

## **The Agency in Cyberspace: A Content Analysis of Ad Agency Homepages**

### **Abstract**

*The Internet is changing the nature of marketing communications. Through the Internet, buyers have “real-time” access to businesses across the world. Interestingly, in spite of a number of studies that investigate the Internet’s impact on **advertising messages**, to date, no one has examined the Internet’s impact on the **advertising agency**. In this study, we begin to fill this “gap” in the literature. We conducted a content analysis of advertising agency homepages to determine how agencies use the web to communicate with current and potential customers. Specifically, we examine two broad questions: 1) what percentage of leading U.S. advertising agencies have a web presence?, and 2) for what purposes do ad agencies use their homepages? To answer the second question, we investigate three specific aspects of the homepages: a) communication strategy, b) interactivity, and c) the degree to which the homepage lists firm credentials.*

### **INTRODUCTION**

"If you don't get noticed, you don't have anything. You just have to be noticed, but the art is in getting noticed naturally, without screaming or without tricks." — Leo Burnett

Although these words of advertising great Leo Burnett preceded the Internet age, his wisdom holds true in the virtual business world. No longer a “trick to get noticed,” web sites are a necessity for businesses today. Establishing a successful web presence means bringing the consumer a memorable, informative, and satisfying experience. The homepage determines the web user’s first impression of the entire site; also, the homepage is often the first step in moving a web user to a desired action. While it is said that one cannot judge a book by its cover, users do often judge a web site by its homepage.

Strategically designed user-friendly, interactive, and creative homepages are crucial to attracting and keeping web users.

Web designers can allow their creativity to run rampant when working on a business’ web site. Advertising is perhaps one of the most creative industries; therefore, it seems logical that ad agencies would “showcase” their creativity on their homepages with a cutting-edge site or savvy flash introduction. Existing and potential clients may use the web not just to preview an agency’s credentials and creative work, but also to seek client/agency partnerships and contact information. In lieu of a

tedious and time-consuming offline search, many advertisers are turning to agency web sites to assist in their agency selection process. In fact, 90 percent of advertisers value the ability to search and review agency sites anonymously— especially in the early stages of their search (*Advertising Age* 2003). In spite of the importance of this marketing tool for agencies, little research focuses on the agency’s own “virtual self-marketing” tool—the ad agency homepage.

We investigate this gap, and focus on how leading U.S. ad agencies (based on *Advertising Age’s* 2003 *Agency Report*) represent themselves on their homepages. Our objectives are twofold, as we aim to determine:

1. How many of the leading advertising agencies provide a publicly-available homepage, and
2. The purposes for which ad agencies use their homepages. Toward that end, we assess the types of information agencies provide on their homepages.

We examine the second objective by addressing three aspects of the agency homepage:

- a) **Homepage communication strategy** (i.e., number of visuals and words on the homepage, use of animated introductions, sounds, and hyperlinks);
- b) **Interactivity** (i.e., inclusion of a search engine, references and links to firm offices, inclusion of an email address, and links to contact information); and
- c) **Firm credentials** (i.e., inclusion of agency awards, clients, and personnel on the homepage; inclusion of investor information, and inclusion of a newsroom).

We lay out the paper as follows: first, we present a summary of the literature on ad agencies and on commercial web sites; then, we present our research questions, method, and results; we conclude with a discussion of our results and suggestions for additional research.

## **ADVERTISING AGENCIES: TAPPING THE WEB’S POTENTIAL**

One of the most important service providers for businesses in consumer-based free-market societies is the advertising agency. “An advertising agency is an independent organization that specializes in providing one or more advertising-related services to companies” (Burnett 1993).

Advertising agencies are classified in two categories: full-service agencies and boutique agencies. Full-service agencies tend to offer services in five areas: creative, media, financial, support services and account management (Burnett 1993). Boutiques are small ad agencies that usually offer only creative services; hence, boutiques are able to concentrate on art and copy. Hiring a boutique, therefore, reduces costs to clients (Burnett 1993). We examine both types of agencies in our study.

As more organizations turn to the Internet for information and goods, logic suggests the Internet will be a primary research tool for those in need of the services that an advertising agency can provide. A company establishing a web site must consider the credibility of the Internet as an information medium. Past research indicates that “information obtained via the Internet is perceived to be as credible as that found through magazines, the radio and television” (Flanagan and Metzger 2000). Nonetheless, the same study found that savvy users tend to scrutinize information from the web more vigorously than information received from other sources. This indicates that web users now have greater knowledge of media channels than was possible before the Internet (Flanagan and Metzger 2000). In assessing the impact of increasing web user sophistication, however, one must also consider whether or not ad agency personnel are aware of the fact that potential clients now possess more information about their agencies.

A review of the literature suggests that “media planning professionals must find ways to deliver messages to consumers in a media landscape that looks very different than it did just a few years ago” (Lloyd, Slater and Robbs 2000). Advertising professionals claim to be aware of these changes. Several Japanese ad agencies (e.g., Hakuhodo, Dai-Ichi Kikaku) pioneered the Internet as early as the mid-1990s; these agencies saw the web as a medium to promote their services to major Japanese corporations (e.g., Nissan Motors, Sony Business Systems). However, the high costs involved in developing interactive web sites in the mid-1990s tempered the Japanese ad agencies’ excitement over the Internet (Kilburn 1995).

Unfortunately for the Japanese agencies, Internet usage in Japan lagged, which contributed to a decline in the agencies' business. Two agencies, Dentsu and Ogilvy & Mather Worldwide, obtained the accounts of high tech companies (e.g., IBM, Canon); however, other agencies struggled to gain clients through the Internet. Despite the initial optimism, Japanese advertisers were reluctant to use the medium by the late 1990s (Herskovitz 1999).

At the same time that the Japanese were getting excited about the potential of the Internet, many American agencies steered clear of the medium. "The Internet, it was thought, was no place for ad agencies" (Rich 1996). The chairman of BBDO Worldwide told his staff: "the Internet and the World Wide Web weren't businesses for anyone but hackers" (Rich 1996). Yet, once it became clear that the Internet *is* a viable communications medium, agencies such as Saatchi & Saatchi and Lowe & Partners/SMS created entire new media departments. Notably, the agency that had the most foresight was the one that was having success in the Japanese market: Ogilvy & Mather. Ogilvy & Mather created its new media division in the 1980s—well ahead of the curve (Rich 1996).

By the millennium, U.S. ad agencies recognized that the Internet was a mainstream medium. "Research companies quickly delivered reach, usage, demographic and psychographic information site-by-site, portal-by-portal" (Savage 2000). This research helped agencies: a) develop ads for the Internet itself, and b) determine who was using the Internet. For instance, data on net users was essential in helping one New York ad agency develop web sites for major financial institutions ("The Web Site Is the Brand, Advertising Executive Says" 2000).

By developing web sites for clients, one may assume that these agencies have gained insight into developing their own web sites. Therefore, agency web sites should allow current and potential clients to assess an agency's ability to provide an organization with essential services. As one ad executive stated:

We're using the Internet aggressively. We use the Internet as an Intranet tool that allows us to put the collective capital smarts of our company on the desktops of all our media planners around

the world... We have other mechanisms that allow us on a secure Internet [connection] to communicate with our clients and allow them to keep track of planning activities, planning revisions, competitive activity, copy that's running, just about anything they wanted that related to their media business... ("Media in the Next 20 Minutes" 2000).

Motivated by the exponential increase in Internet usage in the U.S. from the mid-1990s, many advertising agencies developed new media divisions. The rapid changes forced other agencies to take what seemed to be more chaotic measures; slow-moving agencies found their media departments "unbundled and restructured to increase media buying clout and attract new business" (Lloyd, Slater and Robbs 2000). As a result, many ad agencies morphed into more flexible entities providing traditional agency services, as well as developing new technologically-based services.

We summarize the effects of the web on ad agencies as follows: first, as a whole, U.S. ad agencies offer a wide variety of services to actual and potential clients. Second, ad professionals have attained knowledge of how the Internet can help their agencies. Third, ad agencies use the Internet to provide information to interested parties. Thus, we seek to answer two questions: to what extent do ad agencies use the Internet? And, what information do agencies choose to provide on their homepages?

## **RESEARCH QUESTIONS**

To examine the issues of ad agency web presence, communications strategy, interactivity, and posting of firm credentials, we address the following sets of research questions:

### **Web Presence**

*RQ1: What percentage of the leading U.S. ad agencies have a web presence?*

Our most basic question concerns the extent to which advertising agencies are now online. How many agencies allow current and potential clients to access their agencies through the web?

### **Communications Strategy**

*RQ2: What is the mean number of visuals on an agency homepage?*

*RQ3: What is the mean number of words on an agency homepage?*

*RQ4: What percentage of agency homepages include an Introduction before you reach the homepage?*

*RQ5: What percentage of agency homepages include sound (or .wav) files?*

*RQ6: What is the mean number of hyperlinks on an agency homepage?*

Ad agencies promote themselves as experts in communications. Agency managers want to fashion a clear, interesting message on their homepages. We are interested in what means the agency uses to communicate on its homepage. Specifically, we examine the degree to which the agency incorporates traditional communications methods (visuals (RQ2) and words (RQ3)); furthermore, we examine the extent to which the agencies use some of the newer methods developed to help web-based firms conduct business. Coders, therefore: a) examined whether each web site included an animated introduction prior to the homepage (RQ4), b) determined whether the homepage used sound (RQ5), and c) also counted the number of hyperlinks (RQ6) on each homepage.

### **Interactivity**

*RQ7: What percentage of agency homepages include a search engine?*

*RQ8A: What percentage of agency homepages include references to the agency's physical address?*

*RQ8B: What percentage of agency homepages include links to agency offices in different cities?*

*RQ9: What percentage of agency homepages include an email address?*

*RQ10: What percentage of agency homepages include a link labeled "Contact Information" or "Contact?"*

Scholars define a web site's interactivity as the degree to which the site: a) allows a web user to engage in exchanges with a site, and b) allows two-way communications (i.e., allows the user to send information to the agency, as opposed to just receiving information) (Song and Zinkhan 2003; Zeithaml, Parasuraman, and Malhotra 2002). Regarding criterion "a," we examine the extent to which the agency makes information about its business available to the web user. In order to examine this question, coders determined whether each homepage contained a search engine to allow users to find specific information

(RQ7) on the site, and whether the homepage included specific reference to an agency's offices through text (RQ8A) or links (RQ8B). In order to examine criterion "b," coders determined whether the homepage allows the user *send* information to the agency. Therefore, we examined whether the homepage included the firm's email address (RQ9) or a link labeled "Contact Information" or "Contact" (RQ10).

### **Firm Credentials**

*RQ11: What percentage of agency homepages list awards that the agency has won?*

*RQ12: What percentage of agency homepages make reference to the agency's clients?*

*RQ13: What percentage of agency homepages include links to agency "personnel" or "people?"*

*RQ14: What percentage of agency homepages make reference to investor information?*

*RQ15: What percentage of agency homepages include a link labeled "news" or "newsroom?"*

A business' web site represents a prime opportunity to promote the organization to current or potential customers. Given that ad agencies are in the business of promotions, this would seem to be an opportunity that they would be loath to pass up. Furthermore, advertising is a service business; as a rule, it is difficult for customers of service-based businesses to assess quality prior to purchase (Levitt 1986). Therefore, agency managers may provide signals that their firms offer quality services to clients. To examine the degree to which the homepages emphasize agency credentials (or quality), we constructed a series of research questions. Specifically, we examined how many of the pages listed awards that the firm had won (RQ11), how many listed the names of clients (RQ12), and how many included links to "personnel" or "people" (RQ13). Additional means by which firms may attempt to build credibility include posting investor information (RQ14) and news about the agency (RQ15) on their homepage.

## METHOD

### Sample

We use *Advertising Age's 59<sup>th</sup> Annual Agency Report* as a sampling frame for this study (*Advertising Age* 2003). In the report, *Advertising Age* provides statistics pertaining to the 469 leading U.S. advertising agencies (ranked by annual ad revenues). From the 469 firms listed in the report, a random number generator selected 160 firms for the analysis. Of the initial 160 sites, we found web sites for 156 agencies. (Phone calls to the other four agencies confirmed that they had no web site). Therefore, we answered RQ1; independent coders answered the remaining research questions.

### Code Sheet Development

Given the surprising lack of attention content analysts have paid to ad agencies, we engaged in several brainstorming sessions to devise an appropriate list of variables for this study. Over several sessions, we: a) devised draft items, b) browsed agency homepages to assess whether such items would be appropriate for a formal content analysis, and c) decided whether we should include the item, amend the item, or discard it from the content analysis. We emerged with three general classes of items, which relate to one of three aspects of the homepage: 1) communication strategy, 2) interactivity, and 3) firm credentials. Most of the measurements are categorical; however, three items (number of visuals, words, and links) are measured at a continuous level.

### Procedure

During fall 2003, two trained coders completed coding the sites. Initially, the coders: a) accessed a site, b) read the code sheet and code book, c) coded a site, and d) reported any questions. Their feedback helped ensure that the code sheet questions and operational definitions were “set.” Coding proceeded in the following manner. Coders examined the 160 sites in eight phases; each phase consisted of coding twenty sites. The coders independently coded the same twenty sites during each phase. To



eliminate inconsistency, the coders used the same computer for all eight phases. Prior to each phase, we examined all twenty sites to ensure that: a) the web addresses that we provided the coders were correct and that, b) the site was accessible (or “up”). During the coding, some sites were taken offline, others were under construction, and the partners in one firm split into separate agencies. These changes left 149 “codeable” sites. (Please see the Appendix for a list of the agencies in the sample).

The unit of analysis for the study is the agency homepage. Coders did not venture off the homepage in conducting their analyses. McMillan (2000) notes that coding only the homepage is a very common method in online content analyses. Specifically, she notes that the homepage is: a) the access point and main source of information about a site, and b) that some web sites contain over 50,000 separate web pages. We suggest a third factor: many business-to-business sites contain password-protected pages that are inaccessible to the general public, unlike the publicly-available homepage.

### **Reliability**

To enhance reliability, each of the coders worked independently and examined all 149 usable sites. Also, where there were problems with reliability, the researchers discussed these problems with the coder in order to resolve any confusion. As a result, the overall coefficient of reliability, for the twelve categorical measures, is 91.9 percent. This exceeds the 80% criterion recommended by Riffe et al. (1998). Individual measures of reliability (percent of agreement) range from 81.2% to 100%; therefore, all twelve measures exceed the recommended 80% threshold (Riffe et al. 1998).

For the continuous measures (i.e., number of visuals, words, and links) we assessed reliability through the Pearson Product-Moment Correlation. Inter-coder correlations between continuous variables in a content analysis should exceed .8 (Riffe et al. 1998). All of the inter-coder correlations surpass this standard: number of visuals (.899), number of words (.997) and number of links (.975). All three

correlations are significant at the .000 level. Therefore, our measures evince evidence of reliability. In the results section we report the mean of the coders' findings.

## RESULTS

### Web Presence

Of the 160 initial firms, 4 had no web site (2.5%). Therefore, in answer to RQ1, the vast majority of the top agencies (97.5%) have some type of "official" web site.

---

*Table About Here*

---

### Communications

Agencies use a combination of old and new methods to communicate with Internet users. Among the older methods of communication, the mean number of visuals is just under five per homepage (RQ2 = 4.79), while the mean number of words is just over 60 (RQ3 = 62.57). In regard to RQ2 and RQ3, we note that there is a large amount of variance among agencies. For instance, one homepage contains over 350 words; another contains over 30 visuals. There are many differences in the rates at which firms use newer communications methods as well. Introductions (e.g., flash) prior to the homepage are quite common (RQ4 = 49%); however, sound is much less popular (RQ5 = 27.25%). Finally, most homepages include slightly fewer than ten links (RQ6 = 9.72). There is a wide variance in the number of links; for example, one page contains over 35 links and other pages have none at all.

### Interactivity

Previously, we noted that web sites may contain two types of interactivity: a) ability to *obtain* information, and b) ability to *provide* information. In regard to a), we examine whether the homepage includes a search engine (RQ7) and whether the homepage makes references (RQ8a) or contains links (RQ8b) to the agency's geographic (i.e., physical) location. Relatively few firms provide a search engine (RQ7 = 2.35%). Surprisingly few homepages reference the firm's physical location for offices (RQ8a =

24.5%). Even fewer agencies provide links to multiple locations (i.e., additional offices) (RQ8b = 8.4%). In regard to b), e-mail addresses on the homepage are remarkably uncommon (RQ9 = 11.5%). However, the fact that over three-quarters of the sites provide a link to contact information (RQ10 = 75.1%) may explain the scarcity of web addresses on the homepage.

### **Firm Credentials**

Finally, we examine whether agencies promote their credentials on their homepages. Homepages vary widely in regard to the methods used to promote the firm. Almost half of the homepages reference the name of agency clients (RQ12 = 49.9%). Similarly, many homepages provide a link to news about the agency (RQ15 = 49%), and approximately one-quarter provide links to information about firm personnel (RQ13 = 26.2%). However, far fewer agencies mention awards (RQ11 = 9.4%); fewer still mention investor information (RQ14 = 2%). The lack of investor information may stem from the fact that many advertising agencies are not publicly-traded companies, and/or are concerned with privacy issues.

## **DISCUSSION & CONCLUSIONS**

Ad agencies vary greatly in the content provided on their homepages. Further, agencies show clear preferences for providing some types of information over others. For instance, relatively few firms provide search engines to help web users navigate the site; on the other hand, information about agency clients is much more common. It would be interesting to explore why such differences exist, as well as the clients' perspectives on the advantages and disadvantages of an information-laden or bare site.

Why are so many agency sites so "bare?" Answers could involve agencies' desire to protect both creative information and their clients' privacy. Cyber-identity theft victimizes businesses; therefore, greater information disclosure on a homepage might provide thieves with more ammunition for their schemes (Close, Zinkhan, and Finney 2004). Also, clients may wish not to have details about their

campaigns on the agency site because of the threat of a competitor taking the creative idea. Because the Internet provides information in real-time and even “before time” (e.g., ads may be online before the ad is aired/printed), clients may forego the “free advertising” on their agency’s site in order to protect their privacy.

In considering the results from our study, one must recognize some limitations. Because coders analyzed only homepages, one must be aware that many agencies might elect to disclose information on pages other than the homepage. Also, some agency sites may exert a higher degree of interactivity than what is apparent by examining their home pages. For instance, chat rooms and online bulletin boards are often posted on inner pages.

Furthermore, while presence/absence coding does enhance the feasibility of analyzing one hundred sixty pages, this coding may not indicate the breadth or depth of the measure. For instance, the agency may post one award or a “laundry list” of all awards earned, however this study explores whether the agency mentions any awards at all. In order to examine some of our variables more intensively, future researchers may wish to focus more narrowly on specific aspects of agency web sites.

We close with a few questions for researchers interested in pursuing this topic. The most intuitive extension of our work is to move beyond the descriptive nature of this study; researchers could develop normative models indicating what information an agency *should* provide on its homepage. For instance, how does web page content link to agency performance? An extension of this work might be to obtain data on agencies’ financial performance and examine how financial performance relates to web site content. Researchers might also examine whether agencies prefer to use the web as a tool for obtaining new clients or for servicing current clients. One might also examine whether boutique and full-service ad agencies differ in their home page information content.

## REFERENCES

- Advertising Age* (2003), *59<sup>th</sup> Annual Report*, April 21.
- Burnett, John J. (1993), Promotion Management. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Close, Angeline Grace, George M. Zinkhan, and R. Zachary Finney (2004), "Cyber-Identity Theft: A Conceptual Model and Implications for Public Policy," *Proceedings of the American Marketing Association Summer Educator's Conference*, (forthcoming).
- Flanagan, Andrew J. and Miriam J. Metzger (2000), "Perceptions of Internet Information Credibility," *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*. 77(3), 515 – 540.
- Herskovitz, Jon (Nov. 11, 1999), "Internet Focus: Japan," *Advertising Age International*. p. 48.
- Kilburn, David (1995), "Japanese Clients Surf the Internet," *Adweek Western Edition*. 45(7), 12.
- Krippendorff, Klaus (1980), Content Analysis: An Introduction to Its Methodology, Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Levitt, Theodore (1986), *The Marketing Imagination*, New York: Free Press.
- Lloyd, Carla V., Jan Slater, and Brett Robbs (2000), "The Advertising Marketplace and the Media Planning Course," *Journalism & Mass Communication Educator*, 55(3), 4 – 13.
- McMillan, Sally J. (2000), "The Microscope and the Moving Target: The Challenge of Applying Content Analysis to the World Wide Web," *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly*, 77(1), 80-98.
- "Media in the Next 20 Minutes" (Mar. 13, 2000). *MediaWeek*. 10(11), 34 – 41.
- Rich, Laura (1996), "Creating a Home for New Media," *Adweek*. 37(42), 29-33.
- Riffe, Daniel, Stephen Lacy, and Frederick Fico (1998), Analyzing Media Messages: Using Quantitative Content Analysis in Research, Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Savage, Jed (2000), "Upfront and Center," *Adweek*. 41(24), 16.
- Song, JiHee and George M. Zinkhan (2003), "Features of Web Site Design, Perceptions on Web Site Quality, and Patronage Behavior," *ACME Proceedings*, 106-114.
- "The Web Site Is The Brand, Advertising Executive Says" (Nov. 27, 2000). *Web Finance*. 4(24), 4 – 5.
- Zeithaml, Valarie A., A. Parasuraman, and Arvind Malhotra (2002), "Service Quality Delivery Through Web Sites: A Critical Review of Extant Knowledge," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 30 (Fall), 362-410.

**TABLE  
DATA ANALYSIS – RESEARCH QUESTIONS  
& RELIABILITY**

<b>Research Questions - Web Presence</b>		<b>% sites containing</b>	<b>Reliability*</b>
RQ1	Percentage of top agencies with a homepage	= 97.5%	N/A**
<b>Research Questions - Communications Strategy</b>		<b>% sites containing/ mean</b>	<b>Reliability*</b>
RQ2	Mean # of visuals	mean = 4.79	.899 (C)***
RQ3	Mean # of words	mean = 62.57	.997 (C)***
RQ4	Homepages with introductions	= 49%	81.2% (I)
RQ5	Homepages with sound/wav files	= 27.25%	95.3% (I)
RQ6	Mean # of links	mean = 9.72	.975 (C) ***
<b>Research Questions - Interactivity</b>		<b>% sites containing</b>	<b>Reliability*</b>
RQ7	Homepages with search engine	= 2.35%	98.0% (I)
RQ8A	Homepages with references to physical address	= 24.5%	89.9% (I)
RQ8B	Homepages with links to location	= 8.4%	92.6% (I)
RQ9	Homepages with email address	= 11.5%	95.3% (I)
RQ10	Homepages with contact information link	= 75.1%	89.3% (I)
<b>Research Questions - Firm Credentials</b>		<b>% sites containing</b>	<b>Reliability*</b>
RQ11	Homepages listing awards	= 9.4%	94.6% (I)
RQ12	Homepages referencing clients	= 49.9%	83.9% (I)
RQ13	Homepages with links to personnel	= 26.2%	83.9% (I)
RQ14	Homepages with investor information	= 2.0%	98.7% (I)
RQ15	Homepages with links to firm news	= 49%	100.0% (I)

NOTE: \* for Reliability: (I) denotes Intercoder agreement (for categorical measures)

(C) denotes Correlation (Pearson) (for continuous measures)

\*\* Reliability is Not Applicable (N/A) for RQ1; the researchers, not the coders, completed this item

\*\*\* All Pearson Correlations are significant at the .000-level.

**APPENDIX  
AD AGENCIES INCLUDED IN THE DATA SET**

1 BBDO Worldwide	48 Ignited Minds
2 Kinzie & Green	49 Avrett Free & Ginsburg
3 DiMeo & Co.	50 Exclamation Point Advertising
4 Kupper Parker Communications	51 Cooper & Hayes
5 Toth	52 Mendelsohn/Zien Advertising
6 Ibis Communications	53 Star Group
7 Grant Scott & Hurley	54 GEM Group
8 Ziccardi Partners Frierson Mee	55 A Partnership
9 Marketing Integrators	56 Oasis Advertising
10 North Castle Partners	57 Sigma Group
11 Grafica Group	58 Foote, Cone & Belding Worldwide
12 Dieste Harmel & Partners	59 Donald L. Arends
13 Berlin Cameron/Red Cell	60 Brozena Schaller Menaker & Ripley
14 Porcaro Communications	61 Barnhart/CMI
15 Sawyer Riley Compton	62 Marcus Thomas
16 Merkley Newman Harty Partners	63 Eric Mower & Associates
17 Crispin Porter & Bogusky	64 Lapiz
18 Vidal Partnership	65 Arvizu Advertising & Promotions
19 Margeotes Fertitta & Partners	66 E.B. Lane Marketing Communications
20 Heil-Brice Retail Advertising	67 Skyworks
21 Intertrend	68 Fletcher Martin Ewing
22 Barefoot Advertising	69 Beber Silverstein Group
23 Ovation Advertising & Marketing	70 Creative Alliance
24 Zimmerman & Partners	71 Siddall
25 Publicis Worldwide	72 Hunt Adkins
26 Bandy Carrol Hellige Advertising	73 Ron Foth Advertising
27 HSR Business to Business	74 Anderson Communications
28 Coyne Beahm	75 Young & Laramore
29 Hughes Group	76 Yaffe & Co.
30 Time Advertising	77 Martin Agency
31 Open Minds Agency	78 L3 Advertising
32 Gardner Geary Coll	79 Liggett-Stashower
33 Flowers & Partners	80 Euro RSCG Tatham Partners
34 Stoner Bunting Advertising	81 MKA
35 Phelps Group	82 Carol H. Williams Advertising
36 Grey Global Group	83 Espanol Marketing & Communications
37 Charleston/Orwig	84 Associated Advertising Agency
38 Cooper Leder Marketing	85 McCormick Co.
39 Stone & Simons Advertising	86 Mars Advertising
40 Al Paul Lefton Co.	87 Innis Maggiore Group
41 Creative Civilization	88 Penny/Ohlmann/Neiman
42 Ackerman McQueen	89 Carton Donofrio Partners
43 McClain Finlon Advertising	90 Marketing Support
44 Lopez Negrete Communications	91 Hiebing Group
45 G&G Advertising	92 Prime Access
46 Erwin-Penland	93 SRK
47 Cole & Weber/Red Cell	94 Buck & Pulleyn

95 Flashpoint Advertising  
96 DavisElen Advertising  
97 Cartel Group  
98 Malcolm Marketing Communications  
99 Kerker  
100 Deutsch  
101 Trahan Burden & Charles  
102 Publicis Sanchez & Levitan  
103 St. John & Partners Advertising & PR  
104 Cranford Johnson Robinson Woods  
105 GMMB  
106 Henderson Advertising  
107 Adasia Communications  
108 Casanova Pendrill Publicidad  
109 Schraff Group  
110 Leagas Delaney  
111 Macy Advertising  
112 Young & Roehr Group  
113 White & Baldacci  
114 CreativeOnDemand  
115 Gardner-Nelson Project  
116 DRGM Advertising & Public Relations  
117 M&C Saatchi  
118 Arnold Worldwide  
119 Hadrian's Wall  
120 Trumpet  
121 Christy MacDougall Mitchell Bodden  
122 Siboney USA  
123 DGWB Advertising  
124 Leopold Ketel & Partners  
125 Flynn Sabatino & Day  
126 Euro RSCG MVBMS Hispanic  
127 Bates USA  
128 Cramer-Krasselt  
129 KI Lipton  
130 Dae Advertising  
131 Mullen  
132 Amazon Advertising  
133 Aragon Advertising  
134 Brouillard Communications  
135 Enlace Communications  
136 CORE  
137 Buntin Group  
138 Intermark Group  
139 Della Femina, Rothschild, Jeary & Partners  
140 Winning Strategies/Warren Kremer Paino  
141 GodwinGroup  
142 Rives Carlberg  
143 Hill Holliday Connors Cosmopolos  
144 Copper  
145 J. Walter Thompson Co.  
146 Thielen & Associates  
147 Nationwide Advertising Services  
148 Bernstein-Rein Advertising  
149 Weintraub Advertising