

**GAP III -- TABLE OF CONTENTS: 1 OF 9**

**I. INTRODUCTION: GOALS, METHODOLOGY, OVERALL RESPONSE, REPORT FORMAT ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

**II. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

**III. OVERVIEW OF ENTIRE FINDINGS RELATIVE TO ALL RESPONDENTS**

	<b><u>PAGE</u></b>
<b><i>III/A. Respondent Data</i></b>	
1. Respondents by organization size	2
2. Respondents by organizational type	4
<b><i>III/B. Public Relations Budgets</i></b>	
1. Total average PR budgets and percentages of budgets allocated to salaries	5
2. Percentile budget changes	7
3. Ratio of PR budgets to gross revenues	9
4. Expected change in PR budget next fiscal year	10
5. PR budgets relative to advertising budgets	12
6. PR budgets dedicated to evaluation	13
<b><i>III/C. Structure/Size/Reporting Lines of the PR Function</i></b>	
1. PR function reporting lines	14
2. How appropriate is this line of reporting	15

**GAP III – TABLE OF CONTENTS: 2 of 9**

	<b><u>PAGE</u></b>
<b><i>III/C. Structure/Size/Reporting Lines of the PR Function (cont'd)</i></b>	
3. Average PR staff size	<b>18</b>
4. Percent change in PR staff size	<b>20</b>
<b><i>III/D. Use of Outside PR Agencies</i></b>	
1. Do/Don't Use PR Agencies	<b>22</b>
2. Percent of PR budget allocated to agency fees	<b>23</b>
3. Nature of agency relationships	<b>27</b>
4. Number of agencies used	<b>29</b>
5. Reasons for working with agencies	<b>31</b>
6. Concerns about working with agencies	<b>33</b>
7. Which departments are involved in agency selection	<b>36</b>
<b><i>III/E. Methods of Public Relations Evaluation</i></b>	
1. Use of PR evaluation methodologies	<b>39</b>
2. Use of PR evaluation methodologies by revenue category	<b>40</b>
3. Extent to which data from other functions is used in PR evaluation	<b>48</b>
<b><i>III/F. Respondents' Perception of Senior Management's Views/Support</i></b>	
1. How senior management ranks nine common corporate functions' contributions to success	<b>49</b>
2. Degree of management support for PR	<b>52</b>
3. Extent to which PR recommendations are taken seriously	<b>54</b>

**GAP III – TABLE OF CONTENTS: 3 of 9**

	<b><u>PAGE</u></b>
<b><i>III/F. Respondents' Perception of Senior Management's Views/Support (cont'd)</i></b>	
4. Extent to which PR and reputation are factored into organizational decision making	<b>56</b>
5. Likelihood of PR being invited to meetings dealing with any type of crisis	<b>58</b>
6. Likelihood of PR being invited to meetings dealing with organizational and strategic planning	<b>59</b>
7. Likelihood of PR being invited to meetings dealing with important issues that may or may not have PR implications	<b>60</b>
8. Likelihood that CEO would encourage the PR function to take various actions	<b>61</b>
9. CEO believes regarding evaluation, reputation, etc.	<b>62</b>
<b><i>III/G. Communications Functions</i></b>	
1. Functions for which respondents have budgetary responsibility	<b>63</b>
<b><i>III/H. Extent to which communications functions are integrated and coordinated</i></b>	<b>72</b>
<b><i>III/I. Respondents' Perception of Organizational Climate</i></b>	<b>73</b>

**GAP III – TABLE OF CONTENTS: 4 OF 9**

**IV. CHARACTERISTICS OF ORGANIZATIONS THAT APPEAR  
ON FORTUNE MAGAZINE’S “MOST COMPANIES” (MAC) LIST  
RELATIVE TO THOSE OF NON-MACS.**

	<b><u>PAGE</u></b>
<i>Summary of Overall Findings Among Most Admired Companies (MACs)</i>	2
<i>IV/A. Respondent Data – MACs vs. Non-MACs</i>	
1. Respondents by company size	5
2. Public v. Private MACs	6
<i>IV/B. PR Budgets – MACs vs. Non-MACs</i>	
1. Total average PR budgets	7
2. Percentile budget change	8
3. Percentage of gross revenues to PR budgets (PR/GR ratio)	9
4. Expected change in PR budget next fiscal year	10
5. Percent size of PR budget relative to advertising budget	11
6. Percent of PR budget dedicated to measurement and evaluation	12
<i>IV/C. Structure, Size and Reporting Lines of PR Function – MACs vs. Non-MACs</i>	
1. PR function reporting lines	13
2. How appropriate is this line of reporting	15

**GAP III – TABLE OF CONTENTS: 5 of 9**

	<b><u>PAGE</u></b>
<b><i>IV/C. Structure, Size and Reporting Lines of PR Function – MACs vs. Non-MACs (cont'd)</i></b>	
3. Average size of PR staff	<b>16</b>
4. Percent change in PR staff size	<b>17</b>
<b><i>IV/D. Use of Outside PR Agencies – MACs vs. Non-MACs</i></b>	
1. Do use PR agencies	<b>18</b>
2. Percent of PR budget allocated to agency fees	<b>19</b>
3. Nature of agency relationships	<b>20</b>
4. Number of agencies used	<b>23</b>
5. Reasons for working with agencies	<b>24</b>
6. Concerns about working with agencies	<b>27</b>
7. Which departments are involved in agency selection	<b>29</b>
<b><i>IV/E. Methods of Public Relations Evaluation – MACs vs. Non-MACs</i></b>	
1. Usage of various PR evaluation methodologies	<b>30</b>
2. Ranking of evaluation methods	<b>31</b>
3. Extent to which data from other organization functions is used in evaluation	<b>36</b>
<b><i>IV/F. Senior Management Views/Support – MACs vs. Non-MACs</i></b>	
1. How senior management ranks nine common corporate functions' contributions to success	<b>37</b>

**GAP III – TABLE OF CONTENTS: 6 of 9**

	<b>PAGE</b>
<i>IV/F. Senior Management Views/Support – MACs vs. Non-MACs</i>	
<i>(cont)</i>	
2. Degree of management support for PR	<b>41</b>
<i>IV/F. Senior Management Views/Support – MACs vs. Non-MACs</i>	
<i>(cont'd)</i>	
3. Extent to which PR recommendations are taken seriously	<b>43</b>
4. Extent to which PR and reputation are factored into organizational decision making	<b>44</b>
5. Likelihood of PR being invited to meetings dealing with any type of crisis	<b>45</b>
6. Likelihood of PR being invited to meetings dealing with organizational strategic planning	<b>46</b>
7. Likelihood of PR being invited to meetings dealing with any important issues that may or may not have PR implications	<b>47</b>
8. Likelihood of CEO encouraging PR to do the following	<b>48</b>
9. Extent of CEO belief in evaluation	<b>49</b>
<i>IV/G. Communication Functions – MACs vs. Non-MACs</i>	
1. Functions for which respondents have primary budgetary responsibility	<b>50</b>
<i>IV/H. Extent to which Organization Communications Functions are Integrated and Coordinated – MACs vs. Non-MACs</i>	<b>55</b>
<i>IV/I. Organizational Climate – MACs vs. Non-MACs</i>	<b>56</b>

**V. PUBLIC AND PRIVATE COMPANIES, AND GOVERNMENT  
AND NON-PROFIT AGENCIES FINDINGS**

	<b><u>PAGE</u></b>
<b><i>V/A. Respondent Data – Public and Private Companies, Government and Non-Profit Agencies</i></b>	
1. Respondents by size	<b>3</b>
2. Respondents by type	<b>4</b>
<b><i>V/B. Public Relations Budgets – Public vs. Private Companies, Government and Non-Profit Agencies</i></b>	
1. Total average PR budgets and percentages of budgets allocated to salaries	<b>6</b>
2. Changes in PR budgets	<b>8</b>
3. Ratio of gross revenues to PR budgets (PR/GR Ratio)	<b>9</b>
4. Expected changes in PR budget, next fiscal year	<b>10</b>
5. Percent size of PR budget relative to advertising budget	<b>11</b>
6. Percentage of PR budget dedicated to measurement and evaluation	<b>13</b>
<b><i>V/C. Structure/Size/Reporting Lines of PR Function – Public and Private Companies, Government and Non-Profit Agencies</i></b>	
1. PR function reporting lines	<b>14</b>
2. How appropriate is this line of reporting	<b>17</b>
3. Average PR staff size	<b>18</b>

### GAP III - TABLE OF CONTENTS: 8 of 9

	<b><u>PAGE</u></b>
<b><i>V/D. Use of Outside PR Agencies – Public and Private Companies, Government and Non-Profit Agencies</i></b>	
1. Do use PR agencies	<b>20</b>
2. Percent of PR budget allocated to agency fees	<b>22</b>
3. Nature of agency relationships	<b>24</b>
4. Number of agencies used	<b>26</b>
5. Reasons for working with agencies	<b>27</b>
6. Concerns about working with agencies	<b>31</b>
7. Which departments are involved in agency selection	<b>35</b>
<b><i>V/E. Methods of Public Relations Evaluation – Public and Private Companies, Government and Non-Profit Agencies</i></b>	
1. Use of PR evaluation methodologies	<b>36</b>
2. Extent to which data from other organizational functions are used in evaluation	<b>49</b>
<b><i>V/F. Respondents’ Perceptions of Senior Management’s Views/Support – Public and Private Companies, Government and Non-Profit Agencies</i></b>	
1. How senior management ranks nine common corporate functions’ contributions to success	<b>50</b>
2. Degree of management support for PR	<b>54</b>
3. Extent to which PR recommendations are taken seriously	<b>55</b>

**GAP III- TABLE OF CONTENTS: 9 of 9**

	<b><u>PAGE</u></b>
<b><i>V/F. Respondents' Perceptions of Senior Management's Views/Support – Public and Private Companies, Government and Non-Profit Agencies (cont'd)</i></b>	
4. Extent to which PR and reputation are factored into organizational decision making	<b>56</b>
5. Extent to which PR is invited to any kind of crisis	<b>58</b>
6. Extent to which PR contributes to strategic planning	<b>59</b>
7. CEO's belief in evaluation	<b>65</b>
<b><i>V/G. Communications Functions – Public and Private Companies, Government and Non-Profit Agencies</i></b>	<b>69</b>
<b><i>V/H. Extent to Which Communications Functions are Integrated and Coordinated – Public and Private Companies, Government and Non-Profit Agencies</i></b>	<b>76</b>
<b><i>V/I. Respondents' Perceptions of Organizational Climate – Public and Private Companies, Government and Non-Profit Agencies</i></b>	<b>77</b>