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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

As competition for jobs and professional recognition grows, and as career mobility becomes increasingly restricted, it becomes more and more important to link persons to the right organization where the organizational climate and related value system suits an individual's needs as early in the career as possible, if the individual is to achieve greater work/job satisfaction. It seems logical to assume that good information, both current and candid, about what it is really like to work in a corporation, profession, department or field, would be valuable to the individual in making career choices.

Further, accurate information on an organizational system—how it really functions rather than how it is assumed or supposed to function; who the informal leaders with real power may be; what the organization's reputation is in its field; what the economic environment may be—all these are pieces of crucial information for the individual making a career decision. Unfortunately, for the individual making that decision, such information is often "inside" information, not readily available, and is passed by word of mouth.
Since research indicates the quality of a decision increases directly in proportion to the sum total of knowledge and information available in a group (Maier, 1967), it seems logical to assume that access to an informal information system such as a women's network, the subject of this study, may provide information resources from which the individual member may benefit. However, the primary conclusions of the only prior study of a women's network conducted by Odendahl (1982) did not support this assumption. Yet as Hall (1976, p. 44) stated:

More small theories of how people perform various career processes are needed: what leads to career search, how a person becomes committed to an area of work, how one chooses an organization or decides to quit, how one moves successfully from one career stage to the next, how women's careers are different from men's, what organizational factors affect the career development of minority people and women, etc. We have just barely scratched the surface of important career issues to be studied.

Hall (1976) pointed out, and a review of the literature verifies, that most career-related research thus far has had a male bias. To add in some small measure to the research on women's careers, as this study attempted to do, may, therefore, be of some value.

**Purpose of the Study**

This study was exploratory in nature and was undertaken in an effort to examine the recent, fast-growing
phenomenon of women's networks and to analyze the perceived value of affiliation with such an organization, as well as to assess the possible impact of contacts with such an organization on women's careers.

The research was designed to investigate the concept of "networking", a newly-coined word which has come to refer to the informal exchange of information related to work or business activities, particularly among employed women. The study sought to describe the demographic profile of the Women's Professional Managerial Network (WPMN) members, and to compare the diverse membership of the WPMN in Seattle (a "horizontal" network) with the "vertical" Incom Network, whose members worked at different levels throughout the hierarchy of one company. The Incom study conducted by Odendahl (1982) is the only prior study of a women's network which has appeared thus far in the literature. Additionally, the study attempted to draw comparisons between the WPMN and Business and Professional Women members. BPW is an organization national in scope with clubs established in hundreds of cities and small towns throughout the United States. A BPW membership survey conducted in 1979 was reported in Odendahl (1982).

The spontaneous mushrooming of women's employment networks, all seemingly dedicated to increasing women's
career opportunities through networking, began in the mid-nineteen seventies. By 1979 over three thousand formalized women's networks had been documented across the country, and thousands of informal networks were assumed to be in operation (Odendahl, 1982, p.6). The belief was widespread among women that the process has been effective. This study sought to address the question: Do networks and networking improve women's upward mobility and increase career opportunities? Also, what other purposes do networks serve?

The availability to this researcher of the population of the WPMN presented a unique opportunity to seek answers to these questions, while at the same time contributing to the literature in the field of women's career development.

**Brief History of WPMN**

The WPMN or Women's Network (WN), which provided the setting for this case study, was conceived in mid-1978 and incorporated as a non-profit organization in January, 1979. The Network chose as its motto: "A non-profit organization dedicated to helping women reach their career goals". In the three years since its founding the Network had grown to a membership of more than four hundred to become the largest such group in the State of
Washington, according to the published membership directory

In early publicity the Network was described as "an idea whose time has come". At the time the Network began the two co-founders were involved in providing management training programs for women through the University of Puget Sound. Previously, both had been employed in Women's Programs in Continuing Education at the University of Washington, so they had been involved in women's issues for several years. The three women who formed the first board of directors for the Women's Network all had had a close working affiliation to Women's Programs.

Because of these long-standing affiliations, all the Network leaders had a wide acquaintance with women in business, government, education and in the professions. These informal connections provided the Women's Network leaders with a rich resource of names and mailing lists to reach women throughout the Pacific Northwest to publicize the Network's first event.

The very first dinner function sponsored by the Network in November, 1978 attracted a group of 386 women to hear author Betty Haragan speak on "Games Mother Never Taught You". The excitement and feeling of ambience generated that evening started the Network on a
continued pattern of growth.

Requests flowed in from women wanting to know how to affiliate with the Network. These names were compiled on a mailing list in March 1979 and stored on the University of Washington Locke Computer. From its inception the Network attempted to be visible in the Seattle community through maintaining an office, being listed in the Seattle telephone directory, and providing professional staff on a part-time basis according to correspondence shared with this researcher. Since all the board members had demanding jobs, and they worked in spread-out geographical locations, planning meetings were held at seven o'clock in the morning or after work. Also, from the very start, board members were willing to plan and help promote Network events, but they delegated coordinating and clerical tasks almost entirely to paid staff.

As the Network has grown and evolved, so have its expressed goals. At the start the Network was formed for a two-fold purpose:

To bring outstanding speakers to Seattle and other West Coast cities who have expertise and knowledge of particular interest to women, and, thereby, to provide a forum for women to communicate with one another.

The Network founders recognized what in marketing terms would be called "a felt need". Women were being
promoted to managerial positions where they might be the sole woman in a department, or were entering professional fields where their numbers had been very small in the past. These women were not readily accepted into the informal camaraderie among their male colleagues. They did not fit comfortably into the "old boy networks" around them. They were often isolated and needed people to talk to about their work experiences, and to keep informed about what was going on in the business community. The Women's Network meetings provided a strategy for bringing together women from diverse work settings, from banking to aerospace, from insurance to retailing, from education to construction, to share information. The Network became a kind of coping mechanism for women in the eighties. As one of the co-founders has said, "My fondest hope is that the Network can self-destruct in five years, because, in that period of time women will have joined the mainstream so the Network will no longer be needed". Changes have not occurred that rapidly, however, so the Network has continued and is currently beginning its fifth year of existence.

In the 1981-1982 membership year during which this study was conducted, the goals had expanded to embrace all the following:

1) To be a "network of networks" extending linkages
to individuals and groups in Seattle and beyond to cities in the U.S. and Canada.
2) To present outstanding speakers who address issues of particular interest to women.
3) To support and encourage women in leadership roles.
4) To provide professional development programs to strengthen women's ability to reach their career goals.

Dissertation Organization

Chapter I presents the organization overview of the study, states the purpose of the study, reviews the brief history of the WPMN, and addresses the nature and significance of the problem.

Chapter II presents a review of literature which is relevant to the question of analysis of a women's employment network. It is this reviewed research that helped form the theoretical framework of the study. Concluding Chapter II are the research questions posed for this study.

Chapter III presents the study design and describes the instrument developed and utilized in the study. In addition, this chapter describes the population, sampling procedures, methodology and analysis of the data.
Chapter IV describes the analysis of the data collected, the procedures used in the analysis, the results of the analysis and the conclusions drawn from the analysis.

Chapter V, the final chapter, summarizes and interprets the information produced by the findings. The research questions are stated once again with the relevant results. Possible implications of the findings and recommendations for further study are included in this chapter.

**Operational Definitions of Research Variables**

For the purposes of the present study the following definitions of terms were used.

**WPMN Population** - consisted of the 451 members who had paid annual dues for the 1981-1982 membership year, which began on October 1, 1981 and ended September 30, 1982.

**Job-Finding Behaviors** - referred to the means workers used to find out about jobs: formal means, personal contacts and direct application. Included under "formal means" are advertisements, public and private employment agencies (including those calling themselves "executive recruiters"),
placements sponsored by colleges or professional associations. The defining characteristic of formal means is that the job-seeker depended upon the help of an impersonal intermediary between herself and the prospective employer. "Personal contact" by contrast implies that there is some individual known personally to the respondent, with whom she first became acquainted in some context unrelated to a search for job information, from whom she found out about her new job, or, who recommended her to someone who then contacted her. "Direct application" means that one contacts a firm directly, does not use a formal or personal intermediary, and has not heard about a specific opening from a personal contact.
CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE RELEVANT LITERATURE

Introduction

A body of literature has built up during the 1960's and 1970's on the social conditioning of women, job discrimination against women, role expectations, psychology of women, exploding myths about women. Brief mention of the unique problems of women in our society is made in this review of the literature only as they relate to women's career development and the formation of women's groups, most particularly, the recent growth of women's networks.

Diffusion theory, one aspect of social network theory, provided a conceptual framework for constructing the research study.

Literature Related to Women's Networks

Only one study similar to this project had been reported in the literature when this study was begun in 1982. Undoubtedly, the scarcity of research is linked to the fact that women's networks, formed to assist women in reaching their career goals, are such a very recent phe-
nomenon. The consciousness-raising feminist groups of the early 1970's have faded to be replaced by the women's networks of the 1980's. (Carden, 1974; Cassell, 1977; Col, 1979; Daniels, 1979; Fritz, 1979; Welch, 1980.)

Odendahl (1982) in her dissertation titled *The Women's Network: Conflict and Opportunity in a Corporate Setting* focused on an examination of the membership of what is currently called a "vertical" network, of women who were all employed at various occupational levels within one corporation. Odendahl conducted interviews to gain life history on the network leaders and used a survey questionnaire to gain a profile of a sample of the women's network membership. A survey questionnaire was sent to the entire membership (N=353) of the women's network employed at the corporate headquarters of a large financial institution (called Incom, for the purposes of the study). Odendahl's questionnaire was administered to the women's network population in the present study, in order to gain parallels to compare the two networks. (See Appendix B for questionnaire.)

A primary conclusion of Odendahl's research was that women's networks do not significantly contribute to the upward career mobility of a majority of their membership. Since Odendahl's return rate on her questionnaire was 27 percent, however, one might question this conclusion.
Odendahl's findings showed that although career development for members was a stated goal of the women's network at Incom, only 38.7 percent of the women who returned the completed questionnaire indicated they believed their involvement in the organization had assisted them in their careers (Odendahl 1982, p. 155). Odendahl concluded that in spite of the fact that the primary purpose of women's networks had been to empower women within the American business system by teaching them how to help themselves, such networks have been unsuccessful, largely because they overlooked the structural constraints of the organization on women's career advancement (Odendahl, 1982, p. 204). Kanter (1977) identified the structure of employing organizations as a barrier to women's upward mobility and pay equity.

Approximately 80 percent of all employed women work in sex-typed jobs in the clerical field, factories, retail trade, and the service industry (Current Population Reports, 1981, pp. 36-37). The clustering of women employees into clerical classifications at Incom simply reflected the picture of society as a whole.

Odendahl's study provided some evidence that membership in a women's network did have positive impact on women's careers by facilitating information exchange between women and allowing them to lend improved moral and
personal support to each other. Odendahl's findings showed networks may also help to improve the quality of women's worklife. For example, networks provide some career women with a substitute for family life. This was true in the case of the Incom network, to which a high percentage of unmarried, childless women belonged. The women's group could be depended upon for camaraderie, social interaction, and psychological encouragement (Odendahl, 1982, p.211).

A similar conclusion was supported by the survey questionnaire findings of the membership of the National Federation of Business and Professional Women Clubs conducted in 1978 by Odendahl and a research team (Odendahl and Smith, 1979). In the BPW study, 3,500 members were selected through a systematic sampling of the organization's mailing list. A total of 2,543 members (72.7 percent) returned the questionnaire. Wherever possible, in structuring questions for the present study, an attempt was made to gain parallel information to provide for comparison to the BPW study. (See Appendix C for a copy of the BPW questionnaire.) These findings appear in Chapter 5 as a part of the analysis of the data.

In an unpublished paper based on early returns from a national survey of women's networks Col (1979) collected responses to a questionnaire from eight networks and
interviews with members and leaders of six other networks. These groups ranged from ad hoc, consciousness-raising meetings to highly organized associations designed to train and inform members (Col, 1979, p.6). Her survey concerned organization, history, membership, financial basis, operation and goals of women's employment networks. From her preliminary findings Col observed: "Across job categories, women are seeking contacts for better performance on their job, chances for advancement in a transfer or job change, and fulfillment of personal and social needs" (Col, 1979, p.4). Col has not completed her research and has indicated she would feel a need to update her data were she to plan to publish her study. A computer-based data search did not produce any research using a single "horizontal" network population where membership cuts across occupational lines, such as that utilized in the present study.

Very few articles on women's network formation have appeared in the literature. Daniels (1979, p.215) in her article on "Development of Feminist Networks in the Professions", pointed out that "through common sense we know the importance of informal networks within any institutional system or any community". Tracing the beginnings of informal women's networks in the academic community, she indicated that they are used to fill gaps
in information through pooling resources. Making contacts in distant cities, finding where to get needed advice, each woman learned from others, and gained know-how to proceed through channels inside an organization.

As women develop an understanding of how the social-psychological benefits of networking may be especially useful to those whose position in a sex-stratified system encourages little positive or unambivalent sense of self-worth, they perceive that informal "old boy" or "old girl" networks are not intrinsically bad. (p. 216).

In a case study of professional communications networks within a national public health association, Yokopenic, et al (1975) documented the under-representation of women members in leadership roles and in presentation of research papers. Findings indicated that the informal system of soliciting papers for annual meetings favored men. Suggestions were reviewed for reducing de-facto discrimination procedures and gaining access to decision-making committees.

Ortiz (1978) reported a similar case analysis revealing the difficulties faced by women seeking positions in school administration. The difficulties women face in gaining entrance to all-male, work-related networks has been amply documented by others as well (Fullerton, 1981; Fitt, 1981; Brown, 1980; Hay, 1980; Burns, 1980).

The sudden appearance and growth of women's networks
in cities throughout the country was undoubtedly stimulated by the appearance of two popular books in 1980. Networking (Welch, 1980) provided networking success stories as well as advice on how to set up a women's network and the first comprehensive, nation-wide list of 180 women's networks then in existence. Women's Networks (Kleiman, 1980) provided an even more complete list of 1400 networks. Stern (1981) produced a similar "how to do it" book on networking which concluded with a caution on the dangers of a women's network gaining publicity, becoming too visible, and thereby losing part of its anticipated effectiveness.

A spate of articles in newspapers and magazines began with "The New Girl Network: A Power System for the Future" (Wilson, 1977) and "Women Executives in the Old-Boy Network" (Hennig and Jardim, 1977). Prior to the mid-seventies women managers were few in number, as were women professionals in all but the female-dominated fields of nursing, teaching and social work. Following the passage of civil rights legislation in the 1960's and early 1970's, opportunities in business and in entering professional schools began to emerge for women. Impeding their career advancement was the recognition that women were outsiders to the informal male environment. Women simply did not "know the ropes" (Fenn, 1978) or the rules
of the game (Harragan, 1978). By early 1982 there was convincing evidence that women were eager to learn how the game of business was played through their formation of over 3,000 career-related information networks, as reported in a list compiled by the Business and Professional Women's Foundation, Washington, D.C. (1982). Their attempted strategy was to pool and share information with one another in these women's networks.

**Literature on Social Network Analysis**

During the past three decades social network analysis has gained prominence from its beginnings in the field of anthropology (Bott, 1957; Mayer, 1963; Kapferer, 1969; Boissevain, 1974) to sociology (Caplow, 1955; Katz, 1958; Kadushin, 1966; Granovetter, 1973) and to education (Cohen and Lorentz, 1977; MacConkey, 1980). Most recently, it has been used as a method for understanding the position of women (Daniels, 1979; Metha, 1979; Odendahl, 1982).

In a review article on the topic of network analysis, Mitchell (1974, p. 283) commented that, "There is not a writer among those using social networks to analyze field data who does postulate a formal theory". Most advocates agree that network analysis is not highly theoretical, but rather a framework for conceptualizing, describing and organizing information about human interaction.
Social network analysis is only beginning to develop as a theoretical paradigm (Odendahl, 1982, p. 48).

Analysis of social networks has been approached from two quite different perspectives. One group of researchers examined networks from a structural perspective, focusing on the form of the relationships they observed, rather than the content or substance of the social relations (Odendahl, 1982). Other network analysts have investigated processes within networks, rather than concentrating on static patterns. It is this latter group, including Boissevain (1974) and Granovetter (1973, 1974), which provided the theoretical perspectives for this research.

Although their viewpoints differed, all social network analysts have attempted to describe social life as a constantly changing series of associations among people (Barnes, 1972).

As Odendahl has summarized:

A social network consists of a quasi-group of people who are connected to each other, either through direct relationships, or because of mutual acquaintances. Everyone is part of a social network, and much of what is accomplished in life occurs within these networks. People interact with members of their family, their friends and their colleagues. Each interaction between individuals represents a link, or a connection in a network.

A person's family relationships form one sort of network; business contacts form another. Any individual is at the center of a
constantly fluctuating larger social network which includes both groups. A person may be connected to another through two other people, but everyone in a particular network is connected to everyone else, whether or not they have a direct relationship. Sometimes networks are formed because of kinship, profession, class, or economic status. At other times they are wide-open based upon individuals and groups from different backgrounds who develop relationships out of common experiences and needs. Every individual's total social network is unique, but it overlaps the networks of others. (1982, p. 47.)

Each person is at the center of his personal network.

This social network may...be looked upon as a scattering of points connected by lines. The points, of course, are persons, and the lines are social relations. Each person can thus be viewed as a star from which lines radiate to points, some of which are connected to each other. These form his first order or primary network zone. But these persons are also in contact with others whom our central person does not know, but with whom he could come into contact via members of his first order zone. This process can be carried out at still further removes so that we can theoretically speak not only of a person's second, but also of his third, fourth and Nth order zones. In fact, all of society can be viewed as a network, and via links in his various zones, an individual, in theory, can eventually get in touch with every other person. (Boissevain, 1974, p. 24.)

Theoretical foundations of this study were drawn from research on social network analysis related to diffusion theory. Diffusion theory was defined by Granovetter (1973) as follows:

...whatever (information) is to be diffused can reach a larger number of people, and tra-
verse greater social distance (i.e., path length) when passed through weak ties rather than strong. If one tells a rumor to all his close friends, and they do likewise, many will hear the rumor a second and third time, since those linked by strong ties tend to share friends. If the motivation to spread the rumor is dampened a bit on each wave of re-telling, then the rumor moving through strong ties is much more likely to be limited to a few cliques than that going via weak ones; bridges will not be crossed. (p. 1366)

Granovetter (1974) studied professional, technical workers and managers (PTM) who had changed jobs within the past five years. Using a 50 percent random sample of the PTM population in a Boston suburb, he selected 515 names of which he intended to use 300 in the study. Ultimately, 457 of the 515 names originally drawn were used to gain a total of 282 responses. (Granovetter, 1974, p. 8.)

The data showed that the majority of subjects (56.1 percent) found their jobs through personal contacts or "friends of friends". Higher earnings and more status were also highly correlated to the jobs found through personal contacts. Granovetter deleted both women and self-employed individuals from his subjects. Questions from Granovetter's study have been used in the present study to seek parallel information on how people have found their last three jobs.
Boissevain's in-depth comparison study of the personal social networks of two Maltese residents included an analysis of the two subjects' first order zones.* Since one subject had 1,751 persons in his first order zone and the other subject had 648, Boissevain's task of gathering data on even so small a sample was considerable.

In his study Boissevain (1974) found that the structural characteristics of urban social networks, when compared to those in small-scale, more isolated communities, will score lower on density (the degree to which members of a person's social network are in touch with each other independent of himself) and multi-plexity (many-stranded relationships, where one person is acquainted with

*The first order zone is defined as the entire social network of people with whom the subject is personally acquainted. The first order zone consists of (1) a personal cell of closest relatives and possibly a few most intimate friends. (2) Intimate zone A, consists of both very close friends and relations with whom Ego maintains active, intimate relations. (3) Intimate Zone B, consists of both friends and relatives with whom he maintains more passive relations, but who nonetheless are emotionally important to him. (4) Effective zone, consists of persons important to him in a more pragmatic sense for economic and political purposes and the logistics of daily life. This zone also contains persons who may be useful to Ego; he keeps relations with them warm so he can gain access to the friend of his friends. Thus many in zone 4 are instrumental friends rather than emotional friends. (5) Nominal zone contains persons he knows, but who mean little to him pragmatically and emotionally; or people he may have met, but that is about all. (Boissevain, 1974, pp. 47-48)
another person through several roles). Therefore, Boissevain concluded that information could be expected to move more quickly and become more widespread (diffused) in an urban network. Boissevain admitted that although the data he gathered confirmed a number of hypotheses, the sample was too small for much weight to be attached to it. Nonetheless, he hoped the findings would provoke further discussion and research (Boissevain, 1974, pp. 30-35).

A historical study, of a group of women in mid-nineteenth century rural England, reported the positive effect of a loose social network in gaining work (Prendergast, 1978). The subject group were women who gathered from all around the countryside to play "stoolball", a milkmaid's version of cricket. Although they were criticized and accused of neglecting their families and home chores to engage in play, the simple gathering together of these women on a regular basis to play stoolball provided them a network of information on availability of field work to augment their meager incomes.

Mayer (1963) linked differences in network structure to the rate at which immigrants in South Africa were absorbed into urban institutions. Mayer's research demonstrated how the small size, high density and
multiplexity of certain categories of African immigrants (the "Red Xhosa") encapsulated them and kept them tied to rural institutions and values, thus effectively blocking their absorption into the main stream of urban life. Other immigrants from the same rural areas (the "school Xhosa"), had larger, less interconnected social networks that contained a greater proportion of single-stranded relations which helped integrate them more rapidly into the urban social scene.

These research studies would suggest that more person-to-person contacts and communications transactions can be made through "friends of friends" rather than close friends or relatives, because this second order of contacts is dispersed through more and more social networks.

**Literature on Job-Finding Behaviors**

Scheele (1976) studied the career-related behavior of successful lawyers (n=47). Subjects were defined by others and themselves as "successful." Consistent patterns emerged upon which a theory of careering for women or men has been developed. In tracing the career paths of the subjects, Scheele observed six critical career competencies, which included what she labeled as "connecting" and "positioning" (Scheele, 1976, pp.246-7).
Like Granovetter, Scheele recognized the unconscious skill involved in "being in the right place at the right time" and "knowing the right people," demonstrated skills which have appeared consistently in career paths of both high achieving men and women.

Lawyers, of course, are a single, closely-defined professional group many of whom are self-employed, so one may question whether Scheele's findings can be generalized to a broader population.

Other wider-based studies on job-finding behaviors have provided evidence of the value of informal contacts, but to varying degrees. For example, Sheppard and Belitzky (1966, vi) in research based on a population of 14,000 workers receiving unemployment benefits, found that 43 percent of skilled workers found jobs through contacts suggested by relatives and friends.

Interestingly, the majority of workers ranked this source third when asked their opinion of the "best way to find a job." Although their own experience in the majority of the group belied that perception, they believed that the state employment service and direct company application were better sources.

Other earlier blue-collar studies of job-finding behaviors have shown that personal contacts are especially important to individuals in early career stages,
particularly those seeking and finding a first job (De Schweinetz, 1932, pp. 87-93; Reynolds, 1951, p. 127). In a more recent blue-collar study Reid (1972) found informal sources were particularly valuable for workers seeking job moves voluntarily.

In a study of two-year college alumni who majored in business or engineering technology, Allen and Keaveny (1980, pp.24-25) found that only 38.5 percent of the business majors got jobs through personal contacts, 48.5 percent through formal job sources, and 12.6 percent of the engineering technology group gained employment through informal personal contacts, 60.1 percent from formal job sources and 17.5 percent through direct application.

These various disparate findings point to the importance of considering other factors, both environmental and internal, in reviewing these research studies. For example, if jobs are plentiful and workers scarce in a particular field it may be more likely that the sought-after workers would be recruited through formal means such as newspaper advertising, college recruiters or employment agencies; whereas, in career areas where jobs are scarce and competition keen, it seems likely that jobs would be less likely to be advertised formally and information would very likely be passed informally by
word of mouth.

In considering internal factors related to job finding Allen and Keaveny (1980) have written:

To date, very little vocational research has focused on the job search process and job-seeking behavior despite their importance to the vocational development process. (p. 19)

Studies by Stevens (1973) and Schneider and Stevens (1971) have examined the relationship between selected personality variables and patterns of job-seeking behavior in graduating college seniors and success in job-finding. Schneider and Stevens concluded that individuals who were self-motivated and goal-oriented in their job-seeking behavior, and who had more realistic expectations, were able to find jobs in a shorter period of time than those with more passive and unfocused goals. Presumably, the inner drive of the motivated group caused them to seek opportunities from every available information source, which contributed to their success.

Stevens (1973, p. 219) concluded that effective job search behavior is part of a developmental process which reflects the individuals' level of vocational development, and without such effective behavior a job is not successfully obtained and the task of adjusting to work cannot be experienced by the individual.
Literature on Women's Career Development

It may be well to point out here that much of the research limited to considering the career development of women is of recent origin, within the last decade (1970's), because in previous years it was assumed that women's home-related duties constituted a lifetime career. (Zytowski, 1967; Ginzberg, 1971; Hall, 1975.) In reviewing research on women's careers, Gutek and Nieva (1979) have grouped career determinants in two categories: Proximal factors which have an immediate influence on choice (such as college or school grades, interests measured during school years, or support from teachers or faculty); and distal factors which are more remote in time and place (such as early childhood experiences, child-rearing patterns in the home, and self-concept).

Horner (1968), in one of the often-cited early studies based on distal factors, observed sex difference in achievement motivation of men and women college students. She attributed the women's lower scores to a fear of success. Later researchers have concluded that Horner's findings are not actually related to a fear of success among women, but to anticipated societal criticism of the sex-role appropriateness of their occupational choice. (Sheppard and Ness, 1975)
Hennig (1970) in her study of high achieving women executives linked their career choices to other distal factors related to family background and self-concept.

Kanter (1977) found that the structure of organizations—certainly a proximal factor—plays a powerful role in creating work behavior. When women (or men) seem to be less motivated or committed to their careers, it is probably because their jobs carry less opportunity. This finding should thus lead to a re-interpretation of some of the past stereotypical assumptions about sex differences in work behavior: that men are more ambitious, task-oriented, and work-involved, and women care more about relationships at work. (p.159)

In related studies Homall (1974) demonstrated the connection between realistic expectations and desires of non-exempt employees. Orzack (1969) found that work is a "central life interest" of professional women who did have career opportunity.

Gutek and Nieva (1979) observed that future research in the area of career choice requires a more sophisticated design approach in order to consider all the inter-related factors that affect career choice.

Hall (1976, p. 200) declared that there are at least four different meanings of the term career: "(1) career as advancement, (2) career as profession, (3) career as
life-long series of work experience, and (4) career as lifelong sequence of role-related experiences. Hansen and Rapoza (1978, p. xv) defined career as a "time-extended working out of a purposeful life pattern."

Recognizing the interdependence of work and family life in women's career development, Hall (1975) examined the pressures, conflict, number of roles, satisfaction and happiness of women college graduates, which pointed up the special problems of women as their roles increased.

Summary of the Review of the Literature

The literature on social network analysis (Granovetter, 1973, 1974; Boissevain, 1974; Mayer, 1963, Prendergast, 1978) suggests that a heterogenous women's network population may provide more career contacts or information on job leads than a more homogeneous group. For the purposes of the study, diffusion theory of social networks provided a theoretical foundation for analysis of findings on this "horizontal" network population of women.

The single research study on a women's network population recently completed by Odendahl (1982) has provided a model most useful in formulating the research questions addressed in the study.

Research literature on career development of women
(Gutek and Nieva, 1979; Horner, 1968; Hennig, 1970; Hall, 1976) pointed to some of the factors unique to women's careers, both in the psychological make-up of the individual, and determinants found in the rapidly-changing environment.

Studies of job-finding behaviors have provided evidence of the value of informal contacts, but to varying degrees (Scheele, 1976; Sheppard and Belitzky, 1966, vi; De Schweinetz, 1932; Reynolds, 1951). Other researchers (Allen and Keaveny, 1980; Stevens, 1973; Schneider and Stevens, 1971) have examined internal factors in assessing job-finding behaviors. All have proved of value in formulating the research questions.

Research Questions

1. What is the demographic profile (such as age, income, education, job category, etcetera) of women who choose voluntarily to join a women's network?

2. How does the demographic profile of the women's network group compare to the total population of employed women, as described in the 1980 census?

3. What do women perceive as personal and career-related benefits of affiliating with a women's network?

4. Is there evidence of personal or career effects (such as new job leads, job changes, or negative effects
such as demotions) to women's career paths related to the level of their involvement in a women's network?

5. How do the job-finding behaviors of this group of women compare to other populations described in previous research studies?

6. Does diffusion theory permit explanation of differential career effects of networking?
CHAPTER 3

STUDY DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

The research was designed to investigate the relationship between a women's network, networking and women's careers. The stated purpose of this research was to accumulate and analyze demographic and career data about a previously unstudied population. It sought to investigate whether a network and networking do improve women's career opportunities. The study also sought to explain the functions of women's networks. What purposes do they serve? How are women's networks perceived by the members? Finally, it was possible to compare the Women's Professional and Managerial Network population, whose membership cuts across organizational and occupational lines, with the Incom Network an in-house "vertical" women's network, and with the diverse Business and Professional Women.

Further, the study investigated the job-finding behaviors to determine whether informal contacts had played a significant part in the career paths of the women studied. Was there, in other words, any evidence of correlation between level of career attainment and these kinds of loose ties?
Selection of the Sample

The subjects for this study were selected from among individuals who were members of the Women's Professional and Managerial Network during the 1981-1982 membership year. Members lived and worked throughout the Puget Sound area of Western Washington. Although the greatest concentration of the population lived in the greater Seattle area (King County), members were also scattered in a radius as far as 120 miles wide. Clusters of members were found, for example, in Olympia, the state's capitol, 60 miles distant, and in Wenatchee, over 100 miles from Seattle.

Ninety subjects were randomly selected. Using a pair of dice, a pool of ninety subjects and their replacements were selected from an alphabetized list of the total population by the following means: If the score for a throw of a pair of dice equaled five or six, the name was included in the sample; if the score totaled eight or nine, the name was included in the replacement sample. Thus a total of ninety names were placed in the sample population and ninety names in the replacement sample by the time the list was exhausted. The remainder of the names were rejected.

These ninety subjects represented a twenty percent random sample of the total population (N=451).
Design of the Instrument

The formulation of questions for an interview or questionnaire is still pretty much an art (Noelle-Neumann, 1970; Payne, 1951) but a series of rules constructed by Bouchard (1976, p. 381) and drawn heavily from the work of Erdos (1970), Kornhauser and Sheatsley (1959) and Payne (1951) provided helpful guidelines to the researcher in constructing the questionnaire:

1) Is the question necessary? If not, eliminate it. It is the researcher's responsibility to know what he needs and not burden the respondent unnecessarily.

2) Is the questionnaire repetitious? Does another question serve the same purpose? If so, eliminate it, unless it has been deliberately included to assess reliability or provide convergent validation.

3) Could the answer be obtained more easily elsewhere--by simple observation or from records? If so, get it elsewhere.

4) Does the question contain more than one idea? Is it double-barreled? If so, break it down.

5) Is the question adequate as it stands, or should complementary questions be asked? For example, feelings, knowledge, and behavior often need to be separated.

6) Can the respondent answer the question? Does he have the information? If not, don't ask it.

7) Will the question embarrass the respondent? If it will, and it is necessary, consider putting it at the end of the questionnaire. Rewording is also possible.

8) Could it be made more specific or more concrete? A question that is too general elicits varying frames of reference.
9) **Is the question clear?** Respondents hesitate to reveal that they do not understand a question. Be sure it is clear. Clarity generally correlates with length. Short questions are to be preferred.

10) **Would a memory jogger help?** Can the respondent consult records to gain that information? If so, request that he do so.

11) **Is the question too indirect?** Direct questions are generally preferable.

12) **Is the response format adequate from a theoretical point of view?** Or from the respondent's point of view? Yes-no formats are useful, but other formats may be more useful. Has ignorance (don't know) been given status? Is the intensity range adequate? Are the alternatives clear?

13) **If precoded answers are given, they will yield far more accurate answers than open-ended questions.**

14) **Is the questionnaire susceptible to an order effect?** First and last questions standout and randomization is desirable if the questionnaire is homogeneous.

15) **Can the items be arranged so that particular answers preclude the need to answer others?** If so arrange them this way. You will save time.

16) **Is an item likely to bias those following it?** If such interactions are possible, and undesirable, the items should be separated.

17) **Is the ordering of the questions natural or reasonable?** The order should not be haphazard. It should be easy and comfortable. Consider the following possible orderings: objective-subjective, familiar-unfamiliar, specific-general, past-present, present-past, past-future.

18) **Does the sequence maintain motivation?** A long series of closed-ended questions tends to bore a respondent. Often a change of technique revives interest.

19) **Is the opening appropriate?** The first few questions are often critical. Test them thoroughly.
They should not arouse resistance, anxiety, or defensiveness.

20) Will the respondent be able to read and understand the questions? Reading comprehension is consistently overestimated by researchers.

21) End the questionnaire (or interview) with a courteous Thank You or similar note of appreciation.

Questionnaire construction requires careful consideration of all twenty of Bouchard's questions. In the present study particular attention was paid to placing the most personal and introspective questions near the end of the interview after rapport had been established and comfort level increased. Success of the technique is demonstrated by the single missing case of reported income (often a sensitive issue) in the study and the candor in the responses related to personal goals and experiences shared with the researcher.

The design of the survey instrument followed a review of the specific literature relating to studies which were similar to this research.

The questions used to construct the questionnaire (Appendix A) were drawn from three sources: Odendahl (1982) study of the Incom Network (Appendix B); 1978 questionnaire used to survey the membership of the BPW (Appendix C); and questions drawn from Granovetter (1974) in his study Getting a Job: A Study of Contacts and Careers (Appendix D), in order to be able to compare the
present findings to those of the other three studies.

The first part of the questionnaire was designed to solicit information relative to the subjects' reasons for affiliation with the Network; questions related to demographic data were constructed to parallel those in the Incom and BPW study so comparisons could be made to these populations. Questions concerned with how respondents had found jobs were duplicated from the Granovetter study to attempt to learn whether the findings of his study, using an all-male population, were reflected in this population of women. The array of questions about sources of jobs permitted diffusion theory to be assessed.

Data Collection Procedure

The methodology used to gather the data for the study was a questionnaire (Appendix A) administered during a structured telephone interview with each subject.

Each individual was mailed a questionnaire for preview. Within ten days after mailing the questionnaire, the members of the sample were contacted by telephone to attempt to set an appointment time convenient to the respondent to review the questionnaire. Permission was refused in five cases and two subjects had moved and could not be contacted at a forwarding address. These
seven subjects were replaced from the replacement sample using a procedure to assure randomness.

The eight-page questionnaire used to collect the data was reduced down to fifty percent size on a photocopy machine prior to mailing in the hope that the number of questions would thus appear less formidable and that the anticipated time to reply would be minimized in the minds of the participants.

The questionnaire mailing occurred in September and ninety telephone interviews were conducted over the next three months. Although a strong attempt to reach all participants and set up telephone interview times was made within ten days of the mailing, some hard-to-reach individuals required repeated tries, so that the data collection stretched over twelve weeks, a longer period than was originally anticipated.

The telephone method for gathering the data was selected in preference to mailed responses for the study for several reasons. First, with a mailed questionnaire in which retaining anonymity of the subjects is a consideration it is both difficult and expensive to follow up and attempt to reach non-respondents (Backstrom and Harsh, 1963). Second, filling out and returning a detailed questionnaire with as many as fifty-seven responses, plus an open-ended comment at the conclusion
of the questionnaire, takes considerable time and effort to answer and mail back, so with a mailed response there is always the worry of getting an adequate size sample. In addition, a mailed questionnaire runs the risk of a more skewed population. Studies have indicated that responses may be polarized at the extremes, and that responses from those subjects who do not feel either strongly positive or strongly negative about the questionnaire are less likely to be returned. As Van Dalen and Meyer (1966, p. 306) observed, many people are more willing to communicate orally than in writing, and, therefore will provide data more readily and fully in an interview than on a questionnaire. Further, asking someone for information generally saves an enormous amount of time and effort if that someone is willing and able to supply an answer (Bouchard, 1976, p. 308).

Stebbins (1972) stressed that goodwill and trust must be cultivated and maintained by the interviewer if the interview is to yield useful information. For this reason the researcher was careful to stress a friendly telephone manner and assure respect for confidentiality before proceeding with the interview. The telephone interview proved to be a satisfactory method for the study.
Analysis of the Data

Using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) the data were analyzed by the University of Washington's academic computer center. Nonparametric techniques were used as indicated by the data and the research questions.

Frequency distributions were run on all variables and Chi-square tests of independence were performed on selected variables. Cross tabulations and frequency tables which appear in later chapters were all drawn from the SPSS computer printouts.

In the very few cases where missing cases are omitted, adjusted frequency figures are used when describing the data. In all cases the .05 level of significance was reported and used to interpret results.
CHAPTER 4

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

Research Question 1

1. What is the demographic profile (i.e. age, income, education, job category) of women who choose voluntarily to join a women's network.

To permit the Women's Network population to be systematically compared to other networking groups and to the total population of employed women, selected findings are presented here using descriptive statistics: Frequencies, percentages, and in some cases, in terms of means, medians and modes. Selected comparisons were made among variables as the profiles were presented.

Age

Table 4-1 represents the age distribution of the women among nine categories.

Ethnic Representation

Ethnic groups were represented in the population as follows: The majority (93.3 percent) of the membership
### TABLE 4-1

**AGE DISTRIBUTION OF WOMEN'S NETWORK MEMBERS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Category</th>
<th>Absolute Frequency</th>
<th>Relative Frequency (percent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21 to 25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 to 30</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 to 35</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 to 40</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 to 45</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 to 50</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 to 55</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56 to 60</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 and over</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>90</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
was Caucasian; 3.3 percent were Asian-American, 2.2 percent were Black and 1.1 percent were Hispanic. There were no Native Americans in the group. In terms of the total population of the Seattle area minority groups were under-represented, since 8 percent of the Seattle population is Asian and 10 percent Black. No data has been compiled in the Seattle area regarding ethnic minority women in professional and managerial positions that could provide further comparisons.

**Education**

Women's Network members represented a highly educated group. The total population surveyed were high school graduates with at least some college training. Fully 76.7 percent of the women held a college degree and an astounding 44.4 percent of that number held an advanced degree. Of those with advanced degrees, 11.1 percent held an earned doctoral degree. MBA's accounted for over 25 percent of the master's degrees. Other master's degrees were heavily in fields of education (12.5 percent of those with master's degrees) and human services (12.5 percent).

The 3.3 percent of the total population who held other degrees included the R.N. and Associate of Arts.

More than 46 percent of the Women's Network members also indicated they held a personal goal to continue
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVEL</th>
<th>Absolute Frequency</th>
<th>Relative Frequency (percent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College degree</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>32.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced degree</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other degree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
gaining more education within the next five years. The education table (Table 4-2) illustrates the educational attainment of the Women's Network members.

Marital Status

The population was comprised of 44.4 percent single heads of households. Of this total group 17.7 percent had never married, 22 percent were divorced and 4.4 percent were widowed or separated. Married women comprised 53.3 percent of the sample and 2.2 percent reported living with a partner.

Number of Children

The majority of the group had children (58.9 percent) and of this group 40 percent had dependent children, and 18.9 percent reported grown children who were no longer dependents. Of the members with dependent children, the largest group (20 percent) had one child, 14.4 percent had two children and 5.5 percent reported having three or more children.

Income

More than half the population (52.8 percent) earned more than $25,000 per year. Fully 43 percent earned more than $30,000 with 16.8 percent in the $40,000 and above category. In income the group was far above the national average of $11,197 for women and $18,602 for men (as reported in the Census 1980).
Among those currently earning less than $25,000 per year were a few new mothers who had left established careers to stay at home. One marketing manager had made an unusual arrangement with her employer to work on a part-time contractual basis at home and go in to the office one day a week. Another new mother (a former systems services manager) with a two-month old baby planned to work on her MBA and do some free lance work in her field while staying home.

Both of these women had recognized how difficult it would be to return to their fields if they "stopped out" completely. As one of these younger women stated:

"Being involved in the Network with some older women helped me reach a decision to stay, to "keep an ear in" business. I kept thinking of reminders from these women--about how hard it is to get back in business. So instead of quitting, I negotiated a contract with my company to work in my home. I go in the office one day a week and the rest of the time I've set up an office in my home with a mini-computer. It took a lot of will power and determination to get that contract, but I remembered the women in the Network. When I thought of just staying home with my baby I remembered what they'd said--that people don't put as much value on what you've done for family reasons. This influenced me quite a bit."

Respondents indicated personal income per year, before taxes, in ten categories, reflected in Table 4-3 which follows.
# Table 4-3

**Personal Income Per Year Before Taxes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Category</th>
<th>Absolute Frequency</th>
<th>Relative Frequency (percent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under $10,000</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,000 to $14,999</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$15,000 to $19,999</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,000 to $24,999</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,000 to $29,999</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30,000 to $34,999</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$35,000 to $39,999</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40,000 to $44,999</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$45,000 to $49,999</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000 or more</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not given</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total**  

90 100.0
Those women with some college education, but no degree, represented 20 percent of the population, and were found in every income category. Forty percent of this group earned less than $25,000 per year; 60 percent earned from $25,000 to more than $50,000.

In the majority category, the 76.7 percent of the population holding at least a bachelor's degree, 35.5 percent earned less than $25,000 and 64.5 percent earned from $25,000 to more than $50,000 per year. Within this group, the women who had earned a master's degree (44.4 percent of the total population), 45 percent earned less than $25,000 and the remainder (55 percent) were represented in every category from $25,000 to more than $50,000.

Of the 11.1 percent of the population who held doctoral degrees, 60 percent had incomes of less than $25,000; the rest were scattered in every category from $30,000 to more than $50,000 per year.

In the small group (3.3 percent of the population) of those who held a degree labeled "other degree" such as R.N. or A.A., the total group earned less than $25,000.

Analysis of the data using the chi-square procedure as shown in Table 4-4 did not show any significant relationship between education level and income level.
### TABLE 4-4
EDUCATION AND INCOME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INCOME</th>
<th>Less than $30,000</th>
<th>$30,000 or more</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>EDUCATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>0 = 38</td>
<td>0 = 30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>E = 38.2</td>
<td>E = 29.8</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X2 = .001</td>
<td>X2 = .001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than</td>
<td>0 = 12</td>
<td>0 = 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>E = 11.8</td>
<td>E = 9.2</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>X2 = .003</td>
<td>X2 = .004</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Raw $X^2 = .009 \quad df = 1 \quad p < .05$
As Table 4-5 indicates, divorced women and married women were more heavily represented in the higher income categories than were the never married.

TABLE 4-5

COMPARISON TABLE SHOWING MARITAL STATUS AND INCOME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Level</th>
<th>Never Married</th>
<th>Divorced</th>
<th>Separated</th>
<th>Widowed</th>
<th>Living with Partner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under $10,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,000 - $14,999</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$15,000 - $19,999</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,000 - $24,999</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,000 - $29,999</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30,000 - $34,999</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$35,000 - $39,999</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40,000 - $44,999</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$45,000 - $49,999</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000 or more</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTALS**

16 48 20 1 3 2 =90

A comparison of age categories and income levels, as shown on Table 4-6, provides a picture of the spread of income levels over all age groups.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Level</th>
<th>21-25</th>
<th>26-30</th>
<th>31-35</th>
<th>36-40</th>
<th>41-45</th>
<th>46-50</th>
<th>51-55</th>
<th>56-60</th>
<th>61-</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 10,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 14,999</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,000 to 19,999</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,000 to 24,999</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25,000 to 29,999</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30,000 to 34,999</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35,000 to 39,999</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40,000 to 44,999</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COLUMN TOTAL</th>
<th>1.1</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>20.2</th>
<th>20.2</th>
<th>15.7</th>
<th>6.7</th>
<th>7.9</th>
<th>5.6</th>
<th>1.1</th>
<th>100.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Using the Chi-square procedure the data was analyzed to test whether there was a significant correlation between age and income. It was concluded that there was no significant relationship between these two variables.

**TABLE 4-7**

**AGE AND INCOME**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>Under 30</th>
<th>31-35</th>
<th>36-40</th>
<th>41-50</th>
<th>51 or over</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INCOME</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under</td>
<td>0 = 5</td>
<td>0 = 6</td>
<td>0 = 5</td>
<td>0 = 8</td>
<td>0 = 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>E=6.0</td>
<td>E=5.5</td>
<td>E=5.5</td>
<td>E=6.0</td>
<td>E=5.1</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X2=.16</td>
<td>X2=.05</td>
<td>X2=.05</td>
<td>X2=.67</td>
<td>X2=.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,000-</td>
<td>0 = 9</td>
<td>0 = 6</td>
<td>0 = 3</td>
<td>0 = 3</td>
<td>0 = 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$29,999</td>
<td>E=5.2</td>
<td>E=4.7</td>
<td>E=4.7</td>
<td>E=5.2</td>
<td>E=3.2</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X2=2.8</td>
<td>X2=.36</td>
<td>X2=.61</td>
<td>X2=.60</td>
<td>X2=.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over</td>
<td>0 = 6</td>
<td>0 = 6</td>
<td>0 = 10</td>
<td>0 = 9</td>
<td>0 = 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>E=8.8</td>
<td>E=7.9</td>
<td>E=7.9</td>
<td>E=5.2</td>
<td>E=3.2</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X2=.89</td>
<td>X2=.46</td>
<td>X2=.56</td>
<td>X2=.00</td>
<td>X2=.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

X2 = 8.59  df = 8  P < .05
Expected Income Level within Five Years

A strong majority of the women (78.9 percent) expected to be earning more than $30,000 per year within the next five years. Since 43 percent already earned at least $30,000, their ambitions may not be too far out of reach. A comparison of present income levels and expected income levels within the next five years is presented in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CURRENT INCOME LEVEL</th>
<th>Rel. Freq. (Pct)</th>
<th>EXPECTED INCOME LEVEL IN 5 YEARS</th>
<th>Rel. Freq. (Pct)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under $10,000</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>$10,000 to $20,000</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,000 to $19,999</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>$20,000 to $30,000</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,000 to $29,999</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td>$30,000 to $40,000</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30,000 to $39,999</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
<td>$40,000 to $50,000</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40,000 to $49,999</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>More than $50,000</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000 or more</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not given</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Anticipated Earnings Compared to Level of Career Aspiration

When the group was asked the question: "Relative to your male and female co-workers, how high do you think your own level of career aspiration is?" the majority (44.2 percent) viewed themselves as "way above average", with 38.4 percent as "slightly above average" and 12.8 percent as "average". Only 4.7 percent viewed themselves as "slightly below or way below average".

In comparing their level of career aspiration to that of other women, an even stronger majority (63.1 percent), saw themselves as "way above average" with 26.2 percent in the "above average" category. Only 7.1 percent saw themselves as "average" and the remainder chose the "slightly below" average responses.

As Table 4-9 illustrates the group which viewed themselves as "way above average" in comparing themselves to both men and women in their fields of work expected their ambitions to be reflected in much higher income levels within five years. Over half the population expected to be earning at least $40,000 in five years.

Occupations

Women's Network members were employed in thirty-six different job categories identified according to the Occupational Classification System (OCS) used in the U.S.
### Expected Salary in 5 Years by Level of Career Aspiration

(As compared to men and women)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10,000 - 20,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,000 - 30,000</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30,000 - 40,000</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40,000 - 50,000</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 50,000</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3.37%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Column Total**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>38</th>
<th>33</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>86</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44.2%</td>
<td>38.4%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Census, and in forty-one different types of businesses, listed according to the Standard Industrial Classification code (SIC). Only 2.2 percent of the population was not currently employed and 2.2 percent listed their occupation as housewife.

More than 57.8 percent of the membership were employed at a managerial level. Fully 24.4 percent of the total population managed a staff of at least five or more persons. Professionals in a variety of fields including medicine, law and education, accounted for 16.5 percent of the occupational classifications. A smaller number (5.5 percent) were in sales-related occupations and 4.4 percent in technical positions. Administrative support occupations, which included supervisors, bookkeepers, secretaries and coordinators, totaled 6.6 percent of the group. The remainder were scattered in various service occupations such as food supervisor, protective service or health fields.

A surprising number of the women (26.7 percent) indicated that they held dual job responsibilities either through having two job titles in the same business, or through working full-time at one occupation with another business or profession "on the side."
Table 4-10 illustrates the Women's Professional and Managerial Network membership according to OCS categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OCS</th>
<th>Absolute Frequency</th>
<th>Relative Frequency (PCT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MANAGERIAL OCCUPATIONS 004-037</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>57.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROFESSIONAL SPECIALTY 053-189</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TECHNICAL OCCUPATIONS 208-234</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SALES 253-255</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT, INCLUDING CLERICAL 307</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SERVICE OCCUPATIONS 424-456</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOUSEWIVES (no OCS code)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNEMPLOYED (no code given)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>90</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The types of businesses and non-profit organizations in which members were employed is shown according to major Standard Industrial Code (SIC) groups in Table 4-11.

**TABLE 4-11**

**OCCUPATIONAL DISTRIBUTION OF NETWORK MEMBERS ACCORDING TO U.S. STANDARD INDUSTRIAL CODE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIC MAJOR GROUP CODE</th>
<th>ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY</th>
<th>RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PCT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture, forestry and fishing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation, communications, electric, gas and sanitary services</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale and retail trade</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance, insurance and real estate</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>54.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public administration</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonclassifiable establishments</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Unemployed)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Housewives, for which no SIC code exists)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>90</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Examples of these dual roles were as diverse as a full-time health care administrator who had a partnership in a video taping company, a caterer who worked full-time for one firm while building her own catering business in her spare time, and a labor lawyer in government who consulted to management on a free lance basis.

Another woman with dual roles within her corporation was the controller, treasurer of the corporation, managed the data processing department and helped her employer manage the 17 other businesses he owned. In addition, within the next five years she indicated she hoped to have completed her MBA degree while continuing in her present job. (In her company, she rated herself as "average" in her career aspirations as compared to her male and female co-workers, and added the comment: "This is a very motivated group of people!")

Number of years in the work force

The number of years Network members reported being employed in the work force ranged from one year to forty-two years. The mean for the group was 15.6 years and the mode was 13 years. The median was 14.2 years. Fully 24.5 percent of the group fell in the range from 13 years to 15 years, and 60 percent of the group had worked 15 years or less. These data are presented in Table 4-12.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Absolute Freq</th>
<th>Relative Freq (pct)</th>
<th>Cum Freq (pct)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>24.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>31.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>35.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>52.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>64.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>72.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>78.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>81.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>83.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>85.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>86.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>87.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>88.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>90.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>91.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>92.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>95.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>96.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>97.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>98.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total** 90 100.0 100.0
Number of years as a volunteer

A total of 48.9 percent of the population reported no years of involvement as a volunteer. Of those who indicated having given time as a volunteer, the range of years was from one year to 35 years. Of the members, 17.7 percent had worked on a volunteer basis for one to five years; 11.1 percent had volunteered from six to ten years; 8.9 percent had been volunteers for eleven to fifteen years; 13.3 percent had been donating their services for twenty or more years.

Job Satisfaction

In reporting on their level of job satisfaction the majority (73.4 percent) of the WPMN population were satisfied or very satisfied with their present job; and 25.6 percent were not satisfied. Cross-tabulations of job satisfaction and income level appear in Table 4-13.

Job Promotions

When asked about job promotions, 48.7 percent of the women said they had not received a promotion since starting with their present company. It should be noted that this figure includes those women who may already have been at a senior level or at the top of an organization. Of the 51.3 percent who had received a promotion 34.2 percent had sought the promotion and the remainder had not.
### Table 4-13

**Comparison of Job Satisfaction and Present Income Before Taxes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Under 14,999</th>
<th>15,000-24,999</th>
<th>25,000-34,999</th>
<th>35,000-44,999</th>
<th>45,000-45,000</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Very Satisfied</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Satisfied</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not Satisfied</strong></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COLUMNS TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When the data reported in Table 4-13 was collapsed to form a two by two cell, combining Satisfied and Very Satisfied categories and collapsing income to Under $20,000 per year and Over $20,000 per year, using the Chi-square procedure it was found that there was a significant positive relationship between job satisfaction and income level.

**TABLE 4-14**
JOB SATISFACTION LEVEL COMPARED TO INCOME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Under $20,000</th>
<th>Over $20,000</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied and</td>
<td>0 = 16</td>
<td>0 = 50</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>E = 20</td>
<td>E = 46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$X^2 = .80$</td>
<td>$X^2 = .348$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 = 11</td>
<td>0 = 12</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not satisfied</td>
<td>E = 7</td>
<td>E = 16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$X^2 = 2.29$</td>
<td>$X^2 = 1.0$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Raw $X^2 = 4.44$ $df = 1$ $p < .05$
Future Occupational Goals

Since 57.8 percent of the WPMN population was already employed in some managerial capacity, it is not surprising to note that 31.2 percent aspired to middle or senior management within the next five years. What appeared more interesting is that 43.3 percent had other plans for five years hence. More than 70 percent of this group hoped to own a business or be self-employed in some professional capacity. Only one respondent indicated she hoped to drop out of the work force in order to stay home and have a family. Less than 5 percent anticipated retirement within five years.

Because respondents may have chosen more than one response, percentages related to future occupational goals presented in Table 4-15 do not total 100 percent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 4-15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WHERE DO YOU WANT TO BE PROFESSIONALLY IN FIVE YEARS?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entry level management</th>
<th>2.2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Middle management</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior management</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In another career</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In another company</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not know</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of the above, please specify</td>
<td>43.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Future Personal Goals

A number of questions were asked concerning the future personal goals of the group in order to gain a detailed profile of the membership. Twenty-four percent intended to become more politically involved within the next five years while 23.3 percent wanted to find more time to be alone. A majority (53.3 percent) expressed a desire for greater family involvement within the next five years. This group included those women who hoped to have a child. Further education was a goal for 46.7 percent of the population. For 60 percent of the women finding time for creative endeavors was a goal. Among the 38.9 percent who expressed goals other than those listed, traveling and owning a home were the most frequently expressed goals.

Research Question 2

2. How does the demographic profile of women's network group compare to the total population of employed women as described in the 1980 census?

At the end of 1980 half of all married women were in the work force. Married women comprised 53 percent of the membership of the Network. Fifty-one percent of all
mothers with dependent children under 18 years, were in the labor force by 1981. Mothers of dependent children represented 40 percent of the Women's Network membership.

According to the 1980 U.S. census, women in managerial-administrative positions comprised just 6.8 percent of the female work force, while women in professional-technical fields accounted for 15.9 percent of women workers. In contrast, a majority of WPMN members (57.8 percent) were in managerial positions, and 21.1 percent were in professional-technical positions.

By far the largest category of women workers nationally (33.7 percent were in clerical jobs. Administrative support positions, including clerical jobs, made up just 6.6 percent of the WPMN employment figures.

Women working full-time in 1980 had average annual earnings of $11,197, while men's earnings averaged $18,612. (Average earnings of Women's Network members was considerably higher: 84.3 percent earned more than $15,000.)

Of women in the work force in 1980, nearly 80 percent were in clerical, sales, service, factory or plant jobs. (Network members were largely in managerial positions (57.8 percent) with 5.5 percent in sales, 16.5 percent in
professional-technical positions and 6.6 percent in administrative support positions, including clerical.

Although 420 occupations are listed in the Census Bureau's dictionary of occupational titles, women are concentrated in just twenty occupations, largely clerical. Table 4-16 which follows indicates the occupational categories where women were employed according to 1980 census figures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 4-16</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WOMEN IN THE WORKFORCE 1980</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managerial-administrative (except farm)</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional-technical</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>33.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craft</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operatives, including transport</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonfarm laborers</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service (except private households)</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private household</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4-17 provides a comparison of the employment categories of the WPMN population (Observed frequencies) with the 1980 census of employed women (Expected frequencies), using the Chi-square procedure.

**TABLE 4-17**

**COMPARISON OF WPMN OCCUPATIONAL CATEGORIES AND 1980 CENSUS-EMPLOYED WOMEN**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Managerial</th>
<th>Prof/ Tech</th>
<th>Sales</th>
<th>Clerical</th>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Craft/ Operators etc.**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WPMN* 0=60.5</td>
<td>0=22.1</td>
<td>0=5.8</td>
<td>0=6.9</td>
<td>0=4.7</td>
<td>0=0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980 CENSUS E=6.8</td>
<td>E=15.9</td>
<td>E=7.0</td>
<td>E=33.7</td>
<td>E=18.8</td>
<td>E=17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X^2=424.1$</td>
<td>$X^2=2.42$</td>
<td>$X^2=.206$</td>
<td>$X^2=21.3$</td>
<td>$X^2=10.57$</td>
<td>$X^2=17.8$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Raw $X^2 = 476.4$  \(df = 1\)  \(p < .001\)

*NOTE:* In order to provide parallel percentage comparisons between the 1980 census categories of employed women and the WPMN population, the 4.4% of the WPMN population which included housewives and unemployed was deleted from the total \(n\) of 90. Percentages for the remaining population (86 subjects) were then re-calculated.

**Farm/Non-Farm Laborers, Private Household.**

It was concluded that there was a significant difference between the two populations.
According to 1980 census figures, 37.7 percent of the total white U.S. population were high school graduates. For the State of Washington educational attainment figures were much higher than for the nation as a whole: 76.3 of Washington State residents were high school graduates. (WPMN members were all at least high school graduates).

U.S. Census figures revealed that 15.1 percent of the total white population had from one to three years of college and an additional 17.8 percent had four or more years of college. Fourteen percent of white females held a college degree as compared with 22 percent of white males. (Fully 76.7 percent of WPMN members had a bachelor's degree and 44.4 percent of the total population held at least a master's degree).

Research Question 3

3. What do women perceive as personal and career-related benefits of affiliating with a women's network?

Common use of the word "networking" in its present context had only begun in the late 1970's. Therefore, to respond to this research question it is important to define what the women meant by "networking" and how they practiced "networking".
When asked to give a personal definition of networking in a free response question, 60 percent of the respondents indicated they perceived networking as a process of building and making contacts with both women and men to exchange ideas, share and gain work-related information, increase business prospects. In other words, they viewed "networking" as a reciprocal process. Some typical definitions that fell in this group included these comments:

"Networking is making contacts."
"Getting together with other people from a wide variety of backgrounds to exchange ideas."
"Just talking to people (not necessarily with any ulterior motive)."
"Making connections with people in various fields."
"A two-way support system of contacts, especially business contacts."
"A way to gain informal information--a supportive and informational mechanism for women and men too."

A smaller group of 5.5 percent, who held a narrower view of networking, viewed the process as related only to other people working in their own particular field. They chose to define networking in this vein:

"Making professional contacts."
"Intermingling of ideas and evaluations with people in my professional environment."
"The reciprocal use of contacts to help in professional areas."
Women helping other women was the basic concept of networking held by 14.4 percent of the sample. Their comments are typified by the following quotes:

"Meeting other business and professional women for personal support and ideas."
"Joining together to benefit one another."
"Professional women making contacts through social or professional circles to increase their own business success. I see it as a real arena for getting support-- personal and professional support and for giving the same."
"Basically meeting people concerned with the image women in business are projecting."
"Making contacts with other women in order to assist myself and others in realizing our personal and professional goals and, as a result, increasing the clout of women."

A few (5.5 percent) expressed a view of networking that might be termed unabashedly self-serving, or networking for a specific purpose. The following comments fell in this category:

"Making personal contacts with decision-makers and accessing them when it may be helpful to you."
"Developing and using contacts to achieve means."
"Having a large number of acquaintances to expand one's influence, sources of information, on products, services and sources of referral."
"Making contacts to gain support and information from others in various organizations and industries."

One woman expressed a personal definition of networking that was unique. Her concept of networking was of "older, more experienced people helping those younger
and less experienced. I felt a community obligation to other women." This was her main reason for joining the group.

For 4.4 percent of the membership networking meant primarily making social contacts in a kind of support network. The remainder (9 percent) did not provide a response to this question.

Figure 1 A GUIDE TO NETWORKING illustrates how the networking process was perceived by Incom Network members.

Of the women who joined the WPMN the largest percentage (46.6 percent) had heard about the Network through word of mouth, from a friend, a co-worker, a relative or casual acquaintance.

One might infer that in some instances there may have been subtle peer pressure to join the group because friends had joined. Others (21.1 percent) had first become aware of its existence through a mailed invitation to a Network event, a news article (12.2 percent), an event advertisement (13.3 percent), through their own research (3.3 percent) and the rest could not recall.

A series of questions covered the manner in which women go about networking. Most women indicated they network over lunch (57.8 percent) although 21.1 percent of the respondents used all methods. (See Table 4-18)
FIGURE 1-1
A GUIDE TO NETWORKING

KEY DEFINITIONS

"NETWORKING" - the process of linking people to each other as resources; assisting, supporting, helping others find the resources they need.

"SUPPORT GROUP" - a special interest small group which meets periodically to learn together and support one another in their ongoing professional development.

"A NETWORK" - an interconnected or interrelated chain group or system of contacts, friends, supporters.

REASONS FOR NETWORKING

*Support
*Information
*Job Leads
*Advice
*Contacts

INGREDIENTS FOR SUCCESSFUL NETWORKING

*Trust
*Willingness to act as dependable, mutual resources for each other
*Interest in building relationships through a variety of contacts
*Synergy
*Mutual respect
*Liking each other as people
*Feeling energized by each other

KEY POINTS

Networking doesn't work if:
*It's onesided; all take and no give
*Promises aren't delivered upon
*You feel "compelled" to reciprocate

PAYOFFS FROM NETWORKING

*Promotions
*Increased visibility
*Professional growth
*Your next job may very well come from a network contact

1This chart was designed by Janice Merton. It summarizes "Networking."

(P. 126, Odendahl, 1982, reproduced with permission)
### TABLE 4-18

**SETTING OF NETWORKING ACTIVITIES***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Over breakfast</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over lunch</td>
<td>57.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over dinner</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over the telephone</td>
<td>61.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Around the office</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All of the above</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td><strong>27.8</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(Examples given included professional Meetings/ conferences, seminars)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Several respondents checked more than one response.*

A majority (77.8 percent) indicated they actively made contacts with others with the purpose of networking. They were a group of active joiners as well: 94.4 percent belonged to at least one other organization; 76.7 percent belonged to a professional group in her field; 53.3 percent belonged to some type of community organization; 25.6 belonged to another network group; 36.7 percent belonged to a recreational club and 23.3 percent belonged to some other type of organization. Just 18.9 percent belonged to an "in-house network" at their place of work, and 15.6 percent were a part of a political organization.
In order to determine whether a significant relationship existed between active networking behavior and income level, the Chi-square procedure was used to examine the data.

**TABLE 4-19**

**NETWORKING ACTIVITY AND INCOME LEVEL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INCOME</th>
<th>DO NOT ACTIVELY NETWORK</th>
<th>DO ACTIVELY NETWORK</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under $20,000</td>
<td>0 = 3</td>
<td>0 = 24</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E = 6.06</td>
<td>E = 20.94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X² = 1.55</td>
<td>X² = .43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,000 to $29,999</td>
<td>0 = 6</td>
<td>0 = 17</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E = 5.67</td>
<td>E = 17.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X² = .02</td>
<td>X² = .00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30,000 to $39,999</td>
<td>0 = 6</td>
<td>0 = 9</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E = 3.37</td>
<td>E = 11.66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X² = 2.10</td>
<td>X² = .61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40,000 or more</td>
<td>0 = 5</td>
<td>0 = 19</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E = 4.94</td>
<td>E = 19.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X² = 0</td>
<td>X² = 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ X² = 4.71 \quad df = 3 \quad p \gg .05 \]

It was therefore concluded that there was no significant relationship between actively networking and income level.
Table 4-20 indicates the women's stated reasons for joining the WPMN.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increased business/professional contacts</td>
<td>84.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal career development</td>
<td>53.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fellowship/social contacts</td>
<td>54.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing personal skills and knowledge</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please explain)</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of all the reasons stated above, what was your main reason for joining?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increased business/professional contacts</td>
<td>67.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal career development</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fellowship/social contacts</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing personal skills and knowledge</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please explain)</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All of the above (cannot choose one)</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Question 3 suggests that women expected and sought personal gain resulting from their membership involvement with the Network. A review of the findings (Table 4-20) supports this assumption. Increased business and professional contacts was by far the most important reason for joining (84.4 percent), followed by fellowship/social contacts (54.4 percent) and personal career development (53.3 percent). Under the category "Other (Please explain)" (18.9 percent), one group of responses were typified by the following comments:

"I believe in supporting groups that are doing something worthwhile that stand for something I believe in."

Another group viewed their membership as a way to help other younger women to learn and grow. Still others joined simply because they enjoyed hearing the speakers at the WPMN dinners, and a few were simply curious about what "networking" was all about.

Table 4-21 contains the results of the total population's evaluation of their various experiences through involvement with activities of the Women's Network.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Very valuable/ somewhat valuable</th>
<th>Not valuable</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CONTACTS</td>
<td>63.3</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOB LEADS</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>43.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INCREASED BUSINESS</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRIENDSHIP</td>
<td>64.4</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFORMATION EXCHANGE</td>
<td>76.6</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENERAL CAREER DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUPPORT</td>
<td>58.9</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERSONAL SKILLS &amp; KNOWLEDGE</td>
<td>57.8</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMALL GROUP MEETINGS</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>61.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEWSLETTER</td>
<td>84.5</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTALS**  
100%
To gain a clearer picture of how members' reasons for joining WPMN (Table 4-20) compared to their evaluations of the value of their experiences (Table 4-21) some of the more closely related findings have been grouped together to review:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons for Joining</th>
<th>Network Experience Evaluated as Very Valuable/ Somewhat Valuable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>84.4% Increased business and professional contacts</td>
<td>76.6% Information exchange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>63.3% Contacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.4% Fellowship/social contacts</td>
<td>64.4% Friendship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>58.9% Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.3% Personal career development</td>
<td>48.9% General career development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.9% Developing personal skills and knowledge</td>
<td>57.8% Personal skills and knowledge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Question 4

4. Is there evidence of social or career effects (such as new job leads, job changes, or negative effects such as demotions) to women's career paths related to the level of their involvement in a women's network?

Of the ninety women who made up the WPMN population sample 43.3 percent had been a Network member for one year or less; 35.6 percent had been members for two years and 21.2 percent had been members for three years, or since the Network had been founded.

Membership figures supplied by the organization's membership committee indicated that the membership had grown substantially in this three year span from 152 members in 1979-1980 to 312 members the next year and 451 members in the third year (1981-1982) when this study was conducted. The WPMN had become the largest women's network group in the Pacific Northwest, according to the membership chair.

Most of the 451 members were not very actively involved in the organization during the 1981-1982 membership year when the study was conducted. Just 22.2 percent of the membership indicated a medium to high level of involvement with the Women's Network through
their attendance at Network events or volunteering to assist with committees or other tasks. This finding may not seem at all surprising when one notes that 48.9 percent of the women indicated they had given zero years of volunteer time to any organization or cause during the years they have been employed. Also 40 percent were working mothers with dependent children, a circumstance which presented some obvious demands on their time outside of working hours. Recent studies also indicate that employed women—with children or not—spend at least twenty-six hours a week on household work (National Commission on Working Women, 1979).

Of the 22.2 percent who reported a medium to high level of involvement with the network, the findings showed a positive relationship between level of involvement in the WPMN with positive career effects. A similar positive correlation was demonstrated between degree of involvement with social or personal effects. These results appear in Tables 4-22 and 4-23. Inspection of the tables also shows the greater the involvement the more likely there was help in career development and personal development.

In reporting whether or not their involvement with the WPMN had helped their career 35.6 percent of the
total population answered "yes" and 64.4 percent said "no".

Results also showed that a majority of the WPMN (64.4 percent) felt that their involvement in WPMN activities had helped their personal development.

TABLE 4-22
CROSS-TABULATION
DEGREE OF INVOLVEMENT WITH NETWORK BY INVOLVEMENT HELPED CAREER DEVELOPMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Involvement</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LOW (62.2%)</td>
<td>0=13 (23.2%)</td>
<td>0=43 (76.8%)</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E=19.9</td>
<td>E=36.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\chi^2=2.39$</td>
<td>$\chi^2=1.32$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MED. LOW (15.6%)</td>
<td>0=5 (35.7%)</td>
<td>0=9 (64.3%)</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E=4.98</td>
<td>E=9.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\chi^2=.00$</td>
<td>$\chi^2=12.88$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDIUM TO HIGH</td>
<td>0=14 (70.0%)</td>
<td>0=6 (30.0%)</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E=7.12</td>
<td>E=12.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\chi^2=6.65$</td>
<td>$\chi^2=3.67$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Raw $\chi^2 = 14.03$  df = 2  p < .001

An analysis of the level of involvement and the subjects' responses as to whether or not their involve-
ment had helped their career was conducted using Chi-square procedures. Results shown in Table 4-22 indicated that there was a significant relationship between level of involvement and help in their career.

**TABLE 4-23**

**CROSS-TABULATION**

**DEGREE OF INVOLVEMENT WITH NETWORK BY INVOLVEMENT HELPED PERSONAL DEVELOPMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Involvement</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LOW (62.2%)</td>
<td>0=30</td>
<td>0=26</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(53.6%)</td>
<td>(46.4%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E=36.1</td>
<td>E=19.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X2=1.03</td>
<td>X2=2.49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MED. LOW (15.6%)</td>
<td>0=11</td>
<td>0=3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(78.6%)</td>
<td>(21.4%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E=9.0</td>
<td>E=5.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X2=.44</td>
<td>X2=.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDIUM TO HIGH</td>
<td>0=17</td>
<td>0=3</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(85.0%)</td>
<td>(15.0%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E=12.9</td>
<td>E=7.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X2=1.30</td>
<td>X2=2.37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Raw X2 = 8.07 df = 2 p < .05

In order to test whether there was a significant relationship between level of involvement and help in personal development, the Chi-square procedure was used
to analyze the data. It was concluded that there was a significant relationship between the level of involvement and the perception that involvement had helped in the subjects' personal development.

Considering the fact that only 22.2% of the Network members took an active role involving themselves to a medium or high degree in the events and activities offered, it may be difficult to understand (for an outsider) why people continued to belong. Perhaps this phenomenon can be explained by Gail Sheehy's observation: "To have a sense of your self, you must feel part of something larger than yourself". (Sheehy, 1981, p. 364)

As one Network member stated:

"I want to support something that I believe in (a supportive group of women helping women)."

Another comment:

"When I joined the Network I had just left my last job and was unsure as to what I wanted to become. I did not use the Network as a source of job ideas, but as a source of support. It helped me to maintain my image of myself as a professional woman--even though unemployed. This support was very valuable to me." (former marketing manager turned stock broker)

She described her level of involvement with the network as "medium"; her main reason for joining was increased business and professional contacts with fellowship/social contacts a second reason.
Another member with a high involvement level commented:

"I work alone in my office. The Network provides a balance to that. And it keeps skills sharp in quiet business times. Helps in expanding contacts too. Allows skills and program practice with minimum risk."

She also stated that the Network has assisted in her personal development because it "Renews self-confidence in down times. Provides a personal support system, sharing information and feelings."

Another enthusiastic member with a "medium level of involvement" stated:

"I think that the leadership has done a fine job. I know personal friends who were facing the end of their jobs and careers and who were revitalized through the Women's Network. I've also seen other women at the Network who have entered traditionally male-oriented jobs and who have been an inspiration to others and to the whole community."

And another comment:

"I've used the mailing list to meet some marketing objectives. And every once in a while I'll call someone in the Network who can give me the name of someone to use in marketing, or who will endorse or not endorse a company."

A recent MBA graduate attributed her new job directly to a contact she made through the Network. Through conversation at a Network dinner she found a contact for an
MBA internship. The experience gained in that on-the-job training was crucial experience for the job she managed to get as a financial systems analyst after graduation. She felt the internship made the difference in her being hired in a very competitive job market in late 1980.

A nursing administrator who indicated her involvement with the Network was low still indicated that in terms of developing personal skills and knowledge (her main reason for joining) her experiences had been "very valuable". She judged the emotional support she received as "very valuable" as well. She felt her involvement had assisted in her career "by relating to other professionals in the same field" and to her personal development "by learning new negotiating skills".

A staff accountant in a public accounting firm who indicated a low level of network involvement commented:

"I have enjoyed the meetings--they are very interesting. . . . It (the Network) has served as a booster in terms of enthusiasm and confidence-building."

An assistant controller with a low level of involvement agreed that the Network had helped her personal development:

"I have picked up a few role models from it that I admire."
Another supervising analyst with a consulting firm, who indicated she had not really gotten too involved with the Network because she had been working in another city said:

"Just to know other women are out there doing the same thing I am is encouraging. It is so gratifying to see a large group of other women in business suits!"

These personal comments were typical of the positive effects of network membership regardless of whether involvement was low or high. No evidence of negative effects were reported in the study.

When the degree of network involvement was analyzed by number of years as a network member, using the Chi-square procedure it was found that there was a significant relationship between these two variables. An examination of Table 4-24 shows that none of the first year members were involved more than minimally in the WPMN. One-fourth of the group of two-year members were involved to a medium to high degree and more than 63 percent of those who had been members for all three membership years were involved at a medium to high degree level. The longer women remained as members, the more likely they were to be more involved in network activities.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>0=39</td>
<td>0=24</td>
<td>0=7</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E=30.3</td>
<td>E=24.9</td>
<td>E=14.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>X²=2.49</td>
<td>X²=.0325</td>
<td>X²=4.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>0=0</td>
<td>0=8</td>
<td>0=12</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E=8.67</td>
<td>E=7.11</td>
<td>E=4.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>X²=8.67</td>
<td>X²=.11</td>
<td>X²=14.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

X² = 29.9  df = 2  p < .001
### TABLE 4-25

**DEGREE OF INVOLVEMENT BY JOINED FOR JOB LEADS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Valuable or Valuable</th>
<th>Not Valuable</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low</strong></td>
<td>0=8</td>
<td>0=30</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or</td>
<td>E=11.18</td>
<td>E=26.82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medium</strong></td>
<td>X$^2$=.90</td>
<td>X$^2$=.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medium</strong></td>
<td>0=7</td>
<td>0=6</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to</td>
<td>E=3.82</td>
<td>E=9.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High</strong></td>
<td>X$^2$=2.65</td>
<td>X$^2$=1.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

X$^2$=5.01  df = 1  \( p < .05 \)
Using the Chi-square procedure the degree of network involvement was compared to how valuable network experiences had been for that portion of the population who joined the network hoping to gain job leads. It was concluded that there was a significant relationship between level of involvement and value of experiences in gaining job leads.

**Research Question 5**

5. How do the job-finding behaviors of this group of women compare to other populations described in previous research studies?

Conspicuous in its absence from most of the existing body of research on job-finding is information on the job-finding behaviors of women, and particularly women managers and professionals. Therefore, in planning the present study I was interested in collecting this information to observe whether there were significant differences between this population of women, who by and large held managerial and professional positions, and the population in other studies.

Of particular interest was the research of Granovetter (1974) on job-finding behaviors because he contended that one can pursue a systematic analysis of what is usually termed "luck" in job-finding (having the
right personal contact in the right place at the right time) by developing and applying ideas about social structure (p. viii).

In explaining why he chose not to include women in his research on job-finding behaviors of professional, technical and managerial workers (PTM's), Granovetter (1974) stated that because female career patterns are sufficiently different from those of males that a separate study would be necessary to do justice to them (p. 7). Granovetter did not include any citations to support this opinion. Presumably he based his assumption on his own personal observation since little or no empirical data was available regarding the job-finding behavior of women PTM. He cited only one study of female white collar clerical workers (Schultz, 1962) which showed that the group relied more on informal methods than any other kind, but used formal means more often than blue-collar workers of either sex.

In research on job-finding it has been common practice to divide methods of finding jobs into "formal" and "informal" categories. "Formal" means referred to commercial and public employment agencies and advertisements. "Informal" methods included the use of personal contacts of any kind, and also direct application to an employer (Granovetter, 1974, p.5).
Previous studies of blue-collar workers (Sheppard and Belitzky, 1966; De Schweinitz, 1932; Reynolds, 1951; and Reid, 1972) found that the majority of these workers found jobs through informal contacts rather than formal sources. In a study of white-collar, two-year college graduates, Allen and Keavney (1980) found the majority gained jobs through formal sources.

For purposes of analysis, that portion of the total WPMN population (n=90) which did not fall into the job-finding categories of "informal" and "formal" means were removed from the sample. That portion of the total sample eliminated from the sub-sample included those who were self-employed, promoted in the same department, or created the job. The remaining group (n=53) then provided parallels for comparison to Granovetter's findings.

Granovetter reported that 56.1 percent had found their present job through personal contact and 18.8 percent through direct application. In the WPMN study 54.7 percent found their present job through personal contact and 20.7 percent applied direct.

Results showed that 42.1 percent of the WPMN population found their last job through personal contacts; and 31.2 percent found the job before that through the same means.
The percentages of this same sub-sample of the WPMN population who applied directly to the company or organization were reported as follows: 24.6 percent applied direct for their last job; and 34.4 percent for the job before that.

As the women gained more job experience they used personal contacts more and other means less, as shown in Table 4-26.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Personal Contact</th>
<th>Direct Application</th>
<th>Formal Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 Present Job</td>
<td>54.7</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>24.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Last Job</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Job before that</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>34.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Granovetter (1974) found that the majority of the PTM's in his study (56.1 percent) gained their jobs through personal contact. Another 18.8 percent used direct application. But he went beyond previous studies
and linked higher earnings and more status to the jobs found through personal contacts or "friends of friends". One important bias that should be noted regarding Granovetter's research is that he used only individuals who had changed jobs within the past five years, rather than a general random sample of PTM workers (1974, p. 9). He indicated he adopted this strategy to facilitate memory of mobility experience, and that members of a general sample might show a somewhat different picture of the job-finding process.

No such limits were introduced in sampling the WPMN population. In fact, the WPMN population included not only those who may not have changed jobs within the past five years, but some women who may not have changed jobs as many as three times during their total work life. "Formal" and "informal" job-finding sources utilized by the WPMN group were reported as they related to their current job, previous job and the job before that. These figures are reported in Tables 4-27, 4-28 and 4-29.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>ABS. FREQ.</th>
<th>REL. FREQ. (PCT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Saw ad in newspaper</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Agency/recruiter</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asked a friend who told me about the job</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend who knew I was looking told me about the job</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend who didn't know whether I was looking contacted me</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Someone I didn't know contacted me</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied directly</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Became self-employed</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoted in same dept.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Created it then hired</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>90</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 4-28

**HOW DID YOU FIND OUT ABOUT YOUR LAST JOB?**
*(the job prior to your current job)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>ABS. FREQ.</th>
<th>REL. FREQ. (PCT)</th>
<th>ADJ. FREQ. (PCT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Saw ad in newspaper</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Agency</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asked a friend who told me about the job</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend who knew I was looking told me about the job</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend who didn't know whether I was looking contacted me</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Someone I didn't know contacted me</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied directly</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Became self-employed</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoted in same dept.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Created it then hired</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>MISSING</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL** 90   100.0   100.0
### TABLE 4-29
HOW DID YOU FIND OUT ABOUT THE JOB BEFORE THAT?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>ABS. FREQ.</th>
<th>REL. FREQ. (PCT)</th>
<th>ADJ. FREQ. (PCT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Saw ad in newspaper</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Agency</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asked a friend who told me about the job</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend who knew I was looking told me about the job</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend who didn't know whether I was looking contacted me</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Someone I didn't know contacted me</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied directly</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>26.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Became self-employed</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoted in same dept.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Created it then hired</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>MISSING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>90</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Question 6

6. Does diffusion theory permit an explanation of differential effects of networking?

Research studies on diffusion (Boissevain, 1974; Granovetter, 1974; Mayer, 1963) have found that more person-to-person contacts and communications transactions can be made through weak or loose ties (friends of friends or acquaintances) than through strong ties (close friends or relatives), because the weaker second order of contacts tends to be dispersed through more, and wider, social networks.

Applying this concept of diffusion theory suggests an acceptable explanation for the differential career effects of the networking process addressed in Research Question 4. Findings in the present WPMN study demonstrated a positive correlation between higher network involvement and a perception that "involvement helped my career". Since higher (more intense) involvement assumes a greater time commitment devoted to network activities, it may also be assumed that time spent in these activities provided the higher-involved individual with a greater number of networking contacts for building loose ties, thus expanding the individual's social network and providing more information that proved of value in
forging career opportunities. Further, the finding that higher level of involvement in a dispersed social network (WPMN) was related significantly to job-finding provided more evidence in support of the diffusion concept.

Boissevain (1974) found that network density and size are an index of the potential flow of information. The larger and less dense the network, the greater the possible flow of information. Diffusion theory thus suggests that the broader the network, the more likely there would be career effects. Thus a horizontal network, such as the WPMN, which brought together women from diverse backgrounds, and from a variety of work settings, would be less dense and more likely to provide career effects than a narrower vertical network.

Related to this concept is the finding that work settings and formal organizations are two common sources of weak, or loose, ties (Granovetter, 1973). These findings appear to provide sufficient evidence to suggest that the theoretical framework of diffusion provides a useful basis for testing the research questions related to networking and would permit an explanation of differing effects of networking. Of course more detailed network data, and an additional study would be required to do more than speculate on this issue, but a theoretical framework has, at least, been suggested.
Similarly, diffusion was the theoretical concept Granovetter (1974) used to explain the importance of informal contacts (friends, and friends of friends) in successful job-finding. Results of the present study related to the job-finding behaviors of the WPMN population were very close those of Granovetter (1974) and therefore, provide added support and verification to his research.
Chapter 5

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, DISCUSSION
AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This final chapter contains a summary of the research procedures utilized to analyze the data and draws conclusions from the findings. An effort was made to clearly distinguish between conclusions drawn from the data and implications which go beyond the findings.

In addition, the chapter begins with a brief summary description of the Women's Professional and Managerial Network (WPMN) population drawn from the detailed material presented in the previous chapter and provides a comparison of this network population to both the Incom Network researched by Odendahl (1982) and Business and Professional Women (BPW) network groups.

Chapter 5 concludes with recommendations for further research arising from the data.

Description of the WPMN Membership

The profile that emerges of the Women's Professional and Managerial Network (WPMN) membership is one of a very
highly educated group (76.7 percent had a college degree; 44.4 percent held a graduate degree), working in diverse settings (36 different occupational titles in 41 different types of businesses and professions) with a strong representation (57.8 percent) of managers. The sample was predominantly Caucasian (93.3 percent and a majority (53.3 percent) were married and had children (58.9 percent).

The group ranged in age from 21 to more than 61 with the greatest concentration (40.0 percent) in the 31 to 40 range. Fully 69.7 percent earned more than $20,000, and 43.8 percent earned more than $30,000 in 1982.

Compared to the typical female worker described in the 1980 census, they were much better educated with far-above-average earnings.

Comparison of WPMN to Incom and BPW

The WPMN population was closely parallel to the Incom Network researched by Odendahl (1982) in age: Both groups had a majority of members in the 31 to 40 age range, and were considerably younger than the BPW membership which averaged over age 50 with almost 15 percent beyond age 70.

However, the WPMN membership was generally more highly educated than either Incom or Business and
Professional Women (BPW) members and held a greater number of managerial and professional positions than either the Incom or BPW populations.

Where a majority of Incom network members aspired to be earning $20,000 within five years (Odendahl, 1982), the majority of the WPMN group was already earning above that range in 1982 and 52.3 percent of the WPMN membership aspired to ranges of $40,000 to more than $50,000 within five years. In 1982 fully 69.7 percent of the WPMN earned more than $20,000 and 43.8 percent earned more than $30,000. No actual earnings of Incom members were reported in the Incom study for comparison. Reported annual earnings of a majority of BPW members was less than $12,000 in 1979 (Odendahl and Smith 1979).

A majority of both WPMN and BPW members were married; in contrast, 57 percent of the Incom group were not married. A higher percentage of BPW members had children (64 percent), but these were largely grown and on their own. Among WPMN members 58.9 percent had children, and 40 percent of these were dependent children. Only 23.2 percent of the Incom group had dependent children.

The labels "horizontal" and "vertical" have been used throughout the study to distinguish the structure of the WPMN and the Incom network described by Odendahl (1982) in her ethnography. The BPW organization also could be
described as a horizontal network, with members scattered in clubs in cities and towns throughout the entire United States. Incom members (N=353) worked at various job levels within one large financial institution at its corporate headquarters. WPMN members (N=451) attracted members from throughout Western Washington State with the greatest concentration in metropolitan Seattle. The BPW sample (N=3,500) was representative of a total membership of 180,000 women, largely employed in education, accounting and clerical positions. (Odendahl and Smith, 1979).

Both Incom and WPMN were dedicated to assisting women in reaching their career goals, primarily through a communications process called "networking". Odendahl (1982) described the process:

"At the core of the group was the goal of making contact with other people, of "networking". Women were meeting other company women and men; supporting each other, talking about their problems and possible solutions; and most importantly exchanging information . . . a strategy for improving career opportunities had emerged" (p. 119-120).

The stated goal of BPW in its more than fifty-year history has been to improve the status of working women. (Odendahl and Smith, 1979).

Findings indicated the WPMN group was more highly motivated to engage in "networking" than Incom members
(77.8 percent of the WPMN population contrasted with a reported 47 percent of the Incom group actively made contacts to "network"). Because the WPMN group was much more active in networking it could be suggested that this was related to the higher earnings of WPMN members. An analysis of the data of those who networked actively and those who did not failed to show any significant correlation between networking activity and higher earnings. However, as has been mentioned, these are truncated data so a variance is less likely to be significant.

Although the WPMN and BPW organizations had established written by-laws and each had an elected board of directors, the Incom Network had not formalized its procedures. Both WPMN and BPW had established annual membership dues, while no mention was made of a specific financial commitment on the part of Incom members. In all three groups affiliation as a member was open to anyone who expressed a wish to join.

High membership turn-over was also something the three groups had in common. Over 43 percent of BPW members had been in BPW less than five years; the Incom group reported 18.3 percent had been members from the beginning of the organization: 34.4 percent over two years; 31.2 percent one to two years and 16.1 percent less than one year. In the WPMN population 21.1 percent
had been members for all three membership years, or from the beginning of the organization; 35.6 percent for two years and 43.3 percent for one year or less. The dramatic difference between the groups was in the membership growth figures.

In its three membership years the WPMN showed a doubling of membership from the first to the second year and more than 40 percent growth during 1981-1982. Odendahl (1982) reported that the Incom network was most vital and fast-growing in its formative period in late 1977, and attendance at events had dropped to around 50 persons by 1981. Odendahl attributed this waning of interest in the Incom network partly to a change in leadership, and to the perception that the Incom group had become less welcoming of new members. Although it was reported that total BPW membership had declined somewhat during the 1970's, there were no exact numerical comparisons provided in the Odendahl and Smith (1979) study.

All three organizations had stated goals of helping women's career development. Yet only 12.2 percent of the WPMN members and 9.2 percent of BPW members indicated that personal career development was their main reason for joining. A majority of WPMN members and BPW members chose increased business contacts as their main reason
for joining the group. For comparison purposes it is unfortunate that Odendahl (1982) did not include an answer to this question in her reported findings, although the question as used in the present study was drawn from her questionnaire.

Because Odendahl concluded that there was no evidence that the Incom network promoted the career advancement of a majority of its members, and generalized that conclusion to all women's networks, it would have been interesting to have this piece of information for comparison purposes. Also, it should be remembered that Odendahl received only a 27 percent return rate on her questionnaire, a fact which may have skewed results. Odendahl's conclusion was based on her finding that 38.7 percent of Incom members felt that their involvement in the network had helped their careers. My interest in this point is that if the Incom group's main reason for joining was simply increased business contacts, and not primarily job leads, as was the case with WPMN and BPW, then it might be logical to assume that their expectation would have been met. The work of several researchers in exploring and testing expectancy theory (Atkinson, 1964; Vroom, 1964; Porter and Lawlor, 1968) leads me to suggest that although career development and implied upward mobility may generally have been accepted as the Incom
network's main goal, it may not have been primarily what the majority of members sought and expected.

In response to the same question regarding whether their membership had helped their career development, 35.6 percent of the WPMN population overall stated that membership had helped their career development. Odendahl did not seek to relate degree of involvement in the network to help in career development as was done in the present study. In the WPMN population research findings there was a significant relationship between high involvement and evidence of help in career development. The more involved with the network the WPMN were, the more they perceived that the network had helped their careers.

A number of other questions verified the value of "networking" to members of both Incom and WPMN. An overwhelming majority found their network experiences valuable for information exchange, and a strong majority valued their experiences in gaining personal skills and knowledge, more contacts, friendship and support. BPW members, a generally older group, and presumably more established in their careers, found more satisfaction in increased social contacts than increased business and professional contacts.

The expressed level of job satisfaction in all three
groups was high: BPW members reported that 90 percent were satisfied with their jobs; Incom network reported 76.9 percent were satisfied or very satisfied with their work and 73.4 percent of the WPMN indicated they were satisfied.

Because all the groups evidenced such a high level of job satisfaction, it therefore may not seem surprising that they did not report finding a high percentage of job leads through networking. It would appear they were not actively seeking job leads. The high percentage of the WPMN members who chose the response "no opinion" on the value of the network in providing job leads is further verification of the orientation of this group toward different needs.

CONCLUSIONS AND DISCUSSION

When this research was begun in 1982 there was a widespread but largely untested assumption among employed women that women's networks and networking could be instrumental in boosting the careers of women. Fueled by enthusiastic books and articles in the popular press (Wilson, 1977; Kleiman, 1980; Welch, 1980; Stern, 1981), the networking idea had spread spontaneously resulting in the formation of women's networks in cities and towns from coast to coast.
This study of a horizontal women's network focused on a representative group in a cross-section of mostly managerial and professional occupations. I attempted to build a profile of women who chose to affiliate with a women's network, to investigate what women perceived as possible benefits of network affiliation; and, using diffusion theory, to determine whether the networking process contributed to the career development of the women involved. Because this study represents the first research attempt to gather systematic data about a horizontal women's network, a detailed demographic picture has been documented so that future researchers may make comparisons.

Odendahl (1982) found that such networks were unsuccessful, largely because they overlooked the structural constraints in organizations which impeded women's career advancement. Because her research was limited to a vertical network which existed within one hierarchical financial institution, and because her findings were based on a 27 percent questionnaire return rate, I questioned whether her negative finding could be generalized to other networks which were structurally different. Odendahl's sample did not include women entrepreneurs, women in industry, women in the non-profit sector or women in the professions. All these varied
occupational groupings were represented in the WPMN population in the present study.

The first Research Question provided a demographic profile of women's network members (such as age, income, education, job category, etcetera) and a descriptive profile (job, satisfaction, future occupational and personal goals). Much of these findings have been reviewed in the previous section, a Description of the WPMN Membership. The most significant findings related to Question 1 were that there was no direct correlation between level of education and level of income or age and income. There was a significant relationship between job satisfaction and income.

The second Research Question compared the WPMN group to the total population of employed women as described in the 1980 census. It was found that the WPMN population was significantly better educated, better paid and held a much higher number of professional and managerial positions than the average among employed women described in the 1980 census.

The third Research Question asked what the WPMN population perceived as personal and career-related benefits of affiliating with a women's network. It was found that the majority (67.8 percent) joined the WPMN primarily to gain increased business and professional contacts. For
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12.2 percent of the WPMN population personal career development was chosen as the main reason for joining. The most surprising finding was that 11.1 percent had joined for other reasons, none of which was directly related to the individual's career mobility. These reasons were in some cases altruistic, demonstrating support of the idea of networking, or of providing help for other women. Friendship and social contacts were of first importance to 4.4 percent of the population, while an even smaller percentage (3.3 percent) chose the response "developing personal skills and knowledge."

The women's reasons for joining the WPMN provided some interesting information when related to the findings on Research Question 4 which sought personal or career effects of networking, and when related to Odendahl's finding that women's networks do not contribute to the career development of a majority of their members. If only 12.2 percent of the WPMN members were intent on using their network experience primarily and directly toward their career development one might speculate that this may also have been the case with the Incom network. Although the content of the question was derived from Odendahl's questionnaire, Odendahl did not report the percentages for this response in her findings. The findings concerning the women's evaluations of their network
experiences were positive in all aspects.

Research Question 4 sought evidence of personal or career effects (both positive and negative) to women's career paths related to the level of their involvement in a women's network. The findings indicated a direct relationship between the degree of involvement with the network and evidence that the involvement helped the individual's career. The higher the involvement, the higher the percentage of a "yes" response. The same direct relationship was evidenced in degree of involvement with network by "involvement helped personal development". This is the most significant finding related to this question in the study, and supports the conclusion that networking and involvement in a women's network can provide both positive career development and personal development for the women involved. Further, higher involvement also was significantly related to help in job-finding.

The fact that fully 35.6 percent of the WPMN population reported that involvement helped their careers and a majority (64.4 percent) reported that involvement had helped their personal development would be significant in and of itself; however, the added finding that the higher the degree of the involvement,—the greater the evidence of assistance to the women's careers provides support to
the concept of diffusion theory.

These are truncated data, of course, representing an exceptional population of highly ambitious, well-educated women, many of whom were already well-established in their careers, but this does not detract from the finding that developing and using informal contacts in a horizontal women's network can benefit those involved.

The finding that there was a high turnover in WPMN membership from year to year provides some basis for speculation. The WPMN trend was also evidenced in both the Incom network and in the BPW membership study. It may be speculated that members who dropped out had met their needs, gained what they sought from their membership and moved on. It may also have been that these members did not find networking to their liking and were not comfortable affiliating with a women's network. Geographical mobility probably accounted for a substantial percentage of the turnover (U.S. census figures have shown that on the average 20 percent of the U.S. population moves every year.)

There were no findings of negative effects of networking such as demotions, loss of job or loss of opportunities related to women's affiliation with the WPMN.

The fifth Research Question investigated the job-finding behaviors of the population of women PTM workers.
Findings showed that the majority (54.7 percent) had found their current position through personal contacts, a form of networking, and that this informal method of job-finding was as effective for women PTM's as it was for men PTM's in previous studies, such as Granovetter (1974).

Further, it should be observed that although Granovetter found that 56.1 percent of his sample found jobs through personal contacts, he had limited his population of male PTM's to those who had changed jobs within the last five years. Since no such time limit was used in the present study, the finding that 54.7 percent of the population of women found their present job through personal contacts may be an even stronger result.

The use of personal contacts increased as the women gained more job experience. Presumably they were successfully building diffused social networks with sufficient weak ties to provide linkages to an ever-widening network of others in their fields. This suggests that one of the basic tenets of networking, to make oneself visible enough to be noticed, was demonstrated here successfully as well.

Only in two fields (accounting and para-legal positions) was there a consistent continued pattern of using formal means to secure jobs. This was apparently
the usually accepted procedure peculiar to these two fields of work.

Research Question 6 asked whether diffusion theory permits an explanation of differential career effects of networking. Several researchers including Mayer (1963), Boissevain (1974) and Granovetter (1974) have presented findings from diffusion studies in social network analysis that are consistent with this explanation.

It was felt that the low density and large size of the horizontal women's network provided a setting that increased the potential flow of information through networking contacts (weak ties). It was thus concluded that the theoretical framework of diffusion does permit a satisfactory explanation of the differing effects of networking found in the present study.

Recommendations for Further Research

As this study was conducted, a number of questions emerged that were of interest but that can only be answered and evaluated by further research.

The finding that two-thirds of the WPMN membership did not continue from one year to the next brings forth the question: Were the needs of this group met? Did they gain what they had hoped to gain and move on to other interests, or did they drop out because they were disap-
pointed and frustrated? A follow-up study of this group could prove of value.

Further research needs to probe whether women's networks can and do have negative effects on women's careers. Although no data appeared in the present research to suggest possible negative career consequences, perhaps an additional set of questions might elicit that information.

It is also interesting to speculate whether a three-year span of existence—the length of time since the founding of the WPMN—is sufficient to effectively measure possible benefits or negative effects of affiliating with a women's network. Would a longitudinal study of the present WPMN population yield very different results? Certainly some type of longitudinal study should be conducted to probe the generalizability of the findings of the present study to other networks.
REFERENCES

Allen, R. E. and Keaveny, T. J.

Arbose, J. R.

Argyris, Chris

Astin, Helen S.

Atkinson, J. W.

Attneave, Carolyn L.

Bandura, Albert

Barks, J.
Barnett, Rosalind C., and Baruch, Grace K.  

Bickerstaffe, G.  

Boissevain, Jeremy  

Bott, Elizabeth  

Bouchard, Thomas J.  

Breme, F. J. and Corriel, I. W.  

Briscoe, A and Pfafflin, S., eds.  

Brown, J. R.  
Brown, R. S., Moon, M., Zoloth, B.S.

Brown, Thomas E.

Bryant, A. L.

Burns, Ruth Ann

Campbell, D. and Stanley, J.

Caplow, Theodore

Carden, Maren

Cassara, Beverly B.

Cassell, Joan
Chafe, William

Churgin, Jonah R.

Col, Jeanne M.

Cook, Karen S., and Emerson, Richard M.

Crites, J. O.

Crites, J. O.

Daniels, Arlene Kaplan

Daniels, Arlene Kaplan
Deegan, Mary Jo

DeSchweinetz, Dorothea

Drucker, Peter F.

Evans, Sara

Farber, Bernard, ed,

Fenn, Margaret

Finlayson, Angela

Fischer, Mary A.

Fitt, L. W., and Newton, D. A.
Flynn, W. R., and Letzinger, J. U.

Freedman, Estelle

Fritz, Leah

Fullerton, G.

Gerstenberger, D.

Ginzberg, Eli and Yohalem, Alice M. eds.

Ginzberg, Eli

Gosden, P. H.

Graham, Ellen, ed.
125

Granovetter, M. S.


Group for the Advancement of Psychiatry (GAP)

Gutek, Barbara A., ed.

Gutek, B., Nakamura, C. and Nieva, V.

Hall, Douglas T.


Harragan, Betty

Hay, C. D.
"Women in Management: The Obstacles and Opportunities They Face," Personnel Administrator, Vol. 25, No. 4, April 1980, p. 31-39.
Hennig, Margaret
"Career Development for Women Executives"

Hennig, Margaret and Jardin, Anne
"Women Executives in the Old-Boy Network,"


Higginson, M.V., and Quick, T.L.
"Needed: Career Counseling for Women Subordinates,"

Homall, G.
The Motivation to be Promoted among Non-exempt Employees: An Expectancy Theory Approach,

Horner, M. S.

Kadushin, C.

Kahn, Wolfe, et al

Kanter, Rosabeth
Kapferer, B.

Katz, Fred E.

Kaufman, Debra

Kellen, Konrad

Kleiman, Carole

Kreps, Juanita M.

Kundisn, Ruth B., ed.

Lambert, D. M. and Lawton, S. L.

Larwood, L., and Kaplan, M.
Maier, Norman,  
"Assets and Liabilities in Group Problem Solving:  
The need for an integrative function,"  
*Psychological Review*, Vol. 74, Number 4, July 1967,  
p. 239-249.

Marciano, T. D.  
"Socialization and Women at Work,"  
*National Forum: Phi Kappa Phi Journal*, Vol. 61, No. 4, Fall, 1981,  
p. 24-25.

Mayer, Philip  
*Townsmen or Tribesmen: Conservatism and the Process of Urbanization in a South African City*,  

McNally, Fiona,  
*Women for Hire; A study of the female office worker*,  

Mitchell, Roger E. and Trickett, Edison J.  
Task force report: social networks as mediators of social support: an analysis of the effects and determinants of social networks  
*Community Mental Health Journal*, 16, 1, (Spring 1980), p. 27-44.

National Committe on Working Women report  

"Women's Work: Undervalued, Underpaid,"  

Nemec, M. M.  
"Networking: Here's How at Equitable,"  

"Networking: Getting Past the Cliches"  
*National Business Woman Magazine* Jan/Feb., 1981,  
p. 12 and 13.
"Networking on the Job,"

Norgaard, C. T.
"Problems and Perspectives of Female Managers,"

Odendahl, Terry

Orlov, D.

Ortiz, Flora Ida, and Covell, Janice

Orzack, Louis

Osipow, S. H.,

Perry, B. L.

Porter, L. W. and Lawler, E. E.
Powell, G. N.

Prediger, Dale J.

Prendergast, Shirley

Reid, G. L.

Rokeach, Milton

Ross, A. and Calderwood, A.

Rothstein, W. G.

Ryan, Mary P.

Schein, Edgar


Schneider, L. R. and Stevens, N. D.

Schroeder, H., Driver, M. and Streufert, S.

Scott, Anne Firor

Sewell and Hauser
Shalala, Donna

Shepard, W. and Hess, D.

Sheppard, H. L. and Belitsky, A. H.

Speck, Ross and Atteave, Carolyn

Stern, Barbara,

Stevens, Nancy

Taylor, Charlotte

Terkel, Studs

Tittle, C. K. and Zytkowski, D. G. eds.
Toffler, Alvin

Vroom, V. H.

Warr, Peter and Wall, Toby

Warren, Donald I.

Welch, Mary Scott


White, P.

Whiteley, J. and Resnikoff, A., eds,

Wilson, Jane
Yokopenic, P., Bourque, L. and Brogan, D.  

Young, M. and Willmott, P.  

Zytowski, Donald  
APPENDIX A

COVER LETTER AND QUESTIONNAIRE
Dear Member:

The career patterns and profiles of women who have become members of a women's network are of interest to researchers in the field of education. As a doctoral student at the University of Washington, I am now conducting interviews of these individuals to examine the phenomenon of "networking".

Your name has been selected at random from among members of the Women's Professional & Managerial Network.* We hope that you will contribute your perceptions and experiences to this study.

Enclosed is a consent for research form, which I hope you will sign and return promptly.

Within the next ten days we will try to reach you by telephone to arrange a time to conduct a telephone interview to complete the enclosed questionnaire (which should not take more than twenty minutes).

Your replies will be considered strictly confidential and will be reported in aggregate, without the use of names, either of persons or firms. No individual will be identifiable in the research findings as they are reported. The intent of the research is to look at the concept of "networking".

I look forward to discussing these matters with you and thank you in advance for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

JEAN DONOHUE

*membership year 1981-1982

enc
CONSENT FOR RESEARCH

I give my permission for Jean Donohue to use my responses to the questionnaire for research purposes only. Only persons involved in scoring, programming and evaluating the results will be permitted to view this material. All information will be kept in a locked file in Professor W. S. Schill's office (M215 Miller Hall) until it is coded for analysis and it will then be destroyed.

Signed: _________________________

Date: _________________________
WOMEN'S PROFESSIONAL AND MANAGERIAL NETWORK QUESTIONNAIRE

Please take a few moments to look through this questionnaire. The information you provide will be treated in strictest confidence as part of a research project. We hope you will want to answer the questionnaire completely when you are contacted for a telephone interview, as incomplete data will affect the results. However, if there are questions you would rather not answer, feel free to omit them.

Thank you for taking time to read this information.

1. How long have you belonged to the Women's Professional & Managerial Network (or Women's Network)?
   - 1 Year or less: 1
   - 2 Years: 2
   - 3 Years: 3

2. How did you first hear about the Women’s Network?
   - From a news article: 1
   - From a co-worker: 2
   - From your boss: 3
   - From a friend: 4
   - From an invitation in mail to Celebrity Series dinner event: 5
   - From an advertisement: 6
   - Other, please explain: 

3. Why did you join the Women’s Network? (Check all that apply)
   - Increased business/professional contacts: 1
   - Personal career development: 2
   - Fellowship/social contacts: 3
   - Developing personal skills and knowledge: 4
   - Other (please explain): 5

4. Of all the reasons stated above, what was your main reason for joining?
   - (Circle one of these choices) 1
   - 2
   - 3
   - 4
   - 5
HOW VALUABLE HAVE YOUR EXPERIENCES WITH THE WOMEN'S NETWORK BEEN?  
(please circle one answer for each item)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Valuable</th>
<th>Somewhat Valuable</th>
<th>Not Valuable</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. Contacts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Job leads</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Increased business</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Friendship</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Information exchange</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. General career development</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Support</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Developing personal skills and knowledge</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Small group meetings (i.e. investors, managers)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Newsletter</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. What is your own definition of "networking"?

16. Have you ever had an "official" function within the Women's Network, for example, member of a committee, or some other responsibility?  
   YES 1   NO 2

   If yes, please list function:

17. Do you feel your involvement with the Women's Network has assisted you in your career?  
   YES 1   NO 2

   Please explain:

18. Do you feel your involvement with the Women's Network has assisted you in your personal development?  
   YES 1   NO 2

   Please explain:
19. Do you actively make contacts with others with the goal of networking?

   YES 1  NO 2

20. Do you usually network over:

   Breakfast   1
   Lunch       2
   Dinner      3
   Telephone   4
   Around the office 5
   All of the above 6
   Other, please explain:

21. Do you belong to organizations other than the Women's Network?

   YES 1  NO 2

22. If yes, please check those organizations you belong to:

   Professional group in your field   1
   "In-house" network in your organization   2
   Other network(s)   3
   Community organization   4
   Political organization   5
   Recreational/athletic club   6
   Other   7
   (please describe):

23. How would you describe a role model or mentor:

24. Have you had a role model or mentor?

   YES 1  NO 2

25. How helpful has this role model or mentor been in your career?

   Extremely helpful   1
   Quite helpful   2
   Moderately helpful   3
   Somewhat helpful   4
   Not helpful   5

26. Have you had more than one role model or mentor?

   YES 1  NO 2

27. Can you cite one individual who has had the most positive impact on your career? Please describe how the person helped:
28. Number of years in the workforce (total years of all paid employment)

29. Number of years as a volunteer (total years of unpaid employment)

30. Current position title:__________________________________________
    Type of organization/business____________________________________

31. When did you start your current job? Month____ Year____

32. If you currently have more than one job or position, please list your
    other title(s):
    ______________________________________________________________
    Type of organization/business____________________________________

33. How exactly did you find out about your current job?
   a. I saw an advertisement in a newspaper (or magazine, or trade or technical
      journal)____________
   b. I found out through an employment agency (or "head hunter")_______
   c. I asked a friend, who told me about the job______________________
   d. A friend who knew I was looking for something new contacted me______
   e. A friend who didn't know whether I wanted a new job contacted me______
   f. Someone I didn't know contacted me and said I had been recommended
      for the job________________
   g. I applied directly to the company or organization___________
   h. I became self-employed______
   i. I was promoted in the same department_____
   j. I created the job and convinced them to hire me to do it
   k. Other (please explain):
34. How exactly did you find out about your last job—the one just prior to your current job? (see responses above) ________________

35. And the job before that? ________________
IF YOU FOUND OUT ABOUT THE JOB LISTED IN QUESTION #33 (your current job) THROUGH A FRIEND, PLEASE ANSWER QUESTIONS 36 - 39. OTHERWISE, SKIP TO #40:

36. How did you happen to know this friend?
   a. We went to college together___
   b. We went to high school together____
   c. We grew up in the same neighborhood___
   d. I once worked with him/her___
   e. I once worked under her/him____
   f. Other (please explain):

37. Did your friend put in a good word for you as well as telling you about the job? 
   a. Yes
   b. No
   c. Don't know

38. How did this friend know about the job?
   a. Worked in the same place where the job opened up____
   b. S/he was a business friend of the employer___
   c. S/he was a social friend of the employer___
   d. S/he was the employer____
   e. Other (please explain):

39. At the time when your friend told you about the job, how did you know how to get in touch with each other?
   a. We saw each other pretty often then____
   b. We spoke to each other pretty often then____
   c. We spoke to each other on the phone pretty often then___
   d. We spoke to each other on the phone occasionally then___
   e. We were exchanging letters then____
   f. We were exchanging Christmas (or other holiday) cards then____
   g. We hadn't been in contact recently, but mutual friends put us in touch____
   h. Other (please explain):

NOTE: If you found out about your last job (Q. #34) or the job before that from a friend, please repeat the responses to questions #36 - #39 in the space below:

for LAST JOB: ____________________________

36. ___
37. ___
38. ___
39. ___

for the job BEFORE THAT: ____________________________

36. ___
37. ___
38. ___
39. ___
40. Level of education completed:

- Less than high school 1
- High school 2
- Vocational school 3
- Some college 4
- College degree, B.S. or B.A. 5
- Other degree, please specify:
  - R.N. _ A.A. _ 6
- Advanced degree 7
- Masters Major _ 8
- Doctorate Field _ 9

41. Ethnic group: Black Hispanic Asian American Native American White Other (specify)

42. Age: Under 21 21-25 26-30 31-35 36-40 41-45
- 46-50 51-55 56-60 61+

43. Marital status: Never married 1
- Married 2
- Divorced 3
- Separated 4
- Widowed 5
- Living with partner 6

44. Number of dependent children: Number of children on their own:
- None 0
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5 or more 5
- None 0
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5 or more 5

45. Sex: Female 1 Male 2

46. Which of the following letters best describes your personal income (before taxes) per year?
   a. Under $10,000
   b. $10,000 to $14,999
   c. $15,000 to $19,999
   d. $20,000 to $24,999
   e. $25,000 to $29,999
   f. $30,000 to $34,999
   g. $35,000 to $39,999
   h. $40,000 to $44,999
   i. $45,000 to $49,999
   j. $50,000 or more
47. How many people to you supervise?

None 1
One 2
Two 3
Three 4
Four 5
Five and over 6

48. Relative to your male and female co-workers, how high do you think your own level of career aspiration is?

Way above average 1
Slightly above average 2
Average 3
Slightly below average 4
Way below average 5

49. Relative to your co-workers of the same sex, how high is your own career level of aspiration?

Way above average 1
Slightly above average 2
Average 3
Slightly below average 4
Way below average 5

50. Where do you want to be professionally in five years?

Entry-level management 1
Middle management 2
Senior manage 3
In another career 4
In another company 5
Do not know 6
None of the above, please specify: 7

51. What would you reasonably expect your salary to be in five years? (income)

Under $10,000 1
10,000 to 20,000 2
20,000 to 30,000 3
30,000 to 40,000 4
40,000 to 50,000 5
Over $50,000 6

52. How satisfied are you with your present job?

Very satisfied 1
Satisfied 2
Not satisfied 3

Please explain:
53. When did you receive your last promotion?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 3 months</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 to 6 months</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 to 12 months</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 2 years</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 2 years</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No promotion since you began</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

54. If promoted, did you seek it?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not promoted</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

55. What other goals do you have for yourself beyond your employment considerations for five years hence? (Circle as many as are applicable.)

- Political involvement: 1
- More time to be alone: 2
- Greater family involvement: 3
- Community involvement: 4
- Scholarly pursuits: 5
- Creative endeavors: 6
- Other, please specify: 7

56. Using a scale from 1 to 5 to describe your involvement with the Women's Professional & Managerial Network with 1 representing low and 5 high involvement, please indicate the number that best describes your degree of involvement:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>medium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>high</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

57. Do you have any comments you would like to add to conclude this questionnaire?
APPENDIX B
INCOM NETWORK QUESTIONNAIRE
NETWORKS QUESTIONNAIRE

Please take a few moments to complete this questionnaire. The information you provide will be treated in the strictest confidence as part of the Business and Professional Women's Foundation national research project on "Women in Networks."

This study will result in our first profile of Network membership, as well as analysis of how Networks operates. It will help us to improve our Network, and assist the formation of new networks.

Answer the questions by circling the appropriate number or writing in the blank space. We hope you will want to answer the questionnaire completely, as incomplete data will affect our results. However, if there are questions you would rather not answer, feel free to omit them.

NETWORK

1. How long have you belonged to Network?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 3 months</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 to 6 months</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 to 12 months</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 2 years</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 2 years</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Since it was started</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. How did you first hear about Networks?

- Announcement posted       | 1      |
- News article              | 2      |
- From a co-worker          | 3      |
- From your boss            | 4      |
- From a friend             | 5      |
- Source outside the company| 6      |
- Other, please explain:    | 7      |
3. Why did you join Networks?

4. What is your definition of "networking"?

5. Do you belong to one of Networks' small groups? If yes, what kind of group?

- No ................................................. 1
- Peoples group ................................. 2
- Special interest ............................... 3
- Women's group ............................... 4

6. Approximately, how often do you attend the small group meetings?

- Not a member of a small group.............. 0
- Once a week .................................... 1
- Once every two weeks .......................... 2
- Once every three weeks ........................ 3
- Once a month ................................... 4
- Less than once a month ......................... 5

7. Approximately, how often do you attend the monthly Networks' programs?

- Every month .................................... 1
- Every other month ............................... 2
- Every three months ............................. 3
- Irregularly ....................................... 4
- Almost never ................................... 5
8. Do you read Networks publications? If yes, which ones?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publication</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearinghouse</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networks</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newsclips</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other, please explain:</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. How valuable have your experiences with Networks been? (Circle one answer for each item.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>Very Valuable</th>
<th>Somewhat Valuable</th>
<th>Not Valuable</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small group meetings</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly meetings</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contacts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Awareness</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendship</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Career Development</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Exchange</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Leads</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other, please explain:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20. Have you ever had an "official" function within Networks, for example, facilitation of a small group or member of the steering committee?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If yes, please list function:
21. Have you ever led a monthly program meeting or been a speaker?

Yes ................................................. 1
No ............................................... 2

22. Do you feel your involvement with Networks has assisted you in your career?

Yes ................................................. 1
No ............................................... 2

Please explain:

23. Do you feel your involvement with Networks has assisted you in your personal development?

Yes ................................................. 1
No ............................................... 2

Please explain:

24. Do you actively make contacts with others with the goal of networking?

Yes ................................................. 1
No ............................................... 2

25. Do you have business cards?

Yes ................................................. 1
No ............................................... 2
26. If yes, do you use them regularly?
   Yes ........................................... 1
   No ........................................... 2

27. Do you keep a calendar?
   Yes ........................................... 1
   No ........................................... 2

28. If yes, do you use it regularly?
   Yes ........................................... 1
   No ........................................... 2

29. Do you usually network over:
   Breakfast .................................... 1
   Lunch ........................................ 2
   Dinner ....................................... 3
   Telephone ................................... 4
   Around the office ............................ 5
   All of the above .............................. 6
   Other, please explain: ........................ 7

30. Do you belong to organizations other than Network
   Yes ........................................... 1
   No ........................................... 2

31. If yes, please list those organizations you belong to within the company:

32. Please list any organizations you belong to outside the company:
33. Do you "network" outside

Yes ........................................ 1
No ........................................... 2

Please explain:

ROLE MODELS AND MENTORS

34. How would you describe a role model or mentor?

35. Have you had a role model or mentor?

Yes ........................................... 1
No ............................................. 2

36. If yes, is the person a member of Networks?

Yes ........................................... 1
No ............................................. 2

37. If you currently have a role model or mentor at the time is this person a male or a female?

Do not have a role model .................. 1
Male role model ............................... 2
Female role model ............................ 3

38. How helpful has this role model or mentor been in your career?

Extremely helpful ............................. 1
Quite helpful .................................. 2
Moderately helpful .............................. 3
Somewhat helpful ............................... 4
Not helpful at all .............................. 5
39. If you currently have a role model outside person a male or a female?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role Model Outside Work</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do not have a role model outside of work</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male role model outside of work</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female role model outside of work</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

40. How helpful has this outside role model been to you in your career?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Helpfulness</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extremely helpful</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quite helpful</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately helpful</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat helpful</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not helpful at all</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PERSONAL

41. Age:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21 or under</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 30</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 - 40</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 - 50</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 - 60</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 or over</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

42. Sex:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

43. Marital status:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never married</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

44. Number of children:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Children</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 or more</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
45. Age of youngest child:

   Not applicable, no children ....................  0
   Under 5 .........................................  1
   5 - 10 ...........................................  2
   11 - 15 ..........................................  3
   16 - 21 ..........................................  4
   Over 21 ..........................................  5

46. Level of education completed:

   Less than high school ............................  1
   High school ......................................  2
   Vocational school ................................  3
   Some college ....................................  4
   College degree ..................................  5
   Advanced degree ................................  6

EMPLOYMENT

47. Number of years in the workforce (total of all jobs): __________

48. How many different jobs (even within the same company) have you had?

49. How long have you been an employee at ____________________________

50. How many jobs have you had while at ____________________________

51. Current job title: ____________________________________________

52. What operations area do you work in? ____________________________

53. Salary Grade: ______________________________________________

54. How much do you work?

   Full time ...........................................  1
   Part time ..........................................  2
   Overtime ..........................................  3

55. Sex of immediate supervisor:

   Female ...........................................  1
   Male ..............................................  2

56. If you supervise the work of others, are they mainly female or male?

   Do not supervise others ..........................  1
   Female ...........................................  2
   Male ..............................................  3
57. How many people do you supervise?

None ........................................ 1
One ........................................ 2
Two .......................................... 3
Three ....................................... 4
Four ......................................... 5
Five and over ............................... 6

58. Approximate percentage of men and women at your level and above in your immediate work area:

85% men and 15% women .................. 1
65% men and 35% women .................. 2
50% men and 50% women .................. 3
35% men and 65% women .................. 4
15% men and 85% women .................. 5

59. Who do you talk to most often during the course of a day?

Your peers ................................... 1
Your immediate superior ................... 2
Those above your immediate superior .... 3
People you supervise ...................... 4
Your friends .................................. 5
Other, please explain: ..................... 6

60. Who is most "helpful" to you in terms of networking?

Your peers ................................... 1
Your immediate superior ................... 2
Those above your immediate superior .... 3
People you supervise ...................... 4
Your friends .................................. 5
Other, please explain: ..................... 6

61. Relative to your male and female co-workers, how high do you think your own level of career aspiration is?

Way above average .......................... 1
Slightly above average ..................... 2
Average ....................................... 3
Slightly below average ..................... 4
Way below average .......................... 5
62. Relative to your co-workers of the same sex, how high is your own career level of aspiration?

- Way above average ..................... 1
- Slightly above average .................. 2
- Average .................................. 3
- Slightly below average .................. 4
- Way below average ...................... 5

63. Where do you want to be professionally in five years?

- Entry-level management ................. 1
- Middle management ...................... 2
- Senior management ..................... 3
- In another career ....................... 4
- In another company ..................... 5
- Do not know ................................ 6
- None of the above, please specify: .... 7

64. What would you reasonably expect your salary to be in five years?

- Under $10,000 ........................... 1
- 10,000 to 20,000 ....................... 2
- 20,000 to 30,000 ....................... 3
- 30,000 to 40,000 ....................... 4
- 40,000 to 50,000 ....................... 5
- Over $50,000 ........................... 6

65. How satisfied are you with your present job?

- Very satisfied .......................... 1
- Satisfied ................................. 2
- Not satisfied ............................. 3

Please explain:

66. When did you receive your last promotion?

- Less than 3 months ..................... 1
- 3 to 6 months ........................... 2
- 6 to 12 months .......................... 3
- 1 to 2 years ............................. 4
- Over 2 years ............................. 5
- No promotion since you started ....... 6
67. If promoted, did you seek it?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not promoted</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

68. Did you receive your promotion by using the job posting system?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not promoted</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

69. When did you receive your last lateral transfer?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 3 months</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 to 6 months</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 to 12 months</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 2 years</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 2 years</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not transferred</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

70. If transferred, did you seek it?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not transferred</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

71. Did you use the job posting system?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

72. What other goals do you have for yourself beyond your employment considerations for five years hence? (Circle as many as are applicable.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>political involvement</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more time to be alone</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>greater family involvement</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>community involvement</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scholarly pursuits</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>creative endeavors</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other, please specify:</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
73. How important has Networks been to you personally and what would you like Networks to do in the future?
APPENDIX C

BPW QUESTIONNAIRE
1. Number of years as a BPM member:

- Less than one year: 1
- 1 - 5 years: 2
- 6 - 10 years: 3
- 11 - 20 years: 4
- 21 - 30 years: 5
- Over 30 years: 6

2. Your BPM Club size:

- Less than 20 members: 1
- 21 - 45 members: 2
- 46 - 75 members: 3
- 76 - 150 members: 4
- Over 150 members: 5

3. How did you first learn about BPM?

- Through a BPM member: 1
- Through my employer: 2
- Through BPM publications: 3
- Through the media (newspapers, magazines, radio, T.V.): 4
- Other (SPECIFY): 5

4. What was your main reason for joining BPM? (CIRCLE ONE NUMBER ONLY)

- Increased business/professional contacts: 1
- Personal career development: 2
- Community concern: 3
- Developing personal skills and knowledge: 4
- Fellowship/social contacts: 5
- Other (SPECIFY): 6

5. How has BPM benefited you most? (CIRCLE ONE NUMBER ONLY)

- Contacts which led to professional advancement: 1
- General career development: 2
- Greater community involvement: 3
- Developing personal skills and knowledge: 4
- Overall personal development: 5
- Increased social relationships: 6
- Other (SPECIFY): 7
Listed below are a number of activities which an organization such as BPM might offer its members. How important is it to you that BPM offer? (Circle one answer for each item.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Somewhat Important</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
<th>Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. Support to the women's movement?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Programs to help womenT.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Program to serve the community?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Career development or leadership training workshops?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Job placement services?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Opportunities to influence legislation?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Social activities for members?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Support for day care?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. What do you think should be the main purpose of BPM? (Circle one number only.)

To present issues of general interest to the membership .......................... 1
Individual growth for members .................................................................... 2
Helping other women .................................................................................... 3
Personal career development for members .................................................. 4
Legislative involvement .............................................................................. 5
Community involvement .................................................................................. 6

15. How often do you read or browse through National Business Women? (Circle one number only.)

Don't read it at all ......................................................................................... 1
Regularly (at least half the time), read it thoroughly ................................. 2
Regularly (at least half the time), browse or skim it ................................... 3
Occasionally, but read it thoroughly ........................................................... 4
Occasionally, and only browse or skip through it ......................................... 5

The following are subject areas for articles in National Business Women. How important is it to you that articles appear in the publication on a regular basis? (Circle one answer for each item.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Area</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Somewhat Important</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
<th>Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16. Equal Rights Amendment?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Information on legislative issues?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Career development?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. BPM membership development?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. BPM program planning?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. BPM promotional ideas?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Feature stories on the achievements of women.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23. What is the area of the United States in which you presently reside?

MA., VT., N.H., MA., CT., N.Y., N.J., PA., R.I. ........................................ 1
OH., IN., IL., MI., WI., MN., IA., MO. ..................................................... 3
K.O., S.D., ME., KS., NV., WY., CO. ............................................................ 4
OK., AR., TX., M.N., AZ., UT. ................................................................. 5
CA., WA., OR., HI., AK., NV., ID. .............................................................. 6
P.R., V.I. ....................................................................................................... 7
24. Which of the following best describes the community in which you reside?

- A large city (population 250,000 or more) ........................................ 1
- Suburban area near a large city ....................................................... 2
- A medium-sized city (population 75,000 to 250,000) ......................... 3
- Suburban area near a medium-sized city .......................................... 4
- A small city or town (25,000 to 75,000) ........................................... 5
- A small town (less than 25,000) .................................................... 6
- A rural area .................................................................................. 7

25. Your marital status:

- Never married ............................................................................. 1
- Married ....................................................................................... 2
- Divorced ...................................................................................... 3
- Separated ..................................................................................... 4
- Widowed ....................................................................................... 5

26. Your age:

- 25 or under .................................................................................. 1
- 26 - 34 ........................................................................................ 2
- 35 - 49 ....................................................................................... 3
- 50 - 59 ....................................................................................... 4
- 60 - 69 ....................................................................................... 5
- 70 or over .................................................................................... 6

27. Number of children:

- None ............................................................................................ 0
- 1 ................................................................................................... 1
- 2 ................................................................................................... 2
- 3 ................................................................................................... 3
- 4 ................................................................................................... 4
- 5 or more ...................................................................................... 5

28. Age of youngest child:

- Not applicable, no children ............................................................ 0
- Under 5 ........................................................................................ 1
- 5 - 10 .......................................................................................... 2
- 11 - 15 ........................................................................................ 3
- 16 - 21 ........................................................................................ 4
- Over 21 ....................................................................................... 5

29. Your present employment status:

- Self-employed full-time ................................................................. 1
- Self-employed part-time ............................................................... 2
- Employed full-time ..................................................................... 3
- Employed part-time ................................................................... 4
- Presently unemployed ................................................................. 5
- Retired ......................................................................................... 6

30. Type of organization in which you work:

- Not currently employed .............................................................. 0
- Educational organization ............................................................ 1
- Entertainment and the arts ............................................................ 2
- Government ................................................................................ 3
- Manufacturing .......................................................................... 4
- Nonmanufacturing organization/business .................................. 5
- Nonprofit organization ............................................................... 6
- Other (SPECIFY): ..................................................................... 7
31. What is (was) your major occupational field? (PLEASE CIRCLE ONLY THE ONE THAT YOU THINK BEST DESCRIBES YOUR OCCUPATIONAL FIELD. IF YOUR EXACT OCCUPATIONAL FIELD DOES NOT APPEAR, CHOOSE THE CATEGORY WHICH IS MOST CLOSELY RELATED.)

- Accounting/bookkeeping ........................................... 01
- Financial/banking/investments .................................... 02
- Insurance ..................................................................... 03
- Real estate ................................................................... 04
- Clerical/secretarial ..................................................... 05
- Administration/management ......................................... 06
- Personnel ...................................................................... 07
- Construction/engineering ............................................ 08
- Communications/news media/telephone ......................... 09
- Public Relations/advertising/publishing ......................... 11
- Merchandising/sales .................................................... 12
- Travel/recreation ........................................................ 13
- Food services/food processing ...................................... 14
- Cosmetology/personal services ...................................... 15
- Arts/entertainment ..................................................... 16
- Library sciences ........................................................ 17
- Social work .................................................................. 18
- Computer science ....................................................... 19
- Research ...................................................................... 20
- Education .................................................................... 21
- Medical ........................................................................ 22
- Dental .......................................................................... 23
- Law ............................................................................. 24
- Other (SPECIFY): ......................................................... 24

32. Contact with labor unions:

- No contact .................................................................... 0
- Member of a labor union .............................................. 1
- Regular contacts as a manager, but not a member .......... 2
- Company has direct contacts; I have none. .................. 3

33. On the whole, how satisfied are you with the work you do?

- Not working at present (unemployed or retired) ............ 0
- Very satisfied with the work I do ................................ 1
- Moderately satisfied .................................................... 2
- A little dissatisfied ...................................................... 3
- Very dissatisfied .......................................................... 4

34. What is the combined total income for the past year from all sources, before taxes, of all persons living in your household who are related to you?

- Less than $4,999 ......................................................... 1
- $5,000 - $7,999 .......................................................... 2
- $8,000 - $11,999 ......................................................... 3
- $12,000 - $19,999 ....................................................... 4
- $20,000 - $29,999 ....................................................... 5
- $30,000 - $39,999 ....................................................... 6
- $40,000 - $49,999 ....................................................... 7
- $50,000 and above ...................................................... 8
35. What were your own earnings for the past year, before taxes?

- Less than $3,000. ........................................... 1
- $3,000 - $4,999 ........................................... 2
- $5,000 - $7,099 ........................................... 3
- $8,000 - $11,999 .......................................... 4
- $12,000 - $19,999 ........................................ 5
- $20,000 - $29,999 ........................................ 6
- $30,000 and above ...................................... 7

36. How many persons depend upon your earnings for at least half of their support?

- None ....................................................... 0
- One or two .............................................. 1
- Three or four .......................................... 2
- Five or more .......................................... 3

37. Do you own, or rent, your own home?

- Own (buying) home .................................... 1
- Rent ....................................................... 2
- Other ...................................................... 3

38. How many automobiles do you own?

- None ....................................................... 0
- Own, but rent a car(s) .................................. 1
- Own one automobile .................................... 2
- Own two or more ....................................... 3

39. Highest level of education completed: (CIRCLE ONE NUMBER ONLY.)

- Less than a high school graduate .................... 1
- Technical school instead of high school .......... 2
- High school graduate .................................. 3
- Past high school, business or trade school ..... 4
- Some college ............................................ 5
- College graduate ....................................... 6
- Graduate work or advanced degree ................ 7

40. Continuing education at present:

- None ....................................................... 0
- Vocational/technical courses ......................... 1
- Professional courses/seminars/nondegree programs 2
- Academic program leading to a degree .............. 3

41. In politics, would you say that you are:

- Conservative .......................................... 1
- Moderate ............................................... 2
- Liberal ................................................ 3

42. In comparing discrimination against women in 1978 with the past, do you think that:

- There has never been discrimination against women? ....................................................... 1
- There was discrimination against women, but there is a slight improvement in women’s situations? ....................................................... 2
- There was discrimination, but there is a major improvement in women’s situations? ....................................................... 3
- There was discrimination and there is no real change? ....................................................... 4

PLEASE RETURN TO THE BUREAU OF SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH, INC., 1000 W STREET, N.W., WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036, IN THE ENVELOPE WHICH HAS BEEN PROVIDED. THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR COOPERATION.
APPENDIX D
GRANOVETTER QUESTIONNAIRE
Job Mobility Survey

INSTRUCTIONS: FOR EACH QUESTION, CHECK ONE OR MORE ANSWERS, OR FILL IN ANSWERS IN THE BLANK SPACE PROVIDED.

SECTION I: JOB-FINDING

1. When you first moved to were you changing jobs at the same time?
   a. Yes _______
   b. No _______

2. When was the last time you started in a new job - roughly what month and year?

3. What was the job you held before this change?
   Job Title: ___________________________
   Company: __________________________
   City: _______________________________

4. What was the job you held after this change? (Your present job)
   Job Title: __________________________
   Company: __________________________
   City: _______________________________

5. Was there a period of time when you were actively searching for a new job, before you found the job listed in # 4?
   a. Yes _______
   b. No _______

6. How exactly did you find out about the new job listed in # 4?
   a. I saw an advertisement in a newspaper or magazine, or trade or technical journal. _______
   b. I found out through an employment agency for personnel consultants, “head-hunters”, etc. _______
   c. I asked a friend, who told me about the job. _______
   d. A friend who knew I was looking for something new contacted me. _______
   e. A friend who didn’t know whether I wanted a new job contacted me. _______
   f. Someone I didn’t know contacted me and said I had been recommended for the job. _______
   g. I applied directly to the company. _______
   h. I became self-employed. _______
   i. Other (please explain): _______

7. How did you happen to know this friend?
   a. We went to college together. _______
   b. We went to high school together. _______
   c. We grew up in the same neighborhood. _______
   d. I once worked with him. _______
   e. I once worked under him. _______
   f. Other (please explain): _______

8. Did your friend put in a good word for you as well as telling you about the job?
   a. Yes _______
   b. No _______
   c. Don’t Know _______

9. How did this friend know about the job?
   a. He worked in the same place where the job opened up. _______
   b. He was a business friend of the employer. _______
   c. He was a social friend of the employer. _______
   d. He was the employer. _______
   e. Other (please explain): _______

10. At the time your friend told you about this job, how did you know how to get in touch with each other?
    a. We saw each other pretty often then. _______
    b. We saw each other occasionally then. _______
    c. We spoke to each other on the phone pretty often then. _______
    d. We spoke to each other on the phone occasionally then. _______
    e. We were exchanging letters then. _______
    f. We were exchanging Christmas (or other holiday) cards then. _______
    g. We hadn’t been in contact recently, but mutual friends put us in touch. _______
    h. Other (please explain): _______

11. Was there a period of time between the jobs listed in # 3 and # 4 when you weren’t working at all?
    a. Yes _______
    b. No _______

12. Which of the following best describes the new job listed in # 4?
    a. There were several jobs of the same type, and I replaced someone who held one of these. _______
    b. There was only one job of this type, and I replaced the man who held it. _______
c. I was the first man to hold this particular job.
   d. There were several jobs of the same type, and my job was
      added on to these.
   e. Other (please explain):

13. About how many people work for the company listed in #4?

14. About how satisfied would you say you are with your present
    job?
   a. Very satisfied ______
   b. Fairly satisfied ______
   c. Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied ______
   d. Fairly dissatisfied ______
   e. Very dissatisfied ______

15. Which of the following best describes your old job, the one you
    left to take the job listed in #4?
   a. I know the name of the man who replaced me. ______
   b. I'm not sure who replaced me, but I know that someone
      did. ______
   c. I don't know whether I was replaced or not. ______
   d. They are still looking for a replacement. ______
   e. They decided not to fill the job at that time. ______
   f. The particular job that I held doesn't exist any more. ______
   g. Other (please explain):

6. How long have you lived in Newton? ______

7. Where did you move to Newton from? ______

8. Where did you spend most of your time while you were growing
    up? (Name of city or town) ______

9. How many times have you moved since you took your first full-
    time job? ______

10. Which of the following letters best describes your personal
    income (before taxes) per year in your present job?
    a. Under $5,000. ______
    b. $5,000. to 7,500. ______
    c. $7,500. to 10,000. ______
    d. $10,000. to 15,000. ______
    e. $15,000. to 25,000. ______
    f. $25,000. to 40,000. ______
    g. More than $40,000. ______

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR COOPERATION.

SECTION II: BACKGROUND QUESTIONS

1. What was your father's occupation while you were growing up? ______

2. How far did you go in school? (If college, which one?) ______

3. What is your age? ______

4. Do you have a religious preference?
   a. Protestant ______
   b. Catholic ______
   c. Jewish ______
   d. Other ______
   e. None ______ (If "none", please circle parents' preference.)

5. What is your marital status?
   a. Married ______
   b. Divorced or separated ______
   c. Single ______
VITA
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