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UPWARD MOBILITY OF YOUNG MANAGERS: WOMEN ON THE FAST TRACK?

Although the number of women managers (executive, administrative, and management in official Department of Labor categories) almost tripled during the past fifteen years, in 1983 about 3.5 million women accounted for less than a third of this broad occupational category. The women's share of private sector managerial jobs as reported in annual surveys of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC the agency responsible for implementation of employment antidiscrimination laws) had increased from 9 percent in 1966 to 23 percent in 1982. During the 1970's there was an explosive growth in the number of highly educated individuals who entered management by way of a graduate degree, usually the Master's in Management/Business Administration (MBA). Approximately 63,000 MBA's were granted in 1983 as compared with 21,000 granted in 1970, and women receiving MBA's had increased from four percent of the total in 1972 to more than twenty-five percent by 1980.¹/

Will a significant number of these young, better educated, and achievement-oriented women attain influential senior management positions within the next decade? Compensation is widely accepted as the best measure of upward mobility and success. Conventional wisdom as reflected in the popular press (The Wall Street Journal, Fortune, Business Week) as well as more scholarly endeavors (Strober, Reder, Devanna) indicates that the gap between the compensation (salary plus bonuses and fringe benefits) may widen over time.²/ The primary research objective of the longitudinal study described below was to track a large sample of graduates from the Master's program at MIT's Sloan School of Management, in order to determine whether female and male graduates who received
similar job offers upon graduation, reached comparable levels in middle management five years later and also received equivalent pay. Although the degree granted by the Sloan School at MIT is technically a Master of Science in Management (MSM), it is considered comparable to the MBA granted by most business schools. This report refers to Sloan graduates as "MBAs."

The Study

A sample of 322 graduates from the Sloan School at MIT were surveyed at four points during the first five years of their post-management school careers.* Approximately a third of this sample of graduates from the Master's Program were women. The participants were from the five graduating classes from 1975 through 1979, and they received questionnaires when they graduated, and one, two, and five years after graduation. 1975 was the first year in which slightly more than ten percent of the Sloan graduates were women. Graduates of the Sloan School's Executive Development Program** who receive the same MSM degree as the regular Master's Program graduates, and foreign students were excluded from this data set. The aggregate response rate was 78 percent for the detailed two year survey and 68 percent for the five year follow-up survey. (see Table 1)

*The entire data base (with the exception of the one year surveys which have not been coded) were entered on the Prime 850 computer at the Sloan School, and the statistical package, SPSS was used to perform ordinary least square regression on the dependent variable, annual compensation five years after graduating from Sloan (SABU5).

**The Executive Development Program is full time for individuals with at least ten years of managerial work experiences. Such individuals are usually sponsored by their companies and are being groomed for senior management positions.
TABLE 1
Respondents to Sloan School Surveys, 1975-79

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial Year</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Year Survey</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five Year Survey</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To our knowledge the data set with 113 MBA women is the only longitudinal survey of a sizeable sample of the same women managers. Neither Reder's study of the starting salaries of University of Chicago MBA's nor Strober's examination of Stanford MBA salaries four years after graduation have a high percent of women. These data should serve as a benchmark against which future progress of women managers may be measured. Although the focus of this report is on annual compensation in a specialized labor market and addresses issues of pay equity, the larger study of young managers, which is underway, will examine the functioning of internal labor markets for white collar employment and mobility options from both a personal and organizational perspective.

Detailed information on industry of employment, salary changes, promotions, changes in jobs, geographic location, hours of work, work related travel, performance appraisal, supervisory responsibilities, job satisfaction, productivity relative to peers, career path changes, and significant changes in personal lives were collected in the two year surveys. The more detailed five year surveys in addition covered the graduates' level in the organization, relations with peers and supervisors, mentors, job related stress and detailed information on dual career marriages, number of children, and non-work related activities.
Like many of the young achievers in The Wall Street Journal's 3/ recent survey of female executives, the young women in this study, mostly under thirty-five years of age, work full-time primarily in investment banking and other financial services, high technology, and management consulting firms. Five years after graduation from the Master's program they have done as well as their male peers from management school. They report high levels of career success, of personal success and above average job satisfaction. A principal finding of this research is that there are no significant differences in fifth year compensation between male and female MBA's, but we observe some differences in the determinants of compensation between men and women as defined in pages 13-15 below. Although women MBA's can earn the same level of salary, the psychic costs are higher for women. The level of reported stress is significantly higher for women, 4/ and women also reported working longer hours.

Sample Bias

During 1975-79 about 550 individuals (excluding foreign students and Sloan Fellows in the Executive Development Program) were graduated from the Master's Program at the Sloan School of Management at MIT. The initial sample of 322 individuals (113 women and 209 males) was supplemented by 52 males from the classes of 1975 and 1976 for whom information is available only for the initial and five year surveys. Thus, approximately two-thirds of the Sloan MBA's are in our surveys.

No attempt was made to measure non-response bias. Of the 322 individuals in the initial year survey, 251 responded to the two year follow-up surveys, and 215 responded to the five year survey. A major effort was made to encourage response. Individuals had the option of
written responses to the questionnaires, being interviewed by phone at a
time of the day or day of the week (Two investment bankers who were
working an 80 hour week scheduled telephone interviews at home on Sunday
morning.) that was most convenient for them. Some of the MBA's who
worked in the greater Boston area scheduled face to face interviews at
the Sloan School.

During the ten year data collection period several factors may have
encouraged a high response rate. All participants were notified that a
summary profile of their class after the second year and fifth year
surveys would be prepared. Sloan MBA's continued to compare their
achievements with members of their Sloan class even as they competed with
their peers at work. At the two year survey, they overwhelmingly
considered themselves to be more productive and perhaps superior to their
peers at work. Also during the data collection period the Sloan School
restructured the core Master's Program curriculum, and respondents to the
five year surveys were asked to assess the strengths and weaknesses of
their management education and to suggest changes. Even before this
exercise, the respondents had been informed that as a result of their
identification of deficiencies in communication skills (in a response to
a query on the second year survey), the Sloan School had established
writing workshops and was considering including a communications workshop
as a part of the core requirement. For these reasons response rates were
fairly high for a group in which some individuals had relocated several
times or served overseas during the five year period. Follow-up letters
and/or telephone calls were made to encourage response by all graduates
but because the minority subsample was relatively small, more telephone
calls and letters were sent to these graduates.
Methodology

179 individuals (64 women and 115 men, all full time employees) who responded in both the initial year and the fifth year on which we base the regression methodology.* In order to test the null hypothesis that all other things being equal, there are no significant differences in the fifth year compensation between male and female MBA's, we identified a series of independent variables for their explanatory impact on the dependent variable, fifth year annual compensation.

The annual compensation five years after graduation from Sloan School (SABU5) was adjusted in two ways: (1) all salaries were converted to 1983 constant dollars (using the Consumer Price Index (CPI)) and (2) where a bonus was reported, salary and bonus were added together.\(^{5/}\)

A large number of potential explanatory variables were tested (t-tests at 10 percent level) and eleven independent variables were selected. In fact, among the eleven variables, the six industry variables can be viewed as a single industry factor. (See Table 2). In a separate regression which excluded the six industry variables, and included only five variables (hours, prior work experience, travel, mentor positive and negative), the adjusted \( R^2 \) is 0.098 as compared with 0.370 for the regression in which all eleven independent variables are included. Among variables tested and found not to have a significant impact on MBA compensation were: race, discontinuous labor force participation, technical undergraduate degree, and with the exception of finance, concentration while at Sloan School. The finance, insurance, 

*Excludes part-time workers, students, military personnel, and non-business employees.
real estate (FIRE),* industry variable picked up the impact of MBA concentration in finance, and the later variable was not included as one of the independent variables in the regression analysis. Since a very large proportion of Sloan students concentrate in finance and work mostly in the finance, insurance, and real estate industry, this industry variable reflects this relationship.

Of the 179 observations in the sample, 13 were dropped due to missing values for some of the independent variables. The number of observations for the regression analysis is 166 individuals (62 women and 104 males). The regression analysis of these variables on the MBA compensation is shown in Table 3. Work experience prior to the MBA, significant travel time, mentors and industry of employment, especially FIRE, and management consulting have significant impact on the fifth year compensation. However, one should be aware that there are correlations between the eleven dependent variables. For example, Sloan MBA's employed by investment banking tend to work long hours, 55.8 hours per week on the average as compared to the average of 51.7 hrs./wk. for the entire sample. Management consultants travel extensively and thus tend to report relatively long hours. These highly demanding industries such as investment banking and management consulting pay a significantly higher salary. We have not as yet explored the impact of initial year salaries on fifth year compensation. These characteristics of employers (long hours and extensive travel) may pose multicollinearity problems to the regression results. As expected, working in the public sector has a negative but not significant impact on the level of compensation.

*Excludes commercial banks (see Table 2).
### TABLE 2

**Definition of Variables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SABU5</td>
<td>MBA Compensation in the fifth year (dependent variable).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOUR</td>
<td>Number of hours worked per week.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXP</td>
<td>Full time working experience in years prior to the MBA program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAV5</td>
<td>Travel time over 25% (=1, otherwise =0). In the questionnaire subjects were asked what percentage of the time their jobs required them to travel, and their answers were grouped into six categories; none, up to 10%, between 11% and 25%, between 26% and 60%, over 60% and varies with project. Only the last three categories were significant and after appropriate tests a dummy variable combining them was used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRE</td>
<td>Employed by a investment bank, finance, insurance or real estate companies but exclude commercial banking (=1, otherwise 0).*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANU</td>
<td>Employed by manufacturing industries, excluding high tech industries (=1, otherwise =0).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HITEC</td>
<td>Employed by high-tech industries (=1, otherwise =0).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCON</td>
<td>Employed by management consulting companies (=1, otherwise =0).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBS</td>
<td>Employed by Public sector and non-profit organizations (=1, otherwise =0).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBNK</td>
<td>Employed by commercial banks (=1, otherwise =0).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMENTOR</td>
<td>Positive mentor relationship (=1, otherwise =0).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMENTOR</td>
<td>Negative mentor relationship (=1, otherwise =0).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Commercial banking is excluded from FIRE because of differences in the nature of the job. This results in significant differences in working hours and compensation levels (t-test significance beyond the 0.01 level).
### TABLE 3
Regression Results of MBA Fifth Year Compensation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Mean (Standard Deviation)</th>
<th>Coefficient (T-Statistic)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>24.2*** (2.60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOUR</td>
<td>52.27 (9.11)</td>
<td>0.211 (1.37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXP</td>
<td>3.35 (3.76)</td>
<td>1.17*** (3.09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAV</td>
<td>0.247 (0.433)</td>
<td>8.15** (2.48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMENTR</td>
<td>0.38 (1.69)</td>
<td>-4.67* (-1.96)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMENTR</td>
<td>0.76 (1.67)</td>
<td>4.95** (2.07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRE</td>
<td>0.102 (0.304)</td>
<td>42.4*** (7.36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANU</td>
<td>0.259 (0.439)</td>
<td>8.76* (1.89)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HITEC</td>
<td>0.199 (0.400)</td>
<td>5.39 (1.13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCON</td>
<td>0.175 (0.381)</td>
<td>15.4*** (13.07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBS</td>
<td>0.042 (0.202)</td>
<td>-10.1 (-1.31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBNK</td>
<td>0.084 (0.279)</td>
<td>8.30 (1.38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEX</td>
<td>0.373 (0.485)</td>
<td>-0.51 (-0.18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SABUS5</td>
<td>53.7 (21.74)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( R^2 )</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( R^2 )</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEE</td>
<td></td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of obs.a/</td>
<td></td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( \text{a/Excluding part-time workers, students, military personnel, and non-business employees.} \)

*Indicates significance beyond the 0.10 level.
**Indicates significance beyond the 0.05 level.
***Indicates significance beyond the 0.01 level.
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To test the effect of industry of employment we ran another regression excluding the industry variables and it showed that industry had a very significant effect on MBA's fifth year compensation. The F-ratio is 10.75, significant beyond the 0.01 level. The regression while explaining a fair amount of the variance in fifth year MBA compensation, for both men and women, (adjusted $R^2$ of 0.37) may not reflect some underlying differences in the structure of compensation. For example, prior MBA work experience coefficient indicates that the effect on MBA compensation is $1170$ but in the disaggregated male and female regressions discussed below prior experience remains a significant variable for men but not for women.

We tested the significance of sex on MBA fifth year compensation by including a dummy variable representing sex. The sex variable with a coefficient of -0.51 and a t-statistic of only -0.18 has almost no effect on MBA compensation. That is after considering the differences in employer's industry, travel time, mentor relationship, prior working experience, and number of hours worked Sloan female MBA's receive pay equal to Sloan male MBA's. Five years after graduation from Sloan, the difference in the female MBA's salary of $51,000$ and the male MBA's salary of $53,700$ is apparently accounted for by factors other than sex. We have reason to doubt that female and males are treated the same at work even if no significant statistical differences are revealed in the dollar amount of compensation.

Differences in the Determinants of Female and Male MBA Compensation

The differences in fifth year compensation between male and female MBA's was tested with the eleven variables and the regression model discussed above. We also ran this model separately for the male and female respondents in the sample. These separate regressions revealed...
TABLE 4
Structure of Male and Female MBA's Compensation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Male MBA's Coefficients (T-statistic)</th>
<th>Female MBA's Coefficients (T-statistic)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>30.0** (2.54)</td>
<td>4.59 (0.30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOUR</td>
<td>0.055 (0.30)</td>
<td>0.689** (2.49)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXP</td>
<td>1.60*** (3.07)</td>
<td>0.276 (0.522)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAV</td>
<td>15.0*** (3.53)</td>
<td>-6.01 (-1.22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMENTR</td>
<td>-8.27** (-2.33)</td>
<td>-2.53 (-0.87)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMENTR</td>
<td>8.83** (2.49)</td>
<td>2.12 (0.74)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRE</td>
<td>39.5*** (4.85)</td>
<td>50.3*** (6.38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANU</td>
<td>4.96 (0.70)</td>
<td>7.14 (1.21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HITEC</td>
<td>2.55 (0.35)</td>
<td>6.97 (1.29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCON</td>
<td>13.5* (1.80)</td>
<td>19.4*** (3.14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBS</td>
<td>-14.8 (-1.31)</td>
<td>4.94 (0.51)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBNK</td>
<td>11.1 (1.18)</td>
<td>4.92 (0.73)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SABU5</td>
<td>53.7</td>
<td>51.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>0.456</td>
<td>0.546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>0.391</td>
<td>0.447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEE</td>
<td>18.32</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of obs.$^a/$</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a$/Excluding part-time workers, students, military personnel, and non-business employees.

*Indicates significance beyond 0.10 level.

**Indicates significance beyond 0.05 level.

***Indicates significance beyond 0.01 level.
differences in the determinants of compensation (see Table 4). Some independent variables are significant for males but not for females. For male MBA's prior work experience, travel, employment in management consulting and financial services, and having a mentor have a significant impact on compensation. However, except for financial services, and management consulting the other variables are not significant for women. For example, hours worked per week is significant for women but not men. Is this due to the fact that the travel variable may pick up the effect of the number of hours worked in the male's regression? After dropping the travel variable out of the regression, the hours variable is still not significant. Also closer examination of the data shows that women work more hours than men in four out of seven industries, especially manufacturing industries.

Although there are differences in the determinants of compensation between male and female MBA's, these differences are not statistically significant. At the 0.05 significance level as shown by covariance analysis, we cannot reject the hypothesis that the overall structure of MBA's compensation are the same for men and women. By structure differences we mean the extent to which the eleven variables explain the variances of fifth year compensation (SASBU5). We also cannot reject the hypothesis that the slope vectors are the same between men and women. Conservatively, (at the five percent significance level) we cannot reject the hypothesis that the overall structure, slope vectors, and intercepts of the fifth year MBA compensation are the same between men and women. Given the relatively high F-statistics,* there is reason to believe that there is different treatment in work not reflected in significant

*The F-ratio for the hypothesis on common overall structure is 1.59 and for the hypothesis on common slopes is 1.73.
differences in the dollar amount of compensation. Our preliminary analysis of the mentor relationship for male and female MBA's supports this conclusion.

Mentors

Although female MBA's are more likely to report receiving mentoring than do male MBA's, these mentor relationships do not have significant impact on women's compensation. Forty-one women out of 64 had a mentor relationship and 53 males out of 118 males had such relationships and in both cases the overwhelming number of respondents reported positive relationships. However, there are differences in mentor relationships between male and female.* In addition to the quantitative difference a review of the information provided on the mentor response but not as yet categorized or entered on the computer may indicate that the quality of the mentoring relationship is quite different. We asked respondents to identify where their mentors were in the organizational structure, their age and sex, the amount of time that an individual had served as their mentor, the age differences (if any) between themselves and their mentors, whether they considered their mentors to perform a useful function and exactly what their mentors did for them.

Mentors are males who hold supervisory and senior management positions in firms and are slightly older than the MBA's. Mentors are perceived as performing a useful function but men and women have quite different responses to what it is that mentors do. Men have provided great detail such as: (1) "guidance in a political labyrinth both inside and outside the organization, (2) exposure to key management, (3) career input, (4) feedback on work, (5) philosophical and pragmatic brain-

*The chi-square is 8.41 which is significant at the 1.5 percent level.
storming, (6) advising best approach, (7) protecting me from in-fighting. The responses of women lack this specificity, and it is clear that they have some difficulty describing what their mentors do for them.

This is an example where the quantitative analysis forces us to undertake a more qualitative approach to the developmental relationships between young managers and their mentors. Some pertinent questions are:

(1) Is size of firm associated with the quality of this relationship? In large companies with more formal personnel procedures, supervisors may be required to formulate developmental strategies for their more able subordinates.

(2) Are males more aggressive in their relationship with mentors and have greater expectations about the outcomes of these associations?

(3) Do young women in the non-traditional roles in private sector employment find these associations more threatening than do young, ambitious males? No squash court syndrome.

(4) About three-fifths of the women MBA's are married and nearly all have dual career relationships. Their spouses are successful managers and professional workers. Many have reported that their spouses provide the kind of support that enables them to cope with job related stress. Do these spouses serve as surrogate mentors?

Clawson's conclusion that developmental relationships involving women must be handled differently from developmental relationships involving only men merits further analysis. 6/

Other Indicators

Female MBA's appear to pay a higher price to obtain a comparable level of salary. First, female MBA's are under a significantly higher level of stress than male. On a scale from one to five, we measure two kinds of stress: the stress affecting personal life and the stress on the job. T-test shows that at the 1% level, both measures are significantly higher for women than for men.
TABLE 5
Level of Stress for Male and Female MBA's

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Problems Related to Stress (1 = little 5 = lots)</th>
<th>Stress Affecting Personal Life (1 = little 5 = Lots)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>2.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t-value</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Second, female MBA's worked more hours per week (53.2 hrs./wk.) than their counterparts (50.3 hrs./wk.) in the second year. This is significant at the 6% level. These indications further strengthen our belief that although female MBA's can earn the same level of salary, they have to sacrifice more.

Given our rich, longitudinal data set, there is more analysis to be done. The compensation issue is certainly the most interesting segment of the first five years in the careers of young managers, but Table 6 with information on all fifth year respondents provides several issues for further examination. Women seem to have modified their personal behavior more in order to fit into the organization and more have changed their career aspirations (raised rather than lowered). Nearly sixty percent of the women are married and nearly all (92 percent of those married) have dual career relationships, as compared with a slightly higher proportion of males who are married with a much lower percent of males (56 percent of those married) in dual career relationships. Some males report that they selected a working spouse who had a nine to five job with no late nights or weekend work and with no travel. Their
descriptions more closely fit the dual earner rather than dual career arrangement. Also sixty percent of the women did not have children, and thus had not faced a major problem of meshing their personal and career objectives. Any follow-up beyond five years would have to focus on such concerns.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptor</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>212 - Total</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FIVE YEAR STATUS</strong> (Percent)  3/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. (A) Staff Jobs</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. (B) Staff/Line Responsibility</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. At Appropriate Level</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Title Appropriate</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Compensation Appropriate</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Excellent Job Security</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Job Success</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Self Success</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. On Track Personal Potential</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Above Average Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Perception By Peers (Coincide with Self-Image)</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Supportive Supervisors</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Male Supervisors</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Modify Behavior Some to Fit</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Career Aspirations Changed</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Productivity High Rel. Peers</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Married</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. No Children</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Dual Career (% Married)</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Entrepreneur</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3/ Key questions from Fifth Year Survey are noted in the appendix to this table.
APPENDIX (To Table 6)\textsuperscript{a}/

1(a). Staff Jobs

1(b). Staff/Line Responsibility
(4) -- Are you in staff, line, or staff with line responsibility?

2. At Appropriate Level
(12) -- Are you at an organization level commensurate with your training and work experience to date?
Yes ( )
No ( )

3. Title Appropriate
(14) -- Do you feel that your job title is appropriate for someone with your responsibilities?

4. Compensation Appropriate
(14) -- Do you feel that your compensation is appropriate for someone with your responsibilities?
Yes ( )
No ( ) -- If No, explain.

5. Excellent Job Security
(15) -- How would you rate your job security?
Poor _____ Good _____ Excellent ______

6. Job Success
(20a) -- How is "success" measured in your organization?
-- Have you been successful with respect to these measures?

7. Self Success
(20b) -- Have you been successful with respect to your own measures or goals?

8. On Track Personal Potential
(21c) -- Are you on track according to your potential?
Please explain.

9. Above Average Job Satisfaction
(28) -- Please rate your job satisfaction: (1-5 is low to high). (1) Dissatisfied; (2) Moderately Satisfied; (3) Average Satisfaction; (4) Above Average; (5) Very Satisfied.

10. Perception By Peers (Coincide with self-image)
(34) -- How are you perceived by your co-workers?
(35) -- Does this perception coincide with your own self-image.
APPENDIX (To Table 6)a/
- continued -

11. Supportive Supervisors
    (32) -- Is your supervisor supportive?
      Yes ( )
      No ( )

12. Male Supervisors
    (32) -- Is supervisor male? Yes ( ). No ( ).

13. Modify Behavior Some to Fit
    (37) -- To what extent have you had to modify your own
          personal behavior/goals/ideals in order to "fit"
          in the organization?

14. Career Aspirations Changed
    (46) -- Have your career aspirations changed since the
           time you began work? Please explain.

15. Productivity High Rel. Peers (Second Year Questionnaire)
    (18) -- How would you rate your productivity relative to
          your peers?
          Low
          Average
          High
          Exceptional

16. Married
    (48) -- Are you married (or the equivalent to you)?
      Yes ( )
      No ( )

17. No Children
    (49) -- Do you have children? Yes ( ). No ( ).

18. Dual Career (% Married)
    (50) -- Are you in a dual-career relationship?
      Yes ( )
      No ( )

19. Entrepreneur
    (Page 1) -- If you are an entrepreneur or working in a
      family-owned business please so specify.
      Entrepreneur Yes ( ). No ( ).

__________

a/Numbers in brackets refer to numbers from the questionnaire.
Footnotes
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