling section simple random sampling method is used and in this regard 600 questionnaire, In collaboration with company officials, distributed among regular customers of Digikala and Four-hundred fifty (450) returned questionnaire were used to data analysis with survey success rate equal to 0.75. The items that used for each construct is in table 1. All scales employed in this study were measured on five -point Likert scales ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). The items for organizational reputation originate from Fortune and Shanley that numerous other researchers have used and discussed (Fombrun & Shanley, 1990). Organizational reputation construct in our research includes items such as: “This web site is well-known” and “This web site has a good reputation”. E-loyalty was measured with the scales taken from Srinivasan et al. (2002) which include including items such as: “As long as the present service continues, I doubt that I would switch to another web site” and “When I need to make a purchase, this web site is my first choice”. Also e-trust items were adapted from the study done by Doney and Cannon (1997) including items such as: “I trust the claims and promises this web site makes
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Table 2. CR and AVE for each research constructs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>E-TRUST</th>
<th>E-LOYALTY</th>
<th>ORGANIZATIONAL REPUTATION</th>
<th>E-SATISFACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AVE</td>
<td>0.710</td>
<td>0.559</td>
<td>0.548</td>
<td>0.542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR</td>
<td>0.924</td>
<td>0.910</td>
<td>0.894</td>
<td>0.805</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reliability of the questionnaire in this survey was measured by calculating Cronbach’s alpha coefficient for the whole questionnaire equal to 0.895 which was acceptable. In accordance with the viewpoint of Nanly (1987), the minimum cut-off point for Cronbach’s alpha can be considered equal to .7 (Fallahian Sichani and Tabatabaei, 2015). Also Cronbach’s alpha coefficient for each construct was 0.86 for organizational reputation, 0.84 for e-trust and e-satisfaction and 0.92 for e-loyalty. In order to be sure of validity of the questionnaire, first content validity was investigated through experts’ views. Then in the next phase confirmatory factor analysis of measurement models of the survey was performed to determine factorial validity of the questionnaire by means of Amos Graphics software. General fit indices of measurement models are represented in Table 1.

Comparing amount of fit indices with their acceptable amount (second row in Table 1) shows worthiness of estimation models regarding general fit records. Significance of factorial loads of questions which measure factorial models was examined notwithstanding broad fit files. Amount of partial index of p-value illustrates confirmation of significance of factorial loads except for one question of the e-loyalty’ factorial model. This insignificant factorial load removed from model. In this regard also the C.R. or T-value is displayed in the third column of Table 1. Also in order to be sure of convergent validity AVE and CR indices examined for each construct of research. According to Fornell and larker (1981) and hair et al (2010) when the amount of CR is higher than 0.7 and AVE is higher than 0.5, we could be sure of convergent validity. Results showed that CR is higher than 0.7 and AVE is higher than 0.5 for each construct and in this basis we can say that convergent validity is desirable. The results are indicated in Table 2.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Given to using structural equations model approach in testing the research hypotheses first fit indices of the model should be examined and then research hypotheses will be tested after being assure of their desirability. Table (2) shows general fit indices of research model. Comparing the amount of general fit indices with their acceptable amount (second row in Table 2) demonstrates acceptability of model in terms of general fit indices.

After being assured of general fit indices desirability of research structural equation model, we can examine significance or insignificance of hypotheses. Five hypotheses of the survey have examined through one model. In this regard, partial index of the p-value was applied to test significance or insignificance of hypotheses. P-value should be less than 0.05 keeping in mind the end goal to confirm a speculation in view of importance level 0.05.
Table 2. General Fit Indices of Measurement Models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>CMIN/DF</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>GFI</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>RMR</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>PCLOSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acceptable amount</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0&lt;X&lt;3</td>
<td>X&gt; %5</td>
<td>X&gt; .9</td>
<td>X&gt; .9</td>
<td>X&lt;%8</td>
<td>X&lt;%8</td>
<td>X&gt; %5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reputation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.199</td>
<td>0.939</td>
<td>0.997</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e-satisfaction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.205</td>
<td>0.272</td>
<td>0.993</td>
<td>0.989</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>0.337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e-trust</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.399</td>
<td>0.527</td>
<td>0.998</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e-loyalty</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.034</td>
<td>0.409</td>
<td>0.972</td>
<td>0.999</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td>0.615</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 2, all criteria of fit indices of measurement models are in norm area for example in RMSEA all variables are less than 0.08, thus this model has a standard fit.

Table 3. General Fit Indices of Structural Equations Model of Research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>CMIN/DF</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>GFI</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>RMR</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>PCLOSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acceptable amount</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0&lt;X&lt;3</td>
<td>X&gt; %5</td>
<td>X&gt; .9</td>
<td>X&gt; .9</td>
<td>X&lt;%8</td>
<td>X&lt;%8</td>
<td>X&gt; %5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final model</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>1.009</td>
<td>0.455</td>
<td>0.909</td>
<td>0.999</td>
<td>0.054</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.943</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Results of Hypotheses Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent variable</th>
<th>Dependent variable</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizational</td>
<td>H1</td>
<td>e-satisfaction</td>
<td>6.053</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reputation</td>
<td>---&gt;</td>
<td>e-satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational</td>
<td>H2</td>
<td>e-trust</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reputation</td>
<td>---&gt;</td>
<td>e-trust</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational</td>
<td>H3</td>
<td>e-loyalty</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reputation</td>
<td>---&gt;</td>
<td>e-loyalty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e-satisfaction</td>
<td>H4</td>
<td>e-loyalty</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---&gt;</td>
<td>e-loyalty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e-trust</td>
<td>H5</td>
<td>e-loyalty</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---&gt;</td>
<td>e-loyalty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 2, all criteria of fit indices of measurement models are in norm area for example in RMSEA all variables are less than 0.08, thus this model has a standard fit.

As shown in Table 2, all criteria of fit indices of Structural models are in norm area for example in RMR acceptable amount is less than 0.08, that in these indices is 0.054. These suitable statistics reveal the model to be a good fit for the data.

Results in Table (3) illustrate confirmation of the first two hypotheses (p<0.05) and rejection of the last three hypotheses (P>0.05) at significance level 95%. Also figure 4 shows final tested model of research.

**CONCLUSION**

In this study the impact of organizational reputation on customer e-trust, and customer
e-loyalty was investigated. Results of testing hypotheses represent confirmation of first research hypothesis. Accordingly, we can say that organizational reputation has a critical impact on e-satisfaction. Thus in Iran if organizations try to have reputation, customer satisfaction will follow. Also Loureiro and Kastenholz (2011), Miremadi et al. (2011), and Walsh et al. (2006) have confirmed significant impact of organizational reputation on customer satisfaction in their research too. In fact regardless of other cases, buying at a truthful firm itself can result in satisfaction. In fact when we define customer satisfaction in terms of satisfaction with the products of corporate, overall satisfaction with one corporate and satisfaction related with previous purchase experience, we could indicate that high level organizational reputation have considerable impact on customer satisfaction. In fact customers have more tendency to purchase from one corporate with high reputation than corporate with low reputation and feel more satisfaction from their purchase. In another words when the products of corporate A have equal quality with other corporates but the reputation of corporate A is higher than other corporates, customers feel more satisfaction when purchasing from corporate A. Such a situation occurred in our study and high corporate reputation of Digikala has led to customer satisfaction. In other words, paying little attention to performance, shopping at a reliable, trustworthy and famous company itself can bring about satisfaction.

In second hypothesis of the study, we examined the effect of organizational reputation on e-trust. Result of testing hypothesis two showed that the impact of organizational reputation on e-trust is significant in the selected population. So if Iranian organizations work on organizational reputation will enhance customer confidence. In this regard Ranft et al. (2006) believe that reputation could enhance trust and commitment to the organization. Likewise, results obtained from this hypothesis are consistent with research results of Koufaris and Hampton-Sosa (2004) and Yoon (2002).

Hypotheses test results indicates the rejection of hypothesis three. Indeed the effect of organizational reputation on e-loyalty is insignificant. Thus in this study, reputation for create customer loyalty is not proven. Considering that the ecommerce organization’s such as Digikala in Iran are emerging, so their reputation position is not yet known organization. Results obtained from this hypothesis are incompatible with research results of Casalo et al. (2008), and Loureiro and Kastenholz (2011).

Also according to research results it was found that the fourth research hypothesis also rejected and the effect of e-satisfaction on e-loyalty in this study is not proven. On the other hand, (helm, 2007) suggest that although many researchers had found the direct and significant relation between satisfaction and loyalty, satisfaction is not always the only and reliable antecedent of loyalty (Miremadi et al., 2011). But according to Eid (2011)'s results e-loyalty is strongly affected by e-satisfaction. The result of hypothesis four is also incompatible with research results of Casalo et al. (2008).

Finally, the rejection of fifth research hypothesis showed that the impact of e-trust on e-loyalty in this study is not proven. This result is incompatible with research results of Pitta et al. (2006). Generally we can say that organizational reputation has led to customer e-satisfaction and e-trust but haven’t leaded to customer e-loyalty in selected population of this research. Considering that the ecommerce organization’s such as Digikala in Iran are emerging, so their e-trust and e-loyalty position is not yet known organization.

**Limitation and Further Research**

Similar to the case with any exploration, readers need to consider the presented results within the context of limitations, and suggestions for future research are presented. The first limitation is that this study only concentrated on regular customers
of Digikala, not capturing other customers that purchase in e-shopping organization in Digikala. Regular customers are customers that purchases products or services from a person or business frequently. It is suggested that future researchers investigate this topic on others customers. Also, the process of posing and answering particular research questions typically generates more questions that need to be explored through further research. Moreover, we cannot generalize the result of this study to everyone in the other business in Iran. But we can generalize the results in the e-commerce business. To establish further generality, it must be administrated to other populations.
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