PressAcademia

Journal of Management, Marketing and Logistics

Year: 2017 Volume: 4 Issue: 3

EFFECTIVENESS OF DIGITAL PUBLIC RELATIONS TOOLS ON VARIOUS CUSTOMER SEGMENTS

DOI: 10.17261/Pressacademia.2017.488
JMML-V.4-ISS.3-2017(8)-p.259-270

Necmiye Irem Gulerman[1], Fahri Apaydin[2]
[1] Omeraga Dist. Tekel Str. Kocaeli, Turkey. iremgulerman@hotmail.com
[2] Yalova University, Yalova, Turkey. fapaydin1@yahoo.com

To cite this document
Gulerman, N. I. and F. Apaydin. (2017). Effectiveness of digital public relations tools on various customer segments. Journal of Management, Marketing and Logistics (JMML), V.4, Iss.3, p.259-270.
Permemant link to this document:http://doi.org/10.17261/Pressacademia.2017.488
Copyright: Published by PressAcademia and limited licenced re-use rights only.

ABSTRACT

Purpose- This study aims at measuring effectiveness of digital public relations tools on various customer segments. Digital public relations, an important component of digital marketing, is gaining more and more importance in the e-commerce market, so this research is significant as it is related with this developing realm.

Methodology- Digital public relations tools, social media, company forum page, e-mails, company websites, blogs, are used by most of the e-businesses to manage the organizations' reputation in the virtual life. Structured questionnaire using Likert Scale is developed by the autohors to gather data. Customers of a well-known leading telecommunication company in Turkey are chosen as the universe of the research and we got responses from 213 participants. The data is analyzed using SPSS statistical program and ANOVA tests and frequency tables are used to make analyses.

Findings- We wanted to analyze how effective the company is using such digital public relation tools. The results reveal that various tools might have different effects on specific customer segments.

Conclusion- It is found out that various customer segments are affected differently from various digital puclic relations tools.Thus, it is necessary for the organizations to be aware of how these tools affect various customer segments and develop digital marketing strategies accordingly to increase their marketing performance. Moreover, as traditional public relations tools keep their importance, organizations need to adapt them with the digital ones.

Keywords: Digital marketing, digital public relations, digital public relations tools, e-marketing.
JEL Codes: M30**,** M31, M37

1. INTRODUCTION

Digitalization has changed so many things in the world including the customer behaviors, the way businesses make trade, the way organizations serve to their customers, etc. Thus, most of the marketing concepts which have been searched by the academicians so far need to be searched in the digital context, which will help us understand the changes in customer behaviors as well. Public relations, a significant component of marketing communication mix, is used by the businessmen to manage their organizations' reputation, image and the crises organizations face to contribute to the communications with the public and protect the rights of the organizations. As many people prefer online shopping and engage in activities online for communication with others, organizations should spend special and precise effort on online communications. Digital public relations which is in its infancy has an important potential to realize the functions of public relations mentioned above more efficiently and effectively. With a "click" sometimes even without "a click" organizations might reach millions of

people real time at the same moment. Digital public relations' this ability makes it a vital marketing communication medium and it has some alternative tools that marketers benefit from very often. Most popular ones are mainly: social media, blogs, forums, organization's website, and e-mails sent to customers by the organization. In this study, we explore the effectiveness of each of them and this makes this paper original and it is believed that it contributes the literature. In this exploratory research data is gathered with a survey done with the customers of a leading telecommunication company in Turkey.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Digital public relations is in its infancy, and breathtaking developments are being experienced in the marketing realm. To capture the concept of digital public relations, we believe that it is necessary to dwell on and define digital marketing first. According to Chaffey & Ellis-Chadwick (2012), digital marketing is "Achieving marketing objectives through applying digital technologies." and they add "These digital technologies include the desktop, mobile, tablet and other digital platforms". Scott (2011) defines digital marketing as "Digital marketing is selling, promoting and marketing your product or service online". Brown (2013) by saying "digital PR is dead because all PR is digital" urges that digitalization has become so comprehensive in the business life that it is impossible to do public relations activities without integrating digital tools.

Smith and Zook (2011) define public relations very briefly as "the development of and maintenance of good relationships with different publics". Publics mainly consists numerous groups such as clients, media, consumers, and regulators (government bodies) (Vardeman-Winter and Place, 2015). Among these, the most important is the customers who deserve more attention of the organizations as they are the main target to serve. Another definition done by Newsom and Scott (1985) is "PR is responsibility and responsiveness in policy and information to the best interests of the institution and its publics" and this definition mentions the main function of public relations which is to protect the interests of the organizations. To distribute information, interact with key publics, deal with crises, and manage issues are the main functions of public relations (Hallahan, 2004). In order to realize these functions marketers who are responsible from public relations in an organization need to research, manage, and frame issues (Kent, 2008), and all of these activities can be done more effectively and efficiently using digital tools.

Organizations are endeavoring to find out more efficient ways and tools to achieve these functions and contribute positively to their reputation and brand image. Internet and digitalization in a broader sense is changing the nature of public relations like other functions of organizations. Public relations function in organizations is undergoing a huge change in terms of the tools it is using. Thanks to Internet, professionals of public relations do not depend on traditional media to communicate with the interest groups (Jo and Jung, 2005). Annual reports and news releases, common tools of printed media, are replaced with digital tools such as websites and e-mails. Some academicians put forward that new tools such as social media have high potential to contribute to brand awareness, the reputation of the organizations, and customer service. The new tools also enable organizations do public relations activities more efficiently and effectively by increasing interaction with the customers and thus develop long-lasting relationships (Allagui and Breslow, 2016). These tools also provide more creative public relations activities that might increase customer engagements with the organizations' activities (Green, 2010). Digitalization has changed the nature of the public relations and provided some more tools to exploit for the organizations while making it easier to realize its functions, and it also increased the complexity of this communication mix (Richardson and Laville, 2010; Lahav and Zimand-Sheiner, 2016). Thanks to internet, they also mention that for organizations "conversation, interaction, collaboration and more between organizations and their stakeholders" is faster and efficient, and developing healthier and long lasting relations with customers is possible.

Although digitalization is providing innovative and new opportunities to the marketers to carry out public relations functions, more studies need to be done to explore the effectiveness, power, and utilization of social media and other tools internet presents for public relations (Taylor and Kent, 2010). In this study, social media, forums, blogs, company website, and e-mails sent to customers by the organizations are considered as digital public relations tools and their effectiveness among various customer groups are explored.

3. DATA AND METHODOLOGY

Our research questions are as follows:

1. Which of the digital public relations tools are more effective on various customer segments?

2. Which digital tools are used by the customers most to communicate with the organization?

Data is gathered with structured questionnaire done online. Customers of a well-known leading telecommunication company in Turkey are chosen as the universe of the research to see how effcient the organization is using the digital public relations tools. Some statements are given to the respondents and they are asked to a what extent they agree with the statements on Likert scale 1 being strongly disagree and 5 being strongly agree.

We got responses from 213 participants. Demographic features of the respondents are shown in Table 1. 134 of the respondents are female and they constitute 62.9% of the sample and 79 of them are male constituting 37.1% of the sample.

Table 1: Demographic Features

Demographic characteristics	Freq.	%
Gender		
Female	134	62,9
Male	79	37,1
Age		
Under 20	15	0,07
20-30	87	40,8
31-40	49	27,1
41-50	33	15,5
50+	29	13,6
Education		
Elementary School	13	6,1
High School	59	27,7
Associate Degree	40	18,8
Undergraduate	81	38
Postgraduate	20	9,4
Monthly income		
Under 2500-2500 TL	118	55,4
2501-4000 TL	56	26,3
4001- 5500 TL	19	8,9
Above 5500TL	20	9,4
Occupation		
Civil Servant	15	7
Private Sector Employee	65	30,5
Owner of a Business/Self-Employed	15	7
Manager	7	3,3
Educator (Teacher/Academician)	9	4,2
Engineer	16	7,5
Accountant	11	5,2
Health Sector Employee	6	2,8
Student	23	10,8
Housewife	23	10,8
Retired	16	7,5
Others	7	3,3

The participants of the survey are from a wide range of age groups. 15 (about 7%) of the participants were under 20 years old, 87 (40.8%) of the participants are at the age of between 20 and 30. 49 (23%) of the participants are at the age of between 31 and 40, 33 (15.5%) of the participants are between 41 and 50, and 29 (13.6%) of the participants were at the age of 50 or older. The participants are from a wide range of various educational groups. Participant's educational background is as follows: 6.1% of the participants have elementary school degree, 27.7% of the participants have high school degree, 18.8% of the participants have associate degree, 38% of the participants have undergraduate degree, and 9.4% of the participants have postgraduate degree.

Participant's monthly income is as follows: 55.4% of the participants have a monthly income of less than 2500 TL. 26.3% of the participants have monthly income between 2.501 and 4.000 TL. 8.9% of the participants' monthly income ranges between 4.001 – 5.500 TL, and 9.4% of participants' income is 5501 TL and more. Participant's professions are: 15 (7%) of the participants are civil servants, 65 (30.5%) of the participants are private sector employees, 15 (7%) of the participants are self-employed, 7 (3.3%) of the participants are managers, 9 (4.2%) of the participants are in the education business, 16 (7.55%) of the participants are engineers, 11 (5.2%) of the participants are accountants, 6 (2.8%) of the participants are in the health sector, 23 (10.8%) of the participants are students, 23 (10.8%) of the participants are housewives, 16 (7.5%) of the participants are retired and 7 (3.3%) of the participants are from other occupations.

4. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

Demographics is used as a consumer segmentation criteria by organizations, and they develop different strategies and marketing activities when targeting various consumer segments, so in this study we analyze responses of consumers from various age, education and income groups to digital public relations activities done with digital public relations tools such as social media, forums, blogs, company website, and e-mails. First of all, we explore from which digital public relations tool customers first time learn about any news about the organization to see which of them are more effective to deliver news about the organizations to the consumers. Respondents are divided into various age groups and the descriptive statistics about their responses are given in Table 2. In the table, the numbers in the raws represent the statements about the digital public relations tool and 6. and 7. statements represent more traditional tools to see the difference (1:social media, 2:blogs, 3:forums, 4:company website, 5:e-mails, 6: SMS, 7:print media). The next step was to test whether the differences among the groups are statistically meaningful at the level of 0.05. ANOVA analysis is done and the results are seen in Table 3. Except for the SMS and printed media, it is found out that there are significant differences among the various groups' responses. Thus, it can be inferred that consumers at various age groups are affected at different levels from various digital public relations tools.

Table 2: Descriptive Statistics of Responses of Various Age Group

Age gr.		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
under 20	Mean	3,87	3	2,53	4	3,2	4,4	4
	N	15	15	15	15	15	15	15
	Std. Dev.	1,3	1,69	1,46	1,13	1,42	0,99	1,25
20-30	Mean	4,05	3,03	2,9	3,82	3,47	4,06	4,3
	N	87	87	87	87	87	87	87
	Std. Dev.	1,19	1,32	1,29	1,2	1,24	1,07	1,09
31-40	Mean	3,55	2,53	2,33	3,69	3,06	3,84	4,37
	N	49	49	49	49	49	49	49
	Std. Dev.	1,1	1,24	1,23	1,25	1,28	1,21	0,95
41-50	Mean	3,24	2,21	2,09	3,36	3,12	3,7	4,12
	N	33	33	33	33	33	33	33
	Std. Dev.	1,25	1,49	1,33	1,5	1,32	1,19	1,24
50+	Mean	3,17	1,83	1,83	2,72	2,52	3,76	4,72
	N	29	29	29	29	29	29	29
	Std. Dev.	1,42	1	1	1,03	1,18	1,18	0,59
Total	Mean	3,68	2,62	2,47	3,58	3,17	3,93	4,32
	N	213	213	213	213	213	213	213
	Std. Dev.	1,26	1,38	1,31	1,28	1,29	1,14	1,05

Table 3: ANOVA Tests of Responses of Various Age Groups

Statements		Sum of Sq.	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Between Groups	26,78	4	6,69	4,49	0
	Within Groups	309,87	208	1,49		
	Total	336,65	212			
2	Between Groups	41,2	4	10,3	5,91	0
	Within Groups	362,75	208	1,74		
	Total	403,95	212			
3	Between Groups	33,61	4	8,4	5,3	0
	Within Groups	329,44	208	1,58		
	Total	363,05	212			
4	Between Groups	30,92	4	7,73	5,07	0
	Within Groups	316,9	208	1,52		
	Total	347,81	212			

5	Between Groups	20,92	4	5,23	3,26	0,01
	Within Groups	333,65	208	1,6		
	Total	354,57	212			
6	Between Groups	7,79	4	1,95	1,52	0,2
	Within Groups	267,29	208	1,29		
	Total	275,08	212			
7	Between Groups	7,72	4	1,93	1,77	0,14
	Within Groups	226,93	208	1,09		
	Total	234,65	212			

We explore from which digital public relations tool customers first time learn about any news about the organization to see which of them are more effective to deliver news about the organizations to the consumers having various education background. Respondents are divided into various groups in terms of education and the descriptive statistics about their responses are given in Table 4. In the table, the numbers in the raws represent the statements about the digital public relations tool and 6. and 7. statements represent more traditional tools to see the difference (1:social media, 2:blogs, 3:forums, 4:company website, 5:e-mails, 6:SMS, 7:print media).

Table 4: Descriptive Statistics of Responses of Groups having Various Education Background

education		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
elementary school	Mean	3,54	2,15	2	3,31	3,38	4	4,38
	N	13	13	13	13	13	13	13
	Std. Dev.	1,33	1,28	1,35	1,18	1,19	1,29	1,33
high school	Mean	3,37	2,32	2,44	3,02	2,95	3,86	4,14
	N	59	59	59	59	59	59	59
	Std. Dev.	1,34	1,36	1,43	1,41	1,37	1,2	1,14
associate degree	Mean	3,68	2,65	2,5	3,7	2,93	3,83	4,05
	N	40	40	40	40	40	40	40
	Std. Dev.	1,29	1,51	1,36	1,29	1,42	1,38	1,28
under graduate	Mean	3,9	2,86	2,56	3,91	3,36	3,99	4,53
	N	81	81	81	81	81	81	81
	Std. Dev.	1,18	1,34	1,21	1,04	1,22	1,04	0,82
post graduate	Mean	3,75	2,8	2,45	3,85	3,45	4,1	4,55
	N	20	20	20	20	20	20	20
	Std. Dev.	1,16	1,28	1,23	1,35	1,05	0,72	0,76
Total	Mean	3,68	2,62	2,47	3,58	3,17	3,93	4,32
	N	213	213	213	213	213	213	213
	Std. Dev.	1,26	1,38	1,31	1,28	1,29	1,14	1,05

To see whether there are differences among the groups having various education background are statistically meaningful at the level of 0.05, ANOVA analysis is done, and the results are seen in Table 5. Except for the company websites, there are no significant differences among the various groups' responses. Thus, it is seen that consumers at various groups having various education background are affected at different levels from company websites.

We analyze from which digital public relations tools customers first time learn about any news about the organization to see which of them are more effective to deliver news about the organizations to the consumers from various income levels. Respondents are divided into various groups in terms of income and the descriptive statistics about their responses are shown in Table 6. In the table, the numbers in the raws represent the statements about the digital public relations tool and 6. and 7. statements represent more traditional tools to see the difference (1:social media, 2:blogs, 3:forums, 4:company website, 5:e-mails, 6:SMS, 7:print media).

Table 5: ANOVA Tests of Responses of Groups from Various Education Background

Statements		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Between Groups	9,89	4	2,47	1,57	0,18
	Within Groups	326,76	208	1,57		
	Total	336,65	212			
2	Between Groups	13,57	4	3,39	1,81	0,13
	Within Groups	390,38	208	1,88		
	Total	403,95	212			
3	Between Groups	3,56	4	0,89	0,51	0,72
	Within Groups	359,49	208	1,73		
	Total	363,05	212			
4	Between Groups	30,71	4	7,68	5,04	0
	Within Groups	317,1	208	1,52		
	Total	347,81	212			
5	Between Groups	10,31	4	2,58	1,56	0,19
	Within Groups	344,27	208	1,66		
	Total	354,57	212			
6	Between Groups	1,6	4	0,4	0,3	0,87
	Within Groups	273,48	208	1,31		
	Total	275,08	212			
7	Between Groups	9,63	4	2,41	2,23	0,07
	Within Groups	225,02	208	1,08		
	Total	234,65	212			

Table 6: Descriptive Statistics of Responses of Various Income Groups

income		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
under 2500-2500 TL	Mean	3,67	2,58	2,44	3,46	3,13	3,92	4,19
	N	118	118	118	118	118	118	118
	Std. Dev.	1,33	1,35	1,33	1,31	1,32	1,21	1,15
2501-4000 TL	Mean	3,8	2,73	2,61	3,84	3,36	3,93	4,55
	N	56	56	56	56	56	56	56
	Std. Dev.	1,26	1,39	1,33	1,35	1,38	1,11	0,87
4001-5500 TL	Mean	3,58	2,79	2,32	3,58	3,05	3,89	3,95
	N	19	19	19	19	19	19	19
	Std. Dev.	1,17	1,51	1,16	1,26	1,22	1,15	1,08
5501-above 5501TL	Mean	3,45	2,45	2,4	3,6	3,05	4,05	4,85
	N	20	20	20	20	20	20	20
	Std. Dev.	0,89	1,47	1,31	0,82	0,89	0,76	0,49
Total	Mean	3,68	2,62	2,47	3,58	3,17	3,93	4,32
	N	213	213	213	213	213	213	213
	Std. Dev.	1,26	1,38	1,31	1,28	1,29	1,14	1,05

ANOVA analysis is done to see whether there are differences among the income groups and the results are seen in Table 7. There is significant difference among the varioust income groups' responses in terms of SMS at the level of 0.05. Thus, it is observed that consumers at different groups having various education level are affected at different levels from SMSs.

Table 7: ANOVA Tests of Responses of Various Income Groups

Statements		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Between Groups	2,12	3	0,71	0,44	0,72
	Within Groups	334,53	209	1,6		
	Total	336,65	212			
2	Between Groups	2,05	3	0,68	0,36	0,79
	Within Groups	401,9	209	1,92		
	Total	403,95	212			
3	Between Groups	1,7	3	0,57	0,33	0,8
	Within Groups	361,35	209	1,73		
	Total	363,05	212			
4	Between Groups	5,54	3	1,85	1,13	0,34
	Within Groups	342,27	209	1,64		
	Total	347,81	212			
5	Between Groups	2,73	3	0,91	0,54	0,66
	Within Groups	351,85	209	1,68		
	Total	354,57	212			
6	Between Groups	0,31	3	0,1	0,08	0,97
	Within Groups	274,77	209	1,31		
	Total	275,08	212			
7	Between Groups	13,41	3	4,47	4,22	0,01
	Within Groups	221,23	209	1,06		
	Total	234,65	212			

We analyze from which digital public relations tools customers are affected positively after negative news about the company is spread in the market place. As discussed in the literature part, one of the functions of public relations is crises management. We want to see which digital public relations tools is more effective to achieve this function. Respondents are divided into various age groups and the descriptive statistics of their responses are shown in Table 8. In the table, the numbers in the raws represent the statements about the digital public relations tools and 7. statement represent more traditional tool which is customer service (1:social media, 2:blogs, 3:forum page of the company, 4:e-mails, 5:company website, 6:SMS, 7:customer service).

Table 8: Descriptive Statistics of Responses of Various Age Groups

age		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
under 20	Mean	3,73	3,13	3,47	3,93	4,6	4,2	4,53
	N	15	15	15	15	15	15	15
	Std. Dev.	1,58	1,68	1,46	1,39	0,83	1,21	0,83
20-30	Mean	3,85	2,91	3,49	3,55	4,13	3,95	4,13
	N	87	87	87	87	87	87	87
	Std. Dev.	1,36	1,35	1,18	1,03	1,23	1,16	1,14
31-40	Mean	3,29	2,41	2,96	3,16	3,92	3,49	4,22
	N	49	49	49	49	49	49	49
	Std. Dev.	1,44	1,4	1,34	1,3	1,26	1,26	1,14
41-50	Mean	2,82	2,3	2,45	3	3,48	3,76	4,21
	N	33	33	33	33	33	33	33
	Std. Dev.	1,42	1,36	1,39	1,39	1,44	1,35	1,14
50+	Mean	3,07	1,83	2,41	2,79	3,21	4,31	4,66

	N	29	29	29	29	29	29	29
	Std. Dev.	1,49	0,8	1,4	1,24	1,24	0,85	0,97
Total	Mean	3,45	2,57	3,06	3,3	3,89	3,88	4,26
	N	213	213	213	213	213	213	213
	Std. Dev.	1,46	1,38	1,37	1,24	1,29	1,2	1,11

ANOVA analysis is done to see whether there are differences among various age groups in terms of their responses to the company's crisis management activity done using different digital public relations tools, and the results are seen in Table 9. Except for the sales service activities, there are significant differences among various age groups' responses at the level of 0.05. Thus, it is put forward that consumers at different age react differently to the company's digital public relations activities done with different public relations tools.

Table 9: ANOVA Analysis of Reactions of Various Age gGroups

		Sum of Sq.	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Between Groups	33,87	4	8,47	4,19	0
	Within Groups	420,76	208	2,02		
	Total	454,63	212			
2	Between Groups	34,32	4	8,58	4,85	0
	Within Groups	367,94	208	1,77		
	Total	402,26	212			
3	Between Groups	43,59	4	10,9	6,43	0
	Within Groups	352,62	208	1,7		
	Total	396,21	212			
4	Between Groups	22,87	4	5,72	3,91	0
	Within Groups	303,9	208	1,46		
	Total	326,77	212			
5	Between Groups	31,41	4	7,85	5,04	0
	Within Groups	323,88	208	1,56		
	Total	355,3	212			
6	Between Groups	15,34	4	3,83	2,74	0,03
	Within Groups	290,73	208	1,4		
	Total	306,07	212			
7	Between Groups	7,34	4	1,83	1,51	0,2
	Within Groups	251,94	208	1,21		
	Total	259,28	212			

To see which digital public relations tools are more effective when doing public relations activities on customers having various education background, we did some analyses. In Table 10 descriptive statistics are shown. In the table, the numbers in the raws represent the statements about the digital public relations tools, and 7. statement represents more traditional tool which is customer service (1:social media, 2:blogs, 3:forum page of the company, 4:e-mails, 5:company website, 6:SMS, 7:customer service).

Table 10: Descriptive Statistics of Responses of Various Education Groups

education		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
elementary school	Mean	3,23	2	2,69	2,77	3,08	4,23	3,77
	N	13	13	13	13	13	13	13
	Std. Dev.	1,79	1,22	1,55	1,48	1,38	1,09	1,48
high school	Mean	3,25	2,54	2,8	2,97	3,53	3,78	4,34
	N	59	59	59	59	59	59	59
	Std. Dev.	1,54	1,42	1,51	1,36	1,41	1,31	1,09

associate degree	Mean	3,53	2,73	3,13	3,48	3,95	4,03	4,1
	N	40	40	40	40	40	40	40
	Std. Dev.	1,5	1,47	1,38	1,22	1,3	1,27	1,26
under graduate	Mean	3,57	2,69	3,31	3,58	4,14	3,9	4,3
	N	81	81	81	81	81	81	81
	Std. Dev.	1,38	1,33	1,2	1,04	1,1	1,09	1,03
post graduate	Mean	3,5	2,2	2,95	3,15	4,35	3,6	4,55
	N	20	20	20	20	20	20	20
	Std. Dev.	1,36	1,32	1,36	1,27	1,23	1,23	0,76
Total	Mean	3,45	2,57	3,06	3,3	3,89	3,88	4,26
	N	213	213	213	213	213	213	213
	Std. Dev.	1,46	1,38	1,37	1,24	1,29	1,2	1,11

To compare the customer groups from various education background, ANOVA analyses are done in terms of their reactions to the company's crisis management activity done using different digital public relations tools. It is possible to see the results in Table 11. E-mails sent by the company and the company website reveal significant difference in the reactions of the customers at the level of 0.05. Thus, it is put forward that company e-mails and company website are effective digital public relations tools at the times of crises.

Table 11: ANOVA Analysis of Reactions of Customers of Groups from Various Education Background

		Sum of Sq.	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Between Groups	4,28	4	1,07	0,49	0,74
	Within Groups	450,35	208	2,17		
	Total	454,63	212			
2	Between Groups	9,16	4	2,29	1,21	0,31
	Within Groups	393,1	208	1,89		
	Total	402,26	212			
3	Between Groups	11,27	4	2,82	1,52	0,2
	Within Groups	384,94	208	1,85		
	Total	396,21	212			
4	Between Groups	18,28	4	4,57	3,08	0,02
	Within Groups	308,49	208	1,48		
	Total	326,77	212			
5	Between Groups	25,7	4	6,43	4,06	0
	Within Groups	329,59	208	1,58		
	Total	355,3	212			
6	Between Groups	4,64	4	1,16	0,8	0,53
	Within Groups	301,43	208	1,45		
	Total	306,07	212			
7	Between Groups	6,31	4	1,58	1,3	0,27
	Within Groups	252,97	208	1,22		
	Total	259,28	212			

To analyze whether income is an important determinant in customers' reactions to the digital public relations activities of the company done with different digital public relations tools at the time of crises, we do some analyses. The descriptive statistics is shown in Table 12. In the table, the numbers in the raws represent the statements about the digital public

relations tools, and 7. statement represents more traditional tool which is customer service (1:social media, 2:blogs, 3:forum page of the company, 4:e-mails, 5:company website, 6:SMS, 7:customer service). We do ANOVA analysis to see whether there are differences among various income groups in terms of their responses to the company's crisis management activity done using various digital public relations tools, and the results are seen in Table 13. Except for the customer service, there are no significant differences among groups at the level of 0.05. Thus, it might be inferred that customer service keeps its importance in influencing customers' reactions to the company's public relations activities during the times of crisis.

Table 12: Descriptive Statistics of Responses of Various Income Groups

income		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
under 2500-2500 TL	Mean	3,53	2,69	3,14	3,36	3,85	3,98	4,17
	N	118	118	118	118	118	118	118
	Std. Dev.	1,47	1,42	1,38	1,26	1,24	1,18	1,13
2501-4000 TL	Mean	3,54	2,36	2,95	3,32	4,02	3,73	4,46
	N	56	56	56	56	56	56	56
	Std. Dev.	1,51	1,21	1,33	1,24	1,46	1,17	1,04
4001-5500 TL	Mean	3,21	2,79	3,26	3,21	3,74	3,74	3,79
	N	19	19	19	19	19	19	19
	Std. Dev.	1,27	1,55	1,28	1,03	1,19	1,45	1,23
above 5500TL	Mean	2,9	2,2	2,75	3	3,9	3,85	4,7
	N	20	20	20	20	20	20	20
	Std. Dev.	1,45	1,32	1,48	1,34	1,25	1,18	0,8
Total	Mean	3,45	2,57	3,06	3,3	3,89	3,88	4,26
	N	213	213	213	213	213	213	213
	Std. Dev.	1,46	1,38	1,37	1,24	1,29	1,2	1,11

Table 13: ANOVA Analysis of Reactions of Customers of Various Income Groups

		Sum of Sq.	df	Mean Sq.	F	Sig.
1	Between Groups	8,38	3	2,79	1,31	0,27
	Within Groups	446,25	209	2,14		
	Total	454,63	212			
2	Between Groups	8,03	3	2,68	1,42	0,24
	Within Groups	394,23	209	1,89		
	Total	402,26	212			
3	Between Groups	4,1	3	1,37	0,73	0,54
	Within Groups	392,1	209	1,88		
	Total	396,21	212			
4	Between Groups	2,35	3	0,78	0,5	0,68
	Within Groups	324,42	209	1,55		
	Total	326,77	212			
5	Between Groups	1,58	3	0,53	0,31	0,82
	Within Groups	353,72	209	1,69		
	Total	355,3	212			
6	Between Groups	2,88	3	0,96	0,66	0,58
	Within Groups	303,18	209	1,45		
	Total	306,07	212			
7	Between Groups	11,38	3	3,79	3,2	0,02
	Within Groups	247,9	209	1,19		
	Total	259,28	212			

The previous analyses done all aimed to test the customers' reactions to the digital public relations activities of the company. As we discussed in the literature part, in order for the organizations to carry out timely and purposeful public relations, it is necessary to capture the ideas and feeling of the customers. Digitalization has provided new tools to the customers to communicate their demands and complaints to the organizations. To get a general idea about this issue, we gave some statements to the participants of the survey to learn which digital tools they use to express their demands and complaints to the company. The frequencies are seen in Table 14. It is observed in the table that most of the customers still prefer traditional tools to communicate their demands and complaints. Thus, it could be said that organizations should not ignore the traditional channels of public relations.

Table 14: Customer Preferences about Tools to Express Their Demand and Complaints

	strongly disagree		disagree		neither agree nor disagree		agree		strongly agree	
	frq	%	freq.	%	freq.	%	freq.	%	freq.	%
1. Social media	63	29,58	36	16,9	29	13,62	41	19,25	44	20,66
2. Blogs	87	40,85	54	25,35	39	18,31	17	7,98	16	7,51
3. Company forum page	54	25,35	25	11,74	53	24,88	43	20,19	38	17,84
4. Company e-mail	28	13,15	34	15,96	41	19,25	55	25,82	55	25,82
5. Company website	24	11,27	19	8,92	33	15,49	57	26,76	80	37,56
6. Company physical store	9	4,23	6	2,82	22	10,33	30	14,08	146	68,54
7. Customer service phone	3	1,41	4	1,88	13	6,1	30	14,08	163	76,53

5. CONCLUSION

Digitalization has big impacts on business life and makes it necessary for the marketers to reconsider almost every issue. The nature of many concepts is undergoing evolution thanks to the opportunities digitalization provides to the business life. Therefore, many concepts in the marketing realm need to be researched in the new digitalized marketing context. An attractive topic that is in rise in the business life is digital public relations. Digital public relations is presenting so many opportunities as well as complexities which bear some risks to the marketers. This exploratory study is examining the effectiveness of digital marketing tools among different consumer segments. It is observed that demographic features are significant determinants of being prone to using digital tools, which gives significant hints to the managers about the strategies they could apply to different consumer segment. It is observed that young people are more adaptive to digital tools. Organizations should use both traditional public relations and digital public relations tools since both of them have potential to influence consumers.

REFERENCES

Allaguia, I., Breslowba, H. 2016, "Social Media for Public relations: Lessons from Four Effective Cases", Public Relations Review, vol. 42, pp. 20–30.

Brown, R. 2013." *Digital PR is dead: social goes mainstream", in Brown, R. and Waddington, S. (Eds), Share This Too: More Social Media Solutions for PR Professionals*. Padstow, Cornwall: Wiley.

Green, A. 2010. *Creativity in public relations. In PR in practice series (4th ed.).* London: Kogan Page.

Hallahan, K. 2004, "Protecting an Organization's Digital Public Relations Assets", Public Relations Review, vol. 30, pp. 255–268.

Jo, S., Jung, J. 2005, "A Cross-cultural Study of the World Wide Web and Public Relations", Corporate Communications, vol. 10, pp. 1.

Kent, M.L. 2008, "Critical Analysis of Blogging in Public Relations", Public Relations Review, vol. 34, no. 1, pp. 32-40.

Lahav, T., Zimand-Sheiner, D. 2016, "Public Relations and the Practice of Paid Content: Practical, Theoretical Propositions and Ethical Implications", Public Relations Review, vol. 42, pp. 395–401.

Newsom, D., Scott, A. 1985. *This is PR: the realities of public relations.* Belmont: Wadsworth Publishing Company.

Smith, P. R., Zook, Z. 2011. *Marketing communications Integrating offline and online with social media.* London: Cogan Page Limited.

Richardson, N., Laville, L. 2010. *Develop your PR skills.* London: Kogan Page Publishers.

Taylor, M., Kent, M.L. 2010, "Anticipatory Socialization in the Use of Social Media in Public Rrelations: A Content Analysis of PRSA's Public Relations Tactics", Public Relations Review, vol. 36, no. 3, pp. 207-214.

Vardeman-Winter, J., Place, K. 2015, "Public Relations Culture, Social Media, and Regulation", Journal of Communication Management, vol. 19, no. 4, pp. 335-353.