1989

Resilience and Survival: Executive Careers in Major California Nonprofit Organizations

Cathie J. Witty

Recommended Citation

INSTITUTE FOR
NONPROFIT ORGANIZATION MANAGEMENT

Resilience and Survival:
Executive Careers in Major
California Nonprofit Organizations

by Cathie J. Witty

Working Paper No. 7

working papers

USF
University of San Francisco

Resilience and Survival:
Executive Careers in Major
California Nonprofit Organizations

by Cathie J. Witty

Working Paper No. 7

For Further Information Contact:

March, 1989

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Despite the increasing social involvement of nonprofit organizations in public activity, we really know very little about the education, values and career patterns of the executives who manage this nonprofit sector.

This study begins to address these issues through interviews with fifty executive directors of large California nonprofit organizations. Four types of nonprofit organizations were included in the study. Human service agencies [20] and arts organizations [17] comprise the bulk of the organizations, with foundations [10] and scientific research facilities and museums [3] completing the sample.

The study explores the personal dimensions of mobility, career choices, education and gender-related issues among fifty nonprofit executive directors; it also considers the personal qualities that directors feel are required for the development of nonprofit careers and explores the movement of nonprofit directors between different fields and sectors.

The fifty personal interviews conducted for this study were both structured and open-ended; this combination provided a core of quantitative data and elicited rich qualitative data in the form of personal histories, career mobility decisions, and visions of the nonprofit career of the future.

This study sample is not representative of California nonprofit organizations. These data are probably not generalizable to smaller nonprofits or even to

smaller nonprofits within the same categories; the data only provide preliminary insights into the career paths of nonprofit executives in large organizations.

The study found that although a substantial 20% of this group of directors admitted that they would consider a job offer from a corporate employer, most considered this an unlikely scenario. Contrary to earlier findings, these directors expressed a relatively uniform set of beliefs which creates an important barrier to executive mobility between sectors.

For these executives, the barrier is primarily created by a perceived conflict of values. Executives in this study group care passionately about the value of their work - both its value to people and its greater value to the community. They share a common commitment to make things better in their community and for society as a whole; they do not believe that such values can survive in the corporate world.

Thus, while some executives might be attracted to the private sector through attractive incentives and enthusiastic recruitment, this issue of values would need to be carefully analyzed. Values, ethical behavior and social commitment are a large part of the incentive system for this group of directors. From these directors' viewpoint, sector shifts, especially to the for-profit sector, have potentially negative personal and career consequences.

Educational background and degrees were found to be important career path

determinants among this group of nonprofit executives. Contrary to findings in foundations, the women in this sample have a higher education level than the men.

The qualitative findings show that women have had to overcome sexism, deal with unequal salary structures, and create a personal balance between family duties and management careers. The general outlook is encouraging in the sense that younger women in this group of executives are moving ahead faster and making better salaries than women who entered the field twenty years ago; they have also found personal relationships that give them the career support essential to job movement, upward mobility and peace of mind.

Mentors and personal networks were found to be pivotal factors in the career mobility, recruitment and hiring procedures experienced by these directors. There was a clear generational, gender-related difference in affiliations with mentors, as well. The data are quite clear that mentors for this group of managers had a strong tendency to mentor people of the same sex; this generation seems to have dramatically equalized the distribution of mentoring relationships, however, and predominantly mentor junior staff and colleagues of both sexes.

There was also evidence throughout this study that board members, as well as mentors, had a great deal of informal influence on the executive recruitment and selection process. Often the key personal linkage between a manager and an important job interview was facilitated by board members in the midst of an executive search.

Although the executives in this sample were consistent in their acknowledgement of long hours and inadequate pay, these factors had not yet driven them from the nonprofit sector. Since the average age of these directors was 48, however, their current positions may represent a management career pinnacle which may substantiate contentions from the nonprofit literature that blocked mobility leads to migration to other sectors.

There is strong countervailing evidence in these data and the in-depth discussions that executives may lower their salary expectations, or engage in money-making projects outside their management careers, in order to remain in their nonprofit careers.

Further, there was no evidence in this study that movement of executives between sectors is a major source of upward career mobility; it was not found in the patterns of lateral job movement in the directors' prior positions, or in the attitudes of the majority of the directors directly interviewed about this possibility.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE OF CONTENTS

RESILIENCE AND SURVIVAL:

Executive Careers in Major

California Nonprofit Organizations

Introduction

The nonprofit sector is a vital, growing part of the social and economic

fabric of contemporary American society; not only has the nonprofit sector

expanded faster than either the government or business sectors in recent

decades, but the sector's size is projected to double by the turn of the

century (Rudney and Weitzman, 1984).

Currently, the sector includes over 800,000 nonprofit organizations

nationwide which represent a wide range of interests and concerns. It

employs as many civilians as the federal and fifty state governments

combined, operates with a yearly budget over $250 billion dollars, and

generates more than $300 billion dollars in revenues, about eight percent of

the gross national product (Hodgkinson and Weitzman, 1986; O'Neill and

Young, 1988).

At the local level, the nonprofit sector is often larger than local

governments (Lippert, Gutowski, and Salamon, 1984). In San Francisco, for

example, the nonprofit sector received and spent over twice as much as the

billion-dollar city government in 1982; Atlanta's nonprofit budget was four

times greater than the city budget in the same year.

Increasingly, nonprofit organizations are asked to manage a growing number

of public activities such as health care, social services and low-income

housing as the government retreats from certain areas of federal domestic funding; yet, comparative studies show that such increases in public services are often difficult for nonprofits to support since government funding is often the major source of revenue for local nonprofits, particularly human service organizations. As a recent report notes:

> ...cuts have threatened to reduce the ability of
> nonprofit organizations to meet even these needs...
> because government at all levels...relies extensively on
> nonprofit institutions to carry out public purposes"
> (Harder, Kimmich and Salamon, 1985, pg. xi).

Despite such local economic realities and increasing social impact, the sector has remained relatively unexplored by social scientists and policy analysts; we really know very little about the education, values and career patterns of the executives who manage this nonprofit sector.

There is an urgent need for empirical studies which specifically address the issues of nonprofit career training, job selection, career paths and job mobility; there has been very little investigation of either nonprofit executive career patterns or the role of boards, personal networks and mentors in the executive recruitment and selection process.

Through the efforts of groups such as Independent Sector, Yale University's Program on Nonprofit Organizations (PONPO), the Urban Institute, the Council on Foundations, and United Way of America, nonprofit organizations are beginning to receive serious attention from scholars, policy analysts, and the media.

Independent Sector's most recent volume on Research-in-Progress (1988) in
the areas of philanthropy, voluntary action, and nonprofit activity, for
example, outlines nearly one thousand studies, covering eight distinctive
categories; 560 of these projects are new, reflecting the recent growth of
nonprofit-related research.

Specific efforts are also underway in New York and San Francisco to evaluate
the dimensions of the regional nonprofit enterprise and establish permanent,
systematic data for use in future research and reporting in such diverse
areas as financial impact, sector growth and change, and program activity.

From a social science research perspective, exploration of nonprofit
executive careers is vital to our understanding of the sector's status
within the national labor and educational markets. From a management and
career development perspective, assessment of the professional and personal
characteristics of nonprofit executives helps us analyze two of the central
components of peoples' career choices and their ultimate commitment to their
chosen career paths.

This study begins to address these issues through in-depth interviews with
fifty executive directors of large California nonprofit organizations
[operating budgets over 1 million dollars]. The arts [including museums],
human services, private foundations and research/science facilities were the
four organizational categories which were explored. In both quantitative and
qualitative ways, the study explores the personal dimensions of mobility,
career choices, education and gender-related issues among fifty nonprofit

executive directors.

The study reports on the values, training, education and job histories of
directors, as well as the personal qualities that directors feel are
required for survival as a nonprofit executive. See Appendix A for a ranking
of these personal qualities.

Nonprofit Management

Although the literature on management in the nonprofit sector is growing,
research on executives is extremely limited. Existing studies are generally
confined to four areas: (a) executive skills and effectiveness, (b)
departure patterns of executive directors from nonprofit organizations, (c)
executive directors in the foundation community, and (d) the distinctive
characteristics of nonprofit management.

The first research category includes a recent study by Herman and Heimovics
(1987) which compared effective chief executives with those judged not as
effective. The authors noted that effective nonprofit executives were more
likely to have advanced degrees, "especially more management-oriented
master's degrees (pg.42)." The authors concluded that while much remains to
be learned about highly effective chief executives, educational background
and professional training are key elements which deserve greater attention
in the selection and development of chief executives in the nonprofit
sector.

Two other recent studies, Issa and Herman (1985), and Gilmore and Brown

4

(1985), typify studies which focus on the executive director's decision to leave an organization.

Issa and Herman's (1985) study focused exclusively on the issue of executive departure; they concluded that executive directors leave their positions primarily for personal, job-related reasons. Inadequate pay relative to job pressure, and heavy job responsibilities were secondary issues associated with departure decisions. Most important to the issue of training and career development, an alarming 40% of their sample left the nonprofit sector for jobs in private, for-profit organizations and had no plans to return to the nonprofit sector.

Gilmore and Brown (1985) conducted a longitudinal case study which focused on the cycle of leadership change from an executive director's initial decision to leave the organization through the transition to a new director. Their study stressed the critical role of the governing board during the transition in leadership.

In addressing the question of appropriate training for careers in the nonprofit sector, O'Neill and Young (1988) conclude that while "there is something distinctive about nonprofit organizations in comparison with business and government organizations, in terms of the way they operate, their legal foundations, and the philosophies on which they are based", there is probably no "one best way" to educate nonprofit managers (pg. 20). Rather, they argue for the continued testing of a variety of educational models which integrate theoretical, analytical and practical skills and

5

remain responsive to local needs.

In further considering training and mobility between different nonprofit
fields, DiMaggio (1988) argues that there is little evidence to suggest that
nonprofit management careers are developed in, or later transfer to,
different fields of service. Rather, managers become specialized very
early. He argues that highly structured, increasingly specialized job
markets within the nonprofit sector effectively focus upwardly mobile career
paths inward and thereby create small cadres of field-specific managers.

As DiMaggio notes:

> Local arts agencies have drawn management from the
> performing arts... Art museum directors do not move on
> to administer natural history museums, nor do we see
> history museum executives taking over the
> administration of zoos... (1988, pg. 61)

He concludes that such selective labor pools may lead to careers that are
characterized by blocked mobility relatively early in an individual's life.
The small size of most nonprofit organizations means that very few
individuals will be able to reach the upper management levels; consistent
with Issa and Herman's findings, DiMaggio concludes that blocked career
opportunity eventually leads many nonprofit managers to leave their fields
(pg. 62).

In looking at management careers in private grantmaking foundations,
Odendahl, Boris, and Daniels (1985) focused on career differences between
women and men. Their data elaborated on the importance of personal networks

in finding positions in the grantmaking community; they particularly noted

the influence of age, gender and educational background in the formation of

such career support networks. One result, they argue, is that older men with

established elite school ties have traditionally dominated the world of

grantmaking foundations, since their "old boy" networks were the primary

source of job announcement, referral and recruitment.

Despite the high general level of education among foundation executives, the

authors also found that men were more highly educated than women; men were

more likely to have degrees beyond the master's level and command higher

salaries commensurate with their educational achievement.

The study further noted that foundation executives are recruited from a

variety of disciplines and backgrounds; they are rarely internally developed

and promoted. Such executives, however, usually have some prior

fundraising, consulting, or committee experience with the foundation prior

to being personally tapped for management positions by a member of the

board.

Finally, this study explores significant gender-based differences in the

balance between perceived family duties and career choices:

> When we asked men if their personal or family situation
> had a bearing on their work or career options, they
> generally said no... men in the sample are absorbed in
> work, and so they depend on their wives to provide
> comfortable homes and family life...
> Married women wondered if they spend enough time with
> their families. Younger single women expressed concern
> about whether or not they will marry and have children.
> (Odendahl, Boris and Daniels, 1985, pg. 60).

7

Thus, the authors argue that gender-role expectations differentially affect women in the foundation world as they juggle their work, childrearing and family responsibilities. Women who want a career still bear the majority of the burden in balancing personal and professional activity, including childcare; men are generally able to sidestep these issues and do not consider them as integral parts of their career and time-management decisions.

Finally, on a more philosophical note, O'Connell (1988) argues that high levels of commitment, passion, caring and advocacy are assumed to flourish and find overt expression in the nonprofit sector; he concludes, therefore, that "the specific requirements of nonprofit activity are sufficiently distinct that they call for a somewhat different degree and balance of personal attributes and professional skills" (pg. 160).

This small body of nonprofit literature leaves a variety of interesting questions still unexplored. How do individuals find and compete for executive positions? Is it essential to have mentors? What degrees or type of training is the most useful? Are personal qualities and values pivotal in the career decisions of nonprofit executives? Do the gender-related differences between men and women hold true for nonprofit organizations other than foundations? Do executives move freely between different fields and sectors? And finally, are nonprofit careers limited in distinct ways, or is it a field full of unlimited career opportunity?

8

Study Areas

The fifty personal interviews conducted for this study were both structured [close-ended questions; coded data] and open-ended [probing discussions]; this combination of methods provided a core of quantitative data, and elicited rich qualitative data in the form of personal histories, career mobility decisions, and visions of the nonprofit career of the future. The interview guide [see Appendix B] was designed to address the following subject areas:

◆ **demographic background:** age, sex, ethnicity, educational degrees, parents' education, and parents' influence on career choices

◆ **job history:** the search, application, referral and mentoring activities involved with each previous position; career planning and decision-making; criteria for mobility and movement

◆ **organizational size and structure:** total number of employees [FTE equivalents] in the organization, annual operating budget, number of reporting relationships with the staff

◆ **job assessment:** reasons for accepting current position; sources of advice and counsel; salary goals and aspirations; personal qualities essential to management roles; compelling reasons to stay in or leave the sector

◆ **mentoring**: number and gender of mentors, specific roles mentors play; the executive's personal role as mentor

◆ **outside activities**: professional organizations important to career development, outside board memberships, volunteer activity, importance of spouse in career decisions

◆ **uniqueness of the nonprofit sector**: personal assessment of the unique nature of nonprofit management careers; planned career changes; Consideration of moves to the for-profit sector; Assessment of the future of the field - for director, for younger managers

◆ **value of training and education to nonprofit management**: training and skills essential to career development; Formal education versus on-the-job training; Adequacy and focus of nonprofit management training

Methodology

In-depth personal interviews were conducted with fifty executive directors of major nonprofit organizations; this sample was selected from an original list of 130 organizations which met the minimum budget requirement and final selection was controlled to equally divide the sample between Northern and Southern California [five county San Francisco Bay Area and the greater Los Angeles/Orange County metropolitan area].

Since the sample was drawn at such a high budgetary level, few women (26% of total) or minorities were included (4% of total); the study group was

primarily composed of white males (76% male, 46% of whom were white). There were only two Hispanic males and one Black male included in the study, and only one Black woman.

Four types of nonprofit organizations were included in the study. Human service agencies [20] and arts organizations [17] comprise the bulk of the organizations, with foundations [10] and scientific research facilities and museums [3] completing the sample.

Human service agencies, arts organizations and foundations were easy to sample because of available databases; in theory, they also represent diverse sets of management skills and career paths which will be relevant to subsequent analysis. Research facilities and museums in this high budgetary category provided a small but virtually unstudied group of organizations which were included to round out the sample.

The data consist of self-reported information; no direct observation or collaborative interviews supplement the directors' perceptions. Rather, the data illuminate the directors' personal and retrospective reflections on the formal and personal components of their career histories and affiliation with the nonprofit sector. The analysis will focus on similarities and differences in career patterns among the four categories of organizations studied, as well as findings related to age, gender and other demographic variables.

Since this was a preliminary study, the budget requirement of one million

dollars effectively limited the sample to managers of **large** nonprofit

organizations. The million dollar cutoff figure was also an identifiable

marker in the record-keeping systems of the groups that provided the initial

lists and therefore provided easy access to a sampling frame for these four

organizational categories. Organizations were initially selected from lists

obtained from the United Ways of the Bay Area and Los Angeles, the

California Arts Council, and the Foundation Directory.

Even with a minimum budget requirement of one million dollars, there were

substantial variations in the administrative structure, budget and number of

employees. These variations are summarized in Table 1 :

TABLE 1

ORGANIZATIONAL CHARACTERISTICS OF STUDY PARTICIPANTS

Category	Operating Budgets [millions]	Number of Employees	Number of Direct Reporting Relationships
	Mean	Mean/[Median] *	Mean
Total Sample	**7.8**	**60**	**6**
Arts	8.1	156 [75]	8
Human Services	7.3	131 [63]	6
Foundations	4.5	16 [11]	5
Research	20.3	260 [130]	7

* Since variance and standard deviation are high, both
  mean and median figures are given.

The average number of full-time equivalent (FTE) employees for all organizations is 60, but this is deceptive since foundations [small staffs] and arts organizations [large numbers of performers] create skewed distributions at both the high and low ends of the scale; a clearer picture is provided by consideration of both the mean and median figures.

It should be clear that this sample is not representative of California nonprofit organizations for three reasons. First, it is a self-selected sample [voluntary participation, not randomly selected], and second, it is drawn from very large organizations. The data are probably not generalizable to smaller nonprofits or even to smaller nonprofits within the same categories; the data only provide preliminary insights into the career paths of nonprofit executives in large organizations.

Thirdly, the sample does not mirror the national distribution of these types of nonprofit organizations. While there are over three times as many nonprofit human service organizations as arts organizations [13,549 versus 4,208] estimated nationally throughout the sector (Hodgkinson and Weitzman, 1986, pg. 128), they are given relatively equal weight in this sample.

Since this study focuses on careers paths which have led to large organizations, women and minorities are not significantly represented. While there are interesting differences in the career experiences of men and women in this sample, the number of women [13 of 50] included is too small to allow for meaningful statistical tests. Since only four non-white directors are included in this sample, generalizations related to ethnicity

13

are also impossible.

Exploratory letters were sent to all 130 executive directors in the initial
listings; these letters were followed with a personal telephone call, and
discussion of the research project, methodology, and confidentiality. When
30 interviews were scheduled in each geographic area, subsequent follow-up
calls explained that participation was no longer needed, since the sample
size had been reached. Planning for 60 interviews allowed for attrition due
to sampling error and cancelled interviews. When directors agreed to
participate, they were asked to forward a current resume to the investigator
prior to the interview.

The resume provided educational and demographic information which was
recorded prior to the interview. Since many of the questions were open-
ended and required probing, it saved valuable interview time if educational
and demographic profiles were outlined in advance. When resumes were out of
date or non-existent, background profiles were constructed during the
interview. All interviews were taped and later transcribed and coded [see
Appendix C for responses to selected variables].

DATA ANALYSIS

The Typical Executive in a Large Nonprofit Organization

"The best skill is knowing how to brag in good

taste..."

Given the limitations of this sample, a profile of a "typical" nonprofit executive director does emerge from the data:

The typical executive director of a major California nonprofit organization is a 48 year old white male; he is college educated, although only one of his parents has the same level of education. He feels that his parents had an important influence on his career choices. Even if he doesn't give them direct credit for his career focus, he still gives them substantial credit for his fundamental character development.

Our director has a master's degree, although the subject may seem to have little direct bearing on his current management area. He has had six jobs prior to his current assignment, has worked for 25 years, and was assisted in finding and securing those jobs by two or three mentors; he did not work his way up through his current organization, but was hired from a smaller nonprofit organization.

He is a "people" person who feels that his primary roles involve public relations and internal leadership for his staff. Six of those staff members report to him directly and supervise 60 - 100 other full-time employees [FTE] in the organization. Typically, his duties have remained relatively constant over the past eight or nine years, but if there have been changes, he now spends more time fundraising and working with the board than he did in the early years.

The typical director is a dedicated, tenacious, hard worker; he ranks

acceptance of long hours as one of the most important personal qualities a person needs to succeed as an executive director, along with believing in yourself, and having a good sense of humor. He routinely works 60 hours a week, including some evenings and weekends.

In this career, there is no time to think, no time to plan for the long term, and no time for a vacation, but he loves his job. He is, by necessity, entrepreneurial and is constantly looking for new ways to help his organization grow and still stay in the black. His main satisfaction comes from making good things happen for people and for the community. He is uncomfortable with making tough budget decisions and dislikes messy personnel conflicts and petty politics.

He never planned a management career and never dreamed he could make this much money doing something he loves. If he hasn't yet reached his ultimate salary goal, he expects to fully reach this goal within ten years. So, although he is overworked, his salary isn't his only source of compensation, motivation and satisfaction. Even if offered a better paying job in the for-profit sector, he probably wouldn't take it; he doesn't feel his values would be tolerated in the corporate world.

If he has a management problem, he goes straight to his board members, board president, and then his staff; he seldom consults with other nonprofit directors or outside consultants. He has had the guidance of at least two male mentors during his career and is now a mentor [for both men and women] himself.

Very few professional organizations have really been important to his career; most organizational affiliations are symbolic. He admits, though, that in order to reap career benefits, you really have to get involved in leadership roles with a professional organization, and he hasn't done that.

He typically sits on one or two boards [other than his own], but has severely trimmed such outside commitments as he has taken on more responsibility. He also used to volunteer, but no longer has time for such activity.

Parental Influence

Typically, one of the director's parents was college educated (56%); not surprisingly, this was generally the male parent [85% of the time]. Both men and women (61%) affirmatively stated that their parents had influenced their career choices.

Symphony and museum directors, for example, described how parents had taken them to artistic events when they were children and developed their early love and appreciation for the arts. Human service directors described the charity work that their mother had done throughout their lives; these mothers were early role models for children who grew up caring about the disadvantaged and chose careers that reflect those concerns.

Even the directors [39%] who stated that their parents did not influence their careers, noted that their parents had a great deal to do with shaping their adult character. What they had really meant by a negative response, they explained, was that their parents had not overtly pressured them to

17

pursue one field or interest over another.

Many women reported that they had been encouraged to go to college, particularly by their fathers (60%); most of the remaining 40% had strong role models as mothers, either as professionals or women who had raised families on their own. Both types of mothers taught their daughters the importance of independence; one for the satisfaction of a career, the other for the economics of survival.

Career Paths

Prior Positions

The average number of jobs each director held prior to their current position was six; this number is constant regardless of sex, age or geographic location.

Overwhelmingly, the immediately prior position had been in a smaller nonprofit organization (92%); only 8% of these directors were internally promoted to their current executive positions. Lateral upward career movement between medium-sized and large nonprofit organizations was clearly the norm for this group of directors. Only one of these directors had come to their current position from a for-profit organization, and only 8% had been recruited to their current position from the government sector.

Furthermore, except for temporary positions in their early twenties, only 12% of these directors had **ever** worked in the for-profit sector; governmental positions were more common [29% total], given that more than

half [52%] the human service directors had worked for state or county

agencies at some point in their careers.

Interestingly, although the average number of prior positions in the overall

sample was six, the number of **management** positions prior to the current

positions varied slightly between types of managers. Foundation directors

had the lowest mean score, with an average of only two management positions

prior to their foundation experience, research directors averaged three

prior management positions, while for arts and human services directors, the

average number was five.

Education

Only four director's [8%] have no college education; one did not complete

high school; 11 have Bachelor's degrees [22%], 29 have Master's degrees

[58%], and six have Ph.D.'s, M.D.'s or other professional degrees [12%].

There are, however, some interesting differences in educational backgrounds

when analyzed by type of organization (see Table 2). A breakdown of types of

degrees shows that directors of research organizations, not surprisingly,

have the highest number of combined graduate degrees; all hold either

master's [67%] or doctoral degrees [33%]. These directors were affiliated

with academic institutions prior to their administrative career, and have

the discipline-related graduate degrees required in such settings.

At the master's level, professional degrees are held by over 50% of the

directors in each category, with the Master's in Social Work swelling the

number of degree holders in the human services category. Human service directors found graduate degrees important to career advancement, although many had started in clinical practice or counseling before embarking on an administrative career.

TABLE 2

PERCENTAGE OF TYPES OF HIGHEST DEGREE
BY TYPE OF ORGANIZATION

Degree	Total	Arts	Services	Foundations	Research
N =	50 :	17	20	10	3
None	8%	12%	5%	10%	-
B.A.	22%	30%	20%	20%	-
M.A.	58%	53%	65%	50%	67%
Ph.D *	12%	6%	10%	20%	33%

* Category includes M.D.'s and other professional degrees

There were gender-related variations in degree levels as well.
Men are nearly twice as likely to hold a doctoral degree than women [14% compared to 8%]; women in this study, however, outdistanced the men in master's degrees [69% to 54%] and held even in the bachelor's degrees category [23% to 22%].
If we look at the distribution of degrees between men and women in the sample, Table 3 shows that 11% of the men have risen to the top with no formal degrees; 22% are college graduates, 54% have a master's degree, and

14% hold doctorates. Conversely, all the women in the study have a college degree; 23% are college graduates, and 69% have a masters degree. Only one woman [8%], however, holds a doctorate.

TABLE 3

DISTRIBUTION OF HIGHEST DEGREE LEVEL BY SEX

Degree	Males % / Number		Females % / Number	
None	11%	4	–	0
B.A.	22%	8	23%	3
M.A.	54%	20	69%	9
Ph.D *	14%	5	8%	1

* Category included M.D.'s and other professional degrees

Consistent with the fact that 95% of the directors interviewed said they had no early career plan, bachelor's degrees range from English Literature, Political Science, and Psychology to Engineering and International Relations. These undergraduate backgrounds are entirely consistent with executives' current feelings that a liberal arts education is the best preparation for a nonprofit career (see pgs. 26-28).

Gender

Gender differences in career paths emerged even with the small number of women in the sample [13 or 26%]. Sex distributions across categories were predictable, given the size of the organizations included in the study. Research directors were all male [100%], followed by the arts [82% male],

21

foundations [70% male], human services [65% male].

In general, women directors were older than the men [mean age of 52 versus 48 for men]. However, this sample represents a good range of women's experiences, since both the older women who succeeded under one set of rules and younger women who are defining a somewhat different sets of rules are included.

Although women and men had the identical number of jobs [6] prior to obtaining their current position, women tended to stay longer in each job before promotion or lateral move [nearly 5 years as compared to 3 for men]. Part of this can be explained by the fact that women took longer to complete their graduate degrees [4 years versus 2.5], took time out to have children, or returned for degrees after some work experience. Men were more likely to have uninterrupted degree patterns.

Another part of the gender-related difference, however, can be related to sexism and differential sex role expectations. While older women were less likely to discuss sexism in tangible terms, they did recognize that they had made personal choices early in their careers which set them apart from other women in the workforce; either they decided not to marry, not to have children, or postponed marriage and children until their late thirties or early forties.

Many women over fifty [65%] discussed personal experiences with sexism during their careers, and tended to accept this a product of earlier times.

These women were tough and resilient; they learned their jobs, found valuable mentors, and "hung in there through sheer stubbornness." These older women, then, were not only bright and determined, but, for their time, were relatively untraditional in terms of expected marriage and childrearing roles as they developed their independent careers. They had used a variety of strategies to overcome career difficulties; they suggested pursuing formal education as one method of overcoming prejudice and finding an appropriate mentor as another.

The majority of older women [72%] reported that they had only one significant mentor in their career. While they did not have the consistent support of a mentor in their own careers, they are currently reversing this trend by supporting other young women [and men] with similar goals.

Younger women [under fifty] talked openly about sexism in two major arenas: promotion and education. Although women reported that they may not have been aware of sexism and discrimination at the time, the reflective nature of these interviews elicited a range of experiences which women clearly defined as sexism and which had made their early careers both difficult and unpleasant. Differential treatment and lack of support in graduate school, initial salaries well below male counterparts, and promotion rates lower than less qualified male colleagues were primary examples of the types of unequal treatment reported by nearly half [45%] of these women.

Recruitment and Referral: The Role of Mentors

The similarity in recruitment and referral processes throughout the total
sample was striking; personal networks, frequently activated by mentors,
are the key to career mobility. A vast majority [76%] of these directors
reported having at least one or two important mentors at various points in
their careers. Directors were allowed to define "mentor' for themselves, and
many directors used the terms "mentor" and "role model" interchangeably.

Most directors [79%] agreed that several stages of their career advancement
were directly related to advice and guidance from friends, former bosses,
role models or mentors. Occasionally, there was an individual who found a
new position by applying for openings that were publicly posted, but such
career paths were a clear exception; only 7% of the directors had ever found
a job with using this method.

For the total group, fifty percent of all mentors were male, and 36% were
both male and female; only 14% of the total group reported having only
female mentors. Men clearly had more mentors and more mentors who were
male. Men reported that 81% of their mentors were men, while only 54% of the
women had male mentors. The reverse was also true, in that 46% of the women
reported mentors who were female , while only 12% of the men could identify
any female mentors in their lives.

Men in this study were also twice as likely to have at least one important
mentor throughout their careers than women [8% versus 19%]. The disparity
equalizes somewhat when we look at overall number of mentors; 53% of the

women had between 2-4 mentors, while 76% of the men reported the same number.

These directors, however, take their own roles as mentors very seriously; 89% of the men and 92% of the women report that they mentor at least one junior colleague. Across all categories, directors have at least three mentoring relationships with current or former staff members [56%], and 20% mentor more than three junior colleagues.

While their own mentors were likely to be same sex colleagues, directors in this sample were more balanced in distributing their own mentoring activities among junior colleagues of both sexes; 40% of the women reported that their "mentees" were other women, while 53% reportedly mentored both male and female staff. No women reported mentoring only men. Most men [62%] reported mentoring both men and women; only 11% reported mentoring only women, and the same percent said they mentored only men.

What, specifically, do mentors do ? They call and tell you about a job and suggest that you apply. A mentor gives your name when asked by board members or executives to make a recommendation. A former boss calls and asks if you're interested in a new opportunity; she's recommended you to the search committee and thinks you'd be perfect for the job - and it would be a good move for you.

As one director noted, "mentors give you advise at critical times, and keep you from making mistakes." They are also an important link in the training,

job mobility and career information network that functions at both formal and informal levels across the nonprofit organizations explored in this study.

Through a word dropped here and there, a recommendation from a staunch supporter, a casual suggestion that you apply for an opening, informal social networks operated in 90% of the job transitions analyzed in this study. The majority [78%] of all mentoring relationships developed in early work experiences rather than in college [75%].

Across categories, mentors appear to be most active in the human service area; 80% of those directors responded that yes, they did have at least one mentor. Mentoring rates ran 71% for the arts and foundation directors and 66% for research managers.

Perhaps more interesting is the fact that 40% of the foundation directors reported having no significant mentors at all; this was substantially higher than the 30% lack of any mentors for arts and research directors, and 20% lack in the human services.

Education and Training

Interviews reached beyond documentation of formal training and degrees and probed the role of formal education versus on-the-job training in executive careers. Although substantial numbers of directors have a master's degree in a job-related discipline [see Table 1, pg. 12], only three of these degrees are in nonprofit or arts management; seven are master's degrees in business.

The majority of these directors did not consciously plan a career in management; career histories involved moving from one position to another with increasing authority and responsibility, with a gradual trend in upward mobility. Well into their thirties [average age, 33] they found themselves in a supervisory position and found they had stumbled into a career in nonprofit management.

There were exceptions to this profile [17% of the sample]; these directors had found early careers in organizations that preferred to internally develop and promote managers. These individuals rose to managerial ranks earlier than their counterparts [average age, 29] and generally had not made any lateral moves outside organization.

There was clear consensus among directors that nonprofit management careers cannot develop "by happenstance anymore - those days are over." Directors felt that strong financial management skills were the key to future nonprofit management careers. In addition, the ability to plan and develop policy were important skills that need to be developed in younger staff members.

Directors were consistent in their overall assessment of the value of formal education to nonprofit careers. Most [82%] felt that the best educational preparation for young people is a solid, diverse liberal arts education. Liberal arts, they argued, organizes the mind, instills discipline, and teaches people how to find answers to a variety of questions; it creates inquisitive, multi-faceted human beings. Future nonprofit managers in the

ballet, symphony, research or human services, must be curious, ask
questions, know how to find answers to diverse questions and be interested
in a range of topics. The management specifics of a particular type of
organization can be taught on-the-job; but managers were unanimous in their
concern that without good raw material, no amount of training would produce
a well-rounded and competent manager.

While all directors agreed that formal education provided essential training
in these areas, they also felt that the development of "people" skills must
not be neglected: "whatever managers do, they have to work with people and
get people to work with one another." The ability to understand a profit
and loss statement will not get your staff to work together; without the
ability to direct and motivate people, it is impossible to have a durable
nonprofit career.

Salary

Salary questions dealt with salary satisfaction rather than actual salary
figures. The vast majority of directors in this study [78%] were not only
satisfied with their salaries, but felt that they had reached their highest
salary expectations. Responses such as "I never dreamed I could make this
much" or "I would do this for free, so getting paid well is a real bonus"
were very typical. The salary dimensions of their chosen career paths, then,
were largely irrelevant. Only six directors had substantial family incomes
or for-profit enterprises outside their management careers.

Sixteen percent of the directors felt they had achieved about half their ultimate salary goals, but they were confident that they would reach those goals in ten years or less; these directors were all in their thirties.

Of the remaining 6% who were not satisfied with their salaries, they had accepted such reduced expectations as part of the trade off for doing work that they loved. Responses such as "I'll never make what I'm worth in the nonprofit sector" or "If I had wanted to make that kind of money, I would have gone into a for-profit organization a long time ago" were typical.

Additional Factors in Defining Career Goals and Career Satisfaction

Reasons for Selecting Current Position

In deciding to accept an executive position, people weigh a number of personal and professional goals. The directors were asked why they left their prior position to accept their current job; overwhelmingly, they responded that they were looking for new challenges and new problems to solve [60%]. They were also hoping these new challenges would allow them to accomplish something important and make a difference in peoples' lives [24%]; finally, they were attracted by the quality of the new organization and its people [22%].

Job Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction

The data on job satisfaction represents a qualitative ranking of the major reasons directors gave for liking and staying in their current positions. By combining the responses of "making good things happen" [40%] and the

"quality of our product or service" [36%], it is clear that the vast majority of these nonprofit directors [76%] stick with their careers because they still feel they can make quality things happen, whether it's an artistic performance, human service or research.

Factors that make directors most uncomfortable, and which they define as the "down side" of their chosen careers, were making tough budget decisions [22%], personnel issues [20%], petty politics [12%] and raising money [12%].

Management Roles

The ability to provide leadership was an important aspect of what directors liked about their careers; it is part of what keeps them motivated to come to work each day. Leadership was described with phrases such as "you have to have a vision of the future", "the organization looks to you for direction" or "you have to know where you want to go and how to get other people to want to go there as well." This ability, to see "the big picture" and make others see it as concrete programs and activities, was central to most directors' descriptions of the creative part of their jobs.

Directors felt that the ability to define the future of an organization is a talent that cannot be taught; you can, however, improve your own management skills through education and hire good managers to translate the vision into action. As one director cogently expressed it, "leadership is knowing the right things to do... management is the ability to do things right."

Exploration of executive roles often led to discussion of "entrepreneurial" skills and the ability to constantly change and grow as a manager. Whether directors believed that strategic investments, for-profit subsidiaries or better fundraising techniques were the next step for their organization, it is clear that directors see the nonprofit world as a hazardous and difficult place to develop a career.

Personal Qualities

Personal characteristics, independent of management skills, have a direct bearing on the type of people who initially gravitate toward nonprofit management careers and the type of people who stay in them.

In ranking the most important personal qualities a person must bring to this type of career, directors were in general agreement that a strong belief in yourself [16%] was the most important quality, followed closely by a sense of humor [14%] and a commitment to work long hours [14%].

Secondary qualities included passion for your work [18%], having a vision of the organization's future [14%], and being a relatively intelligent individual [12%].

Outside Activities

While 66% of the directors reported that there were important professional organizations in their lives, discussion revealed that the impact of such organizations is minimal. Only one or two organizations were cited by

directors as having __any__ bearing on their career development; most felt that membership in national organizations were an expected part of professional activity, but most agreed that, unless you are actively involved in the organization, the benefits are primarily social and symbolic.

More men thought that professional organizations had been important to their careers than women. Over three-quarters [76%] of the men said that at least one or two organizations had been important in their career development, while only 38% of the women could make the same statement.

Professional arts organizations appear to be most effective in making significant contributions to executives' careers; 82% of the arts directors reported that there were groups which had directly helped them improve their career options. Only 60% of the foundation directors could find such a connection, and only 50% of the human service directors. While all [100%] research directors reported supportive professional organizations, these organizations were discipline-based (i.e. professional physics associations) contributed very little to their careers as managers.

Membership on boards other than their own was fairly evenly divided within the overall group, with 56% of all directors sitting on boards, committees or commissions; 44% did not participate in any such outside activity. Male directors sat on more outside boards than female directors [60% versus 54%], but not to a significant degree.

Ninety percent also reported that they do not engage in any volunteer activity. Again, 34% said that they had done those things when they were younger, but not longer had the time to volunteer for anything.

Family Life

Finally, in assessing whether their marriage or personal relationships were important considerations in their past or current career decisions, 75% of all directors reported a serious consideration of spouses, children or significant relationships throughout their working lives. Nearly all [92%] of the men were married, while only 77% [10] of the women were married.

Women reported a higher degree of interaction [85%] between career and family choices than men [70%]. The decisions to work, change jobs, have children, and go to school involved greater perceived adjustments in time management, commitment, financial planning and personal relationships among the women.

Women talked at some length about the special spouses or personal relationships that allowed them to "compete on equal footing in a man's world." Not only were spouses an important source of personal support, they also took an active role in child care, laundry and other essential daily tasks. Without their partners, women reported, they really would not have "been able to have it all" or "do their jobs without a great deal of guilt."

Geography

The only interesting geographic variation was that more executive directors

in Northern California were more satisfied with their salary than their Southern counterparts. . While both groups were identical in the number of directors who felt they had only achieved half their salary expectations [16%], a full 72% of the Northern directors felt they had achieved 90-100% of their salary goals; only 58% of the Southern directors felt they had achieved this level of compensation. Whether this is due to different salary expectations, actual differentials in compensation structures, or cost of living factors is unknown; this would be an interesting topic for further research.

The Uniqueness of the Nonprofit Sector

The only research question that remains unexplored is the uniqueness of nonprofit careers and the movement of executives across public and private sector boundaries.

Although a substantial 20% of this group of directors admitted that they would consider job offer from a corporate employer, most considered this an unlikely scenario. Contrary to Issa and Herman's (1985) earlier findings, these directors expressed a relatively uniform set of beliefs which creates an important barrier to executive mobility between sectors.

For these executives, the barrier is primarily created by a perceived conflict of values. As O'Connell [1988] has noted, each executive in this study group cares passionately about the value of their work - both its value to people and its greater value to the community. They share a common commitment to make things better in their community and for society as a

whole; they do not believe that such values can survive in the corporate world.

Thus, while some executives might be attracted to the private sector through attractive incentives and enthusiastic recruitment, this issue of values would need to be carefully analyzed. Values, ethical behavior and social commitment are a large part of the incentive system for this group of directors. From these directors' viewpoint, sector shifts, especially to the for-profit sector, have potentially negative personal and career consequences.

Conclusions

In direct response to the specific research questions which prompted this study, there are a number of preliminary conclusions that can be drawn from these data.

First, in support of the findings of Issa and Herman (1985) and Odendahl, Boris and Daniels (1985), educational background and degrees are important career path determinants among this group of nonprofit executives. A few older men had developed solid careers without the benefit of any college degrees, and male directors are twice as likely to have doctoral or other professional degrees [14% versus 8% for women].

In this group of executives, contrary to the findings in foundations, the women and men have equal percentages of undergraduate degrees [23% for

women, 22% for men] and women a greater percentage of master's degrees [69% versus 54%] than the male directors. Among the bulk of degree holders at the master's level, then, the women in this sample are have a higher education level than the men.

However, these results may reflect findings very similar to those of Odendahl, Boris and Daniels (1985) in the sense that women at this high level of management in large nonprofit organizations need to be more highly educated than their male counterparts in order to compete and succeed. Comparative studies in smaller organizations would help clarify this educational issue.

While male executives may command higher salaries in these large organizations for a variety of reasons, including educational achievement, no significant differences in salary satisfaction or expectations were found between the men and women in this study.

Second, the qualitative discussions are also consistent with the Odendahl, Boris and Daniels findings that women have had to overcome sexism, deal unequal salary structures, and create a personal balance between family duties and management careers. The general outlook is encouraging in the sense that younger women in this group of executives are moving ahead faster and making better salaries than women who entered the field twenty years ago; they have also found personal relationships that give them the career support essential to job movement, upward mobility and peace of mind.

The women in this study have been successful in dealing with the multiple problems of career and family, but 85% of them reported it as an important factor in career and promotion decisions; interestingly, nearly three-quarters (70%) of the men in the study also reported that family life was an important factor in their career choices. This appears to represent a relatively high percentage of men who care about the effect of their career decisions on their family life, although further study would be required to test the validity of these reported data.

Third, mentors and personal networks, were found to be pivotal factors the career mobility, recruitment and hiring procedures experienced by these directors. These findings on personal networks are consistent with the earlier literature, and highlight the importance of such informal social processes in determining the career paths of different types of nonprofit executives.

There was a clear generational, gender-related difference in affiliations with mentors, as well. The data are quite clear that mentors for this group of managers had a strong tendency to mentor same sex staff; this generation seems to have dramatically equalized the distribution of mentoring relationships, however, and predominantly mentor junior staff and colleagues of both sexes. There was a slight tendency for women to pay particular attention to the education and mentoring of younger women in their organization; women report that they do this, not in exclusion of junior male colleagues, but to redress some of the neglect which they experienced as younger management hopefuls.

Fourth, there was evidence throughout this study that board members, as well as mentors, had a great deal of informal influence on the executive recruitment and selection process. Often the key personal linkage between a manager and an important job interview was facilitated by board members in the midst of an executive search. Board members also directly recruited executives through a variety of strategies. Nonprofit board members, their roles and their relations with pivotal mentors in different fields deserve greater attention in future studies of executive career mobility and recruitment.

Fifth, although the executives in this sample were consistent in their acknowledgement of long hours and inadequate pay, these factors had not yet driven them from the nonprofit sector. Since the average age of these directors was 48, however, they had some difficulty in projecting their future career advancement beyond their current position. For most, their current positions may represent a management career pinnacle which may substantiate DiMaggio's (1988) contention that blocked mobility early in the career path leads to eventual migration to other sectors; only time will tell.

In this study, directors over fifty planned to retire in their current job or in a similar position in a larger nonprofit organization of the same type. None planned to leave the sector in search of greater career advancement.

There is also strong evidence in these data and the in-depth discussions, that executives either lower their salary expectations, or secondarily, engage in money-making projects outside their management careers, in order to remain in their nonprofit careers. The vast majority of the 78% who were satisfied with their salary level had adjusted their salary expectations to reasonable "nonprofit standards" during their career; these directors, combined with the few that had outside income (6 of 50; 12%), and the remaining 6% who were unhappy with their lowered salary expectations, represent the vast majority of the sample.

There is no evidence in this study that movement of executives between sectors is a major source of upward career mobility; it is neither reflected in the patterns of lateral job movement in the directors' prior positions, nor in the attitudes of the directors directly interviewed about this possibility. Only one director had come to his current position from a for-profit setting and only a small proportion [8%] had been recruited from the government sector.

More importantly, the directors' perception, valid or invalid, that nonprofit careers and the values they encompass are unique, distinctive, and unacceptable in the for-profit marketplace, strongly argues against widespread movement of executives among the three economic sectors. Directors would consider offers from the business world, but are skeptical about the possibility of having a satisfying career.

Future Research

As the discussion and analysis has noted, there are still unanswered questions regarding the career paths and mobility patterns of nonprofit managers.

First, although the majority of directors in this study report that they are satisfied with their current salaries, the role of salary as a dimension of job satisfaction and mobility clearly needs further exploration. This study cannot determine whether differential salary satisfaction is a function of substantial differences in actual salary, or a variety of intervening variables such as cost of living, additional forms of compensation, or the attempt to impress the interviewer with a strong sense of altruism.

Second, and more fundamentally, the question of real versus perceived differences in corporate and nonprofit value structures is a central issue which deserves systematic, empirical analysis. Such assessment is essential if the very best managers, private, public or nonprofit are to be drawn to organizations in critical circumstances, regardless of the sector.

Third, while this study profiles the careers of executives at the top of very large nonprofit organizations, it is vital that we begin to systematically understand similar dimensions of nonprofit careers in the "trenches" of small nonprofit community organizations. This type of analysis of career and professional profiles is needed among a wide range of smaller California nonprofit organizations [operating budgets $50,000 to $500,000]; such smaller organizations comprise the bulk of the nonprofit sector, are

40

extensively linked to community issues and pressures, and employ significant numbers of minorities and women.

In data drawn from the 1980 Census of Population, Johnston and Rudney (1987) remind us that the nonprofit labor force in 1985 employed nearly 8 million workers [over 7% of all employed workers]; furthermore, projections show the nonprofit sector growing to 9.3 million workers by 1995. More than two-thirds [67.8%] of these workers are women; Black women comprise nearly 75% of all Black workers in the nonprofit service sector [Johnston and Rudney, 1987, pgs. 31-32].

Another significant difference between the smaller nonprofit organizations and those explored in this report is the preponderance of part time workers in the nonprofit services:

> Only about 52 percent of the nonprofit service workers were
> employed year-round...
> The difference between male and female nonprofit workers...is
> also quite large... Overall, fewer than half of the women,
> compared with nearly two-thirds of the men, worked year-round,
> full time [Johnston and Rudney, 1987, pgs. 31-32].

This report also did not focus on the career-related issues of large proportions of part-time staff; analysis dealt only with full-time equivalent figures [FTE] for purposes of assessing overall organizational size. The impact of part-time staff, as well as part-time careers, especially among women and minorities, is a social and economic issue that deserves serious attention in our future research priorities.

41

Fourth, in terms of education, it seems that O'Neill and Young (1988) may be correct in their argument that nonprofit management training remain broadly-based, combine business and analytical skills, and remain responsive to local needs and trends. There was strong support for a liberal arts education, strengthened with business-oriented graduate study, and fine tuned in the workplace among this group of high level executives. Graduate programs must be aware that the diversity and creativity of future nonprofit mangers will be as important as their fundraising and financial skills.

Finally, the role of mentors needs to be more systematically explored and documented. Future studies must differentiate between mentors, role models, former bosses and other varieties of supportive relationships, and explore the complex roles that true mentors play in a manager's overall career support network. Such studies must also include the role of board presidents and trustees in selection of the nonprofit executives of the future.

This report hopes to contribute to a better understanding of the nature of management careers in the nonprofit sector, as well as the personal qualities, family ties, and training required to develop and sustain such careers. It is essential that these and subsequent findings be translated into useful paradigms for nonprofit training programs, governing boards, and nonprofit managers in their roles as models and mentors for the next generation.

Hopefully, future and developing mangers will benefit from the composite personal and professional picture which has been outlined here with broad brush strokes. The nonprofit executives of the future will need all the help, support and information they can get in meeting the growing challenges of complex social changes and shifting financial structures.

Bibliography

Brown, Kathleen M. "Applied Empirical Research on Nonprofit Organization Management: Survey and Recommendations." Working Paper No. 1. Institute for Nonprofit Management, San Francisco, 1986.

DiMaggio, Paul J. "Nonprofit Managers in Different Fields of Service: Managerial Tasks and Management Training." In O'Neill, Michael and Dennis R. Young, Educating Managers of Nonprofit Organizations, Praeger, New York, 1988.

Drucker, Peter. The Changing World of the Executive. Times Books, New York, 1982.

Gilmore, Thomas and Brown, Robert. "Effective Leadership Succession as a Critical Event in Social Agencies." Administration in Social Work, Vol. 9 (4): 25-35, 1985 - 1986.

Harder, Paul; Kimmich, Madeleine: and Salamon, Lester. The San Francisco Bay Area Nonprofit Sector in a Time of Government Retrenchment. The Urban Institute Press, Washington D.C., 1985.

Herman, Robert. "Critical Events in the Management of Nonprofit Organizations: Initial Evidence." Journal of Voluntary Action Scholars, forthcoming, 1989.

Herman, Robert and Heimovics, Richard. "Effective Managers of Nonprofit Organizations." Prepared for the INDEPENDENT SECTOR Spring Research Forum, March 19-20, New York. 1987.

Hodgkinson, Virginia A. and Murray S. Weitzman. Dimensions of the Independent Sector. A Statistical Profile. Second Edition, Washington, D. C., 1986.
Hollander, Edwin P. Leadership Dynamics: A Practical Guide to Effective Relationships. Free Press, New York, 1978.

Independent Sector. Research-in-Progress, 1986 - 1987. A national Compilation of Research Projects on Philanthropy, Voluntary Action, and Not-for-Profit Activity. Washington, D.C., 1988.

Issa, Jeanetta and Herman, Robert. "Turnover Among Nonprofit Chief Executives: An Initial Investigation of Self-Reported Causes and Consequences." Paper presented at 1985 Annual Meeting of the Association of Voluntary Action Scholars, October 6-9, New Orleans, 1985.

Johnston, Denis and Gabriel Rudney. "Characteristics of Workers in Nonprofit Organizations." Monthly Labor Review Vol. 110, #7, pgs. 28-33, 1987.

Kanter, Rosabeth Moss. "Women Managers: Moving Up in a High Tech Society." In Farley, J., The Women in Management: Career and Family Issues. ILR Press, Ithaca, 1983.

Lippert, Paul G., Gutowski, M., & Salamon, Lester M. The Atlanta Nonprofit Sector in a Time of Government Retrenchment. Urban Institute Press, Washington, D.C., 1984.

Middleton, Melissa. "The Place and Power of Non-Profit Boards of Directors." Program on Non-Profit Organizations. Institution for Social and Policy Studies, Yale University. Working Paper No. 78, December 1983.

Middleton, Melissa. "Nonprofit Management: A Report on Current Research and Areas for Development." Program on Non-Profit Organizations. Institution for Social and Policy Studies, Yale University. Working Paper No. 108, February 1986.

Nielsen, Waldemar. The Golden Donors: A New Anatomy of the Great Foundations. Truman Talley Books/E.P. Dutton, New York, 1985.

O'Connell, Brian. The Board Member's Book. The Foundation Center, New York, 1985.
O'Connell, Brian. "Values Underlying Nonprofit Endeavor". Educating Managers of Nonprofit Organizations. In Michael O'Neill and Dennis R. Young, Eds. Praeger, New York, 1988.

Odendahl, Teresa, Boris, Elizabeth Trocolli, and Daniels, Arlene Kaplan. Working in Foundations: Career Patterns of Women and Men. The Foundation Center, New York, 1985.

O"Neill, Michael and Dennis R. Young, Eds. Educating Managers of Nonprofit Organizations. Praeger, New York, 1988.

Rudney, Gabriel. "A Quantitative Profile of the Nonprofit Sector." Program on Non-Profit Organizations. Institution for Social and Policy Studies, Yale University. Working Paper No. 40, November 1981.

Rudney, Gabriel and Weitzman, Murray. "Trends in Employment and Earnings in the Philanthropic Sector". Monthly Labor Review, Vol. 107, #9 (September), pgs. 16-20, 1984.

Sayles, Leonard R. Leadership: What Effective Managers Really Do...And How They Do It. McGraw-Hill, New York, 1979.

Schiff, Jerald and Janette Huffman. "Data Collection Plans for the Nonprofit Sector: What Do We Need To Know?" Prepared for the 1988 Spring Research Forum, Independent Sector, San Francisco, March, 1988.

Young, Dennis. "Executive Leadership in Nonprofit Organizations." In The Nonprofit Sector: A Research Handbook, pgs. 167-179, Yale University, 1987.

TABLE 4

Rankings Of Personal Qualities Needed
To Be A Successful Executive Director

Most Important Personal Quality

Label	Frequency	Percent
Humor	7	14
Vision / Big Picture	4	8
People Person	6	12
Honest / Ethical	2	4
Long Hours / Energy	7	14
Compassion	5	10
Patient / Listener	2	4
Centered / Belief in Self	8	16
No External Praise Needed	1	2
Oral Skills	3	6
Passion	5	10

Second Most Important Personal Quality

Label	Frequency	Percent
Humor	3	6
Vision / Big Picture	7	14
People Person	2	14
Written Skills	3	6
Honest / Ethical	4	8
Long Hours / Energy	1	2
Smart	6	12
Compassion	1	2
Tenacity / Stubborn	3	6
Patient / Listener	1	2
Centered / Belief in Self	1	2
No External Praise Needed	4	8
Oral Skills	1	2
Passion	9	18
Deal With Conflict	4	8

Third Most Important Personal Quality

Label	Frequency	Percent
Humor	2	4
Vision / Big Picture	7	14
People Person	9	18
Written Skills	1	2
Honest / Ethical	1	2
Long Hours / Energy	4	8
Smart	1	2
Compassion	3	6
Tenacity / Stubborn	5	10
Patient / Listener	2	4
Centered / Belief in Self	5	10
No External Praise Needed	2	4
Oral Skills	2	4
Passion	3	6
Deal With Conflict	3	6

APPENDIX B

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR INTERVIEW GUIDE

I. BACKGROUND

1. Did either of your parents' influence your career?

2. Mother's highest educational level or degree _____

3. Father's highest educational level or degree _____

4. Age: Sex: Ethnicity:

II. PREVIOUS WORK HISTORY

Starting with your first job, discuss the following features
of your earlier jobs:

A. Type of organization:
B. Method used to find/get this job:
C. Your Title:
D. Your Duties:
E. Motivation for Leaving:
F. How Long in each position:

III. OTHER EXPERIENCES

1.   Are there non-salaried experiences (school, volunteer work) that developed
     skills important to your career ?

2.   When you were preparing for a career did you intend to
     pursue a career in management ?

3.   Did you have a mentor (s) during college, work career? Age? Sex? Number?
     What, specifically, have they done for you?

IV. CURRENT WORK HISTORY

1.   [Title]:

2.   What factors were involved in deciding to take your present
      job?

3.   What is the current number of full-time paid employees [FTE] in your
      organization? [   ] Part-time? [   ]
      Volunteers ? [   ]

4.   How many people report directly to you?

5.   What is your current annual operating budget?

6.   What are the top three responsibilities in terms of importance ?

7.   Have these responsibilities changed over time? How?

8.   Which three job responsibilities consume most of your time ?

9.   What is the most satisfying aspect of this job?

10.   What is the most irritating/difficult aspect of this job?

11.   If you have an extremely tough management problem to solve and you're not sure what to do, whom are you likely to ask for advice?

12.   Is this decision based on friendship or the nature of the problem?

13.   Describe your Board and your relationships with them.
Size: Type: Style:

14.   If you were explaining to friends the qualities it takes to do this job well, what qualities would you describe?

15.   What would it take to get you to leave this position?

16.   A. In terms of the highest salary you expect to earn during   your career, where does this position fall on the scale?

B. When do you think you can achieve your salary goal?

17.   How does this current position fit into your overall career plan?

18.   Where do you see yourself five years from now?

19.   If you were offered a job at -----------, would you take it?

20.   Do you do any outside consulting?

21.   Do you sit on any boards?

22.   What professional organizations, if any, are important to your career development? Why?

23.   Do you have a mentor (s) now ? Age? Sex?

24.   Are you a mentor for anyone in your organization? Describe.

25. Is there anything unique to the nonprofit sector that is   important to you ?   What?   Why?

VI. FUTURE CONSIDERATIONS

1. Crystal ball: What opportunities or limitations do you see for yourself in this job or in the field? For those coming after you?

2. Do you plan to continue working in the nonprofit sector?
   Why? Why not?

3. Does your personal or family situation have a bearing on your   work or your career options?
   (i.e. family, # or ages of children, marital status)

4. Are there any important issues I've left out that you feel are important to the development of your career?

RESPONSES TO SELECTED VARIABLES

REASON FOR LEAVING PREVIOUS JOB - 1 / REASON - 2

1 = Challenge / Problems to Solve / Professional Growth
2 = Responsibilities
3 = Tired / Time to go
4 = Made me an offer / Opportunity Opened
5 = Accomplish something / Make a difference
6 = Promotion / Next logical step
7 = Close to home/family
8 = Quality of the organization/people

MAJOR JOB RESPONSIBILITIES

1 = External / Public Relations / Politics
2 = Financial management / Budget
3 = Working with board
4 = Motivate/develop staff / Internal Relations
5 = Vision / Direction / Set the tone/course / Plan for Future
6 = Raising money
7 = Daily operations / Paper work / management
8 = Take risks / Try new things/approaches

JOBTIME: WHAT TAKES UP MOST OF YOUR WORKING DAY

1 = Daily operations (paperwork)
2 = Fundraising
3 = Working with staff / Listening to personnel / Boost morale
4 = Negotiating with outside agents
5 = Board / Board development
6 = Same
7 = Marketing and public relations / Advertising

GREATEST JOB SATISFACTION

1 = Performance/service / Quality of product / Success
2 = Problem solving / Getting people to work together / Challenge
3 = Raising money / Securing financial future / Planning &   development
4 = Working with the Board
5 = Working with exciting, dynamic people
6 = Seeing others (staff) grow/succeed
7 = Making (good) things happen / Change / Community is better /
Organization moves forward
8 = Having influence / Power

GREATEST SOURSE OF JOB DISSATISFACTION

1 = Nothing
2 = Having to be tough / Make tough decisions regarding money, people
3 = Politics (external)
4 = Raising money
5 = Day to day paperwork, housekeeping
6 = Incompetent, uninvolved, inactive Board
7 = Personnel issues
8 = Getting the staff to work together
9 = Long hours / Hard work / Draining

MANAGEMENT PROBLEM: WHO DO YOU GO TO

1 = Staff/Managers
2 = Board members
2A = Board president
3 = Outside (NPO) peer
4 = Outside (For-Profit) peer
5 = Outside profits (attorneys, etc.)
6 = Boss
7 = Spouse
8 = God
9 = Kitchen Cabinet (experts)
10 = Consultants

PERSONAL QUALITIES NECESSARY TO BE SUCCESSFUL

1 = Sense of humor
2 = Vision / big picture / overall view / s
3 = People person
4 = Written skills
5 = Honest / ethical / stand up for beliefs
6 = Workaholic / long hours / little externa
7 = Smart /   intelligent / bright
8 = Concern / compassion / humane / caring f
9 = Stubborn / tenacity / ability to persuad
10 = Good listener /patient
11 = Believe in yourself/in what you're doing /
12 = Create own internal satisfaction / no nee_ ._. _..._...._ praise 13 = Good
     talker / persuasive / oral skills
14 = Passion
15 = Deal with conflict

52