International Journal of Advanced Mass Communication and Journalism 2022; 3(1): 78-81

E-ISSN: 2708-4469
P-ISSN: 2708-4450
IJAMCJ 2022; 3(1): 78-81

www.masscomjournal.com
Received: 18-01-2022
Accepted: 12-03-2022

Dr. Asok Biswas
Professor and HOD,
Department of Journalism and Multimedia, CGC Jhanjeri Mohali, Punjab, India

Correspondence
Dr. Asok Biswas
Professor and HOD,
Department of Journalism and Multimedia, CGC Jhanjeri Mohali, Punjab, India

Capturing the sentiment of clients in a competitive market is a major challenge in client exceptionalism

Dr. Asok Biswas

Abstract
In these days, client's turnover is taking place continuously. So it is the duty of the account-servicing department to keep the existing clients for a long time with agency, and make the pitch to capture the new clients. An emerging line of research on agencies and their clients proposes that the client-agency relationship can be made productive and more satisfying for clients if they are viewed as partial employees or temporary participants in the production of agency service. In this study, the respondent takes the following steps to retain the clients for a long time.

Keywords: Client's expectation, Agency service, friedman ANOVA, Maximum cooperation, competitive change

Introduction
Today's clients want integrated communication solution including direct marketing, event management and public relation. The agencies also know the importance of emerging technologies, and they become communication companies. Now the clients want to know whether an agency can offer insights into consumer behaviour. Clients are also beginning to look at ad-agencies not only as content creators but also as a channel to deliver content.
Clients' needs are changing dramatically; the custodian of the brand is no longer the only or even primary mandate for ad-shops.

Table 1: Shows retention steps and Ad-agency response

Retention Steps	Ad-agency Response	
	Nos.	**Percentage**
Direct contact with Clients	25	100
Early presentation of agency to the clients	17	68
Reaction based on competitive change	15	60
More time for clients to make payments	15	60
Speedy decision making in clients' accounts	12	48
Arranging Special Meeting with Clients	10	40
Understanding other media issue of clients	09	36
Allow the clients in all agency functions	07	28
Offer more discount in media buy	05	20

Source: Primary Data

The table 1 brings out 100% of the agency responded to direct contact with the clients by the agency and it helps to make retention ofclients. Frequent visit by the agency people to the clients' company construct good relationship between them. They can share the information regarding brand development, market change, customer expectation, competitors move etc.
The clients with huge volume of budgets, facing number of problems in the market, expect speedy presentation of agency. So 68% of the agencies have given importance for the same.
More time given by the agency to the clients for the payment (60%) and reaction based on competitive change (60%) help the clients to make good rapport with each other. Most clients are satisfied with the above factors. All other factors are given least importance.

Client's expectation from their agencies

Instead, companies are looking for expertise on market strategy, business plans, product design, and the customer intelligence in addition to communication from the agencies.

The following table 2 brings out the expectation of the clientsfrom their agencies and the agencies' perception about the clients'expectation based on their responses.

Clients expectation from ad-agency
(A Comparison between Ad-Agencies and Clients)

Table 2: Results of Friedman ANOVA and Kendall's Coefficient of Concordance for Ranking Scores of Ag-Agencies and Clients over 'Clients Expectation from Ad-Agency'

SI. No	Clients Expectation from Ad-Agency	Ad-Agencies (n = 25)			Clients (n = 50)		
		Average Rank	Sum of Ranks	Rank Obtained	Average Rank	Sum of Ranks	Rank Obtained
1	Quality of creativity	1.14	28.5	1	2.61	130.5	3
2	Prompt services	1.94	48.5	2	2.02	101.0	2
3	Professionalism	3.26	81.5	3	2.57	128.5	3
4	Trustworthiness	9.16	229.0	9	9.39	469.5	9
5	Market inputs	11.12	278.0	11	11.13	556.5	11
6	Product experience	4.60	115.0	5	4.36	218.0	4
7	Reaction to market change	8.76	219.0	9	8.25	412.5	8
8	Scientific media planning	4.54	113.5	5	4.00	200.0	4
9	Media negotiation and media buying skill	6.46	161.5	6	5.87	293.5	6
10	Media sensitivity	10.44	261.0	10	8.19	409.5	8
11	Integrated communication packages	6.80	170.0	7	9.15	457.5	9
12	Effective use of research	9.78	244.5	10	10.46	523.0	10
Kendall's 'W" (Coefficient of Concordance)		0.9154			0.8656		
Friedman ANOVA Chi-Square Value		251.74 (11)			476.05 (11)		

***Source*:** Primary Data ''Significant at 1 per cent level.

Figures in brackets shows the degrees of freedom

Table value of Chi-square for d.f. 11 at 5% level = 19.67 and at 1% level = 27.72

The results of Friedman ANOVA and Kendall's 'W' are depicted in the table 2. The table shows that the calculated coefficient of concordance values of 0.9134 and 0.8656 respectively for both ad- agencies and clients in respect of their ranking score are very high. The Friedman ANOVA chi-square values, 254.74 and 474.05 respectively for both ad-agencies and clients are also very much higher than the table value of 27.72 at 1 per cent level of significance for degrees of freedom 11.

The above results of Friedman ANOVA reveal that both the sample of ad-agencies and clients are drawn from the population with different median ranking values and the high Kendall's coefficient of concordance for both ad-agencies and clients exposed the truth that there is a significant agreement (relatedness) in the ranking of the 'clients expectation from ad-agency' measurement items among ad- agencies as well as clients.

Comparison of ranking perception of ad-agencies and clients regarding 'client's expectation from ad-agency'

To compare the ranking perception of ad-agencies and clients in respect of 'clients expectation from ad-agency', the rank sum scores of the data obtained from them are analysed with 'Mann-Whitney U test' and the results of the above analysis are presented in the table 3.

Table 3: Results of Mann-Whitney 'U' Test Between Rank Sum Scores of Ad-agencies and Clients or 'Clients Expectation from Ad-Agency' Measurement Items

SI. No	Clients Expectation from Ad-Agency	Rank Sums		'U' Test Value	'Z' Value
		Ad-Agencies (n = 25)	Clients (n = 50)		
1	Quality of creativity	2223.5	626.5	301.5	-3.86
2	Prompt services	1743.5	1106.5	468.5	-1.88
3	Professionalism	1693.5	1156.5	418.5	-2.40
4	Trustworthiness	1818.0	1032.0	543.0	-0.94
5	Market inputs	2000.5	849.5	524.5	-1.17
6	Product experience	1898.5	951.5	623.5	-0.02
7	Reaction to market change	1786.5	1063.5	511.5	-1.30
8	Scientific media planning	1683.5	1166.5	408.5	-2.58
9	Media negotiation and media buying skill	1694.0	1156.0	419.0	-2.37
10	Media sensitivity	1695.5	1154.5	420.5	-2.35
11	Integrated communication packages	2005.5	844.5	519.5	-1.22
12	Effective use of research	1949.5	900.5	575.5	-0.57

***Source*:** Primary Data

'Significant at 5 per cent level; "Significant at 1 per cent level. Table value of Z at 5% level = 1.96 and at 1% level = 2.57

Null hypothesis

H_0: There is no significant difference between Ad-agencies andClients in respect of their rank sum scores of the client's expectation from ad-agency.

Results presented in the table 3 shows that the rank sum scores of ad-agencies and clients are significantly differing from each other in respect of 'quality of creativity' ('U' value = 301.5; |Z| value = 3.86 - Significant at 1 per cent level), 'professionalism' ('U' value =418.50; |Z| value = 2.40 - significant at 5 per cent level), 'scientific media planning' ('U' value = 408.50; |Z| value = 2.58 - significant at 1 per cent level), 'media negotiation and media buying skill' ('U' value = 419.0; |Z| value = 2.37 - significant at 5 per cent level) and 'media sensitivity' ('U' value = 420.50; |Z| value = 2.35 - significant at 5 per cent level)

The remaining 7 items envisage the lack of significance difference in the respective rank sum scores between ad-agencies and clients. Since majority of the items has shown insignificant results, it can be concluded that significant difference between Ad-agencies and Clients in respect of their rank sum scores in relation with 'client's expectation from ad-agency' does not exist and hence the null hypothesis is rejected.

Comparison of latent structure of ranking perception on 'client's expectation from ad-agency' between ad-agencies and clients

The latent structure of 'client's expectation from ad-agency' is uncovered based on ranking given by both ad-agencies and clients using principal components method of factor analysis. The analysis shows that ranking scores of both ad-agencies and clients are composed of a single aspect in relation with above measure. The detailed results are presented in the table 4. The scree plot is not required for eigenvalues calculated from ranking perception scores of both ad-agencies and clients as they are composed of single aspect each.

Table 4: Factor loadings of 'Clients Expectation from Ad-Agency' Measurement Items with Extracted Factors for Ad- Agencies and Clients

SI No	'Clients Expectation from Ad-Agency'	Number of Factors Extracted	
		Ad-agencies	Clients
		Factor	Factor
1	Quality of creativity	0.83	0.94
2	Prompt services	0.83	0.76
3	Professionalism	0.94	0.91
4	Trustworthiness	0.97	0.96
5	Market inputs	0.96	0.81
6	Product experience	0.92	0.97
7	Reaction to market change	0.96	0.93
8	Scientific media planning	0.96	0.79
8	Media negotiation and media buying skill	0.96	0.93
9	Media sensitivity	0.91	0.95
10	Integrated communication packages	0.97	0.93
11	Effective use of research	0.93	0.84
12	Quality of creativity	0.83	0.94
Eigenvalue		10.3763	9.6326
Proportion of Total Variance		0.8647 (86.47%)	0.8027 (80.27%)

***Source*:** Primary Data

Note: High factor loadings of an item with extracted factors are boldfaced

Table 4 depict the factor loadings of each of the 'clients expectation from ad-agency' measurement items with extracted factorfor both ad-agencies and clients. The table clearly shows that ranking perception of both ad-agencies and clients comprise just one aspect regarding 'clients expectation from ad-agency'. The proportion of total variance accounted for by ad-agency factor in their ranking perception score is 86.47 per cent and by clients in their ranking perception scores is 80.27 per cent.

Hence from the overall results presented in the table 4, the conclusion can be made in such a way that the respective ranking perception scores of ad-agencies and clients are falling under one common aspect regarding 'clients expectation from ad-agency' and all the items used to measure 'clients expectation from ad-agency' forms one collective group with respect to both ad-agencies and clients.

Classification (grouping) of ad-agencies by their ranking perception of 'client expectation from ad-agency'

Table 5 Presents the results of cluster mean values distinct group of ad-agencies classified using cluster analysis based on their ranking perception of "client expectation from ad-agency"

Table 5: Cluster Mean scores of Various Measurement Factors considered by Ad-agencies regarding 'Client Expectation from Ad-agency' (N=25)

Measurement Items	Cluster Means	
	Cluster 1(N=15) Creativity, Service & Professionalism	Cluster 2 (N=10) Creativity only
Quality of creativity	1.00	1.70
Prompt services	1.67	3.10
Professionalism	2.67	' 6.10
Trustworthiness	7.73	10.60
Market inputs	9.13	11.40
Product experience	3.40	7.30

Reaction to market change	7.20	10.90
Scientific media planning	4.13	6.20
Media negotiation and media buying skill	5.33	9.50
Media sensitivity	7.93	11.70
Integrated communication packages	6.13	9.20
Effective use of research	7.33	11.80

***Source*:** Primary Data

Note: Scores are in rank. Average rank values below 4 and remarkable differencewith other cluster group are boldfaced

Perusal of the table 5, reveals that both cluster 1 and 2 are giving preference to 'quality of creativity' (mean values are 1.00 for cluster 1 and 1.70 for cluster 2) and cluster 2 group of ad-agencies are not giving due importance to the remaining items except 'prompt services' (mean = 3.10). But cluster 1 group of ad-agencies are giving more importance to some other items, such as, 'prompt services (mean = 1.67), 'professionalism' (mean = 2.67) and 'product experience' (mean = 3.40) than that of cluster 2 groups. Also, there has been vase difference in mean values, in respect of those three items, between two cluster groups. The above results clearly indicate existence of dissimilarity among ad-agencies, and due to such dissimilarity they themselves formed into two distinct groups. Based on the above fact, the cluster 1 group is identified as 'creativity, service and professionalism group' and cluster 2 as 'creativity only' group. These groupings are used in cross tabulation with other grouping of ad- agencies to find out association between them.

Conclusion

In the complex media world of today where clients are much more media interactive and demanding in terms of plan justification, the need for media service has been felt like never before. Today media services i.e., planning and buying, have become absolutely to the frontline. Media planners have to be presentable, knowledgeable, articulate and confident" [1].

Media planning is fast becoming a tight ropework. With technology changing so fast, media planners and buyers find it very difficult to deliver the message to the audience through different media options. And it all makes the planners feel very difficult to win the clients' expected target audience. Nowadays, the clients are demanding the following requisites shown in table 6:16 from the media planning and buying.

References

1. Sean Brierley. The Advertising Hand Book, Routiledge, Taylor &Fancis group London and Newyork.
2. Kazmi SHH, Satish Batra K. Advertising and Sales Promotion,Excel Books, New Delhi - 110028, First Edition; c2001.
3. Farbey AD. How to Produce Successful Advertising, Kogan Page Ltd., London; c1994.
4. Chunawalla SA, Sethia KC. Foundations of Advertising Theoryand Practice, Himalaya Publishing House, New Delhi; c1999.
5. Barban Arnold M Donald, Jugenheimer W, Lee F. Yound Grid Inc. Columbus Ohio; c1975. p. 4
6. George Belch E, Michael Belch A. Introduction to Advertising and Promotion, IRWIN London.

---

[1]VIathan Varkey: The Age of the Media Planner, Brand Wagon, The FinancialExpress, Nov.1998,p.2