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ABSTRACT

This investigation conducted a field correlation study to test and understand the potential relationship between networking strategies and degree of job satisfaction of Greater Columbus, Ohio managers. Few empirically-based studies on networking activities are extant in the relevant literature and none were located that examined the relationship interplay regarding networking and job satisfaction. The research incorporated and applied the social exchange theory as a guide for predicting the networking-job satisfaction association. Potentially moderating variables included in the analysis were gender, race, age, tenure, education, marital status, salary, job position, number of promotions, and functional area.

This study hypothesized that managers who engaged in higher levels of networking would experience higher degrees of job satisfaction. The results from administering the Networking Practices Questionnaire (NPQ) were compared to results from administering the short form Minnesota Job Satisfaction Survey Questionnaire (MSQ). The study group entailed men and women managers representing a stratified random sample from The Largest Employers Directory published quarterly by the Greater Columbus Chamber of Commerce located in downtown Columbus, Ohio.
The findings indicated a statistically significant relationship between networking and job position on job satisfaction. The relationships between gender, race, age, tenure, education, marital status, salary, number of promotions, and functional area on job satisfaction were not statistically significant.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

The concept of networking has become a popular topic in recent years. Networking is hailed as the most efficient and savvy way of getting things done (Ibarra, 1991; 1993), getting ahead in life (National Business Employment Weekly, 1994), achieving career success (Rothstein & Davey, 1995; Daley, 1996), and a host of other positive benefits (Baker, 1994). Networking is en-vogue and practical implementation and research interest in networking is burgeoning. Interestingly, a 1994 U.S. Department of Labor study found that job seekers who employed networking strategies found jobs four times faster than job seekers relying on more traditional job search approaches (National Business Employment Weekly, 1994). Furthermore, Gary & Herr (1998) point out in Workforce Education: The Basics that 70 percent of all employment is filled through the informal job market, which is characterized by “word of mouth” recruiting and hiring procedures (Gary & Herr, 1998).

The popular press (Kanter, 1989; Best, 1990; Baker, 1994), consultants (Peters & Waterman, 1982; Peters, 1992), and writers (Fraser, 1994) have also
hopped on the networking bandwagon, advising readers and organizations to tap "connections," build relationships, and make networking contacts.

Organizations have also begun to adopt a networking perspective (Ibarra, 1991; Bahrami, 1992; Nohria & Eccles, 1992; Baker, 1994). Successful companies are dismantling their traditional, centralized hierarchical structures and redesigning themselves into network organizations (Nohria & Eccles, 1992; Baker, 1994). Organizations such as General Electric, Advanced Data Products (ADP), Fruit of the Loom and others offer in-house training programs teaching their employees the importance of and techniques for networking (Peters & Waterman, 1982; Nohria & Eccles, 1992; Peters, 1992; Baker, 1994). More and more organizational meetings and conferences (professional and social) are promoting themselves as opportunities for "networking." Ryan & Imel (1996) noted that employer participation in school-to-work initiatives was bolstered by the employer's perception of such programs as opportunities for networking with other employers.

Networking has gained a considerable amount of attention in recent years. With all the public display, it is easy to get caught up in the fad and forget about substance. If networking is certain to yield numerous positive outcomes such as job, career, and life success, then empirical research should bear out such outcomes; and, the results should be borne consistently. One specific outcome
that is germane to this inquiry and that should be logically associated with the employment of networking strategies is job satisfaction. Drawing on this logic, one related outcome of networking should be job satisfaction. Managers who invest themselves in the execution of networking behaviors within and outside their organizations should at least experience a corresponding measure of job satisfaction.

By way of broad generalities, finding research justification in support of such a hypothesis was problematic. Particularly, a paucity of empirical research was available that documented or supported the conjectured association between increased levels of networking and higher degrees of job satisfaction. Hence, it was in direct aim to study this hypothesis and scientifically investigate this potential relationship that this researcher endeavored.

Purpose

The theoretical efforts of this research attempted to answer the general question: "Is there a relationship between networking activity and job satisfaction?" It is noteworthy to clarify that this research did not set out to prove anything. Strictly speaking, as this inquiry proceeded it sought only to examine the association between networking and job satisfaction.
This investigation drew from the existing theory of social exchange to produce a distinct understanding of the association between networking and job satisfaction. The researcher attempted to build upon previous research findings on networking (Yukl & Wall & Lepsinger, 1990; Michaels, 1991; Ibarra, 1993) in order to make the formal prediction about the relevance between varying levels of networking and associated degrees of job satisfaction. The findings of this dissertation also attempted to extend previous research findings concerning managers (Mintzberg, 1973; Kotter, 1982; Kaplan, 1984; Ibarra, 1991, 1993; Carroll & Teo, 1996).

This research sought to address the limited knowledge pertaining to the relationship between networking and job satisfaction. Specifically, this study examined the relationship between particular networking activities and degree of job satisfaction for managers who represent the 590 largest employers in Greater Columbus, Ohio. This research utilized the framework of social exchange theory to attempt to analyze and explain the phenomena of job satisfaction as it relates to the interaction phenomena of networking. Finally, this research aimed to contribute to the general body of knowledge necessary to lead to possible resolution of the current problem of job dissatisfaction with which employers, academics, managers, and workforce educators must grapple.
This study attempted to investigate and report tests of a series of research questions regarding the networking-job satisfaction association using data collected from a researcher-designed demographic questionnaire, short form ©Minnesota Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (Weiss, Dawis, England, and Lofquist, 1977), and the Networking Practices Questionnaire (Michaels, 1991). On the one hand, this research constitutes an attempt to generate new findings using objective measures and a random sample on a diverse group of managers employed in a diverse array of companies and organizations in Greater Columbus, Ohio. On the other hand, this work builds upon the continued "research program" on managers (Carroll & Teo, 1996).

The researcher gathered and analyzed scientific data in order to provide an expanded understanding and heightened awareness of specific networking activities that are related to job satisfaction. The study investigated increased networking activity as a potential correlate to increased degrees of job satisfaction. In addition, examining the relationship of the foregoing variables can also help in elaborating the line of research inquiry of managers. Thus, the general purpose advanced in this investigation is trilaterally aimed to elucidate the following interrelated and highly important topics—managers, networking, and job satisfaction. Specifically, this research investigation endeavored to contribute to (1) the expansion of the knowledge base about modern managers; (2) the current
knowledge about networking; and (3) the generation of useful data for managers, workforce educators, employers, and employees who seek a practical means for achieving job and career satisfaction efficiently and quickly through relationships with people.

Assumptions

The theoretical basis upon which this study was developed is the theory of social exchange as advanced by various social exchange theorists, namely Peter Blau (1964). Also, the study gleaned explications of the theory from the International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences (1968). Social exchange theory is undergirded by several assumptions. Those assumptions are hereby capitulated: (a) Individuals have the freedom of choice that allows them to choose options among various different alternatives in various social situations. (b) People engage in activities (e.g., networking) as a means of obtaining goals (e.g., job satisfaction). (c) Any action provides some rewards and also involves some costs. (d) Rewards need not be strictly tangible, but can include intangibles such as love, power, prestige, respect, and status. (e) Individuals will attempt to maximize rewards and minimize costs (Michener, DeLamater, Schwartz, 1986).

In addition to the aforementioned theoretical assumptions, social exchange also assumes that the exchange process proceeds in light of the following
activities: (a) People anticipate that associating with others will result in attainment of certain anticipated goals: hence, individuals will not interact unless both parties believe that their interaction will be mutually rewarding. (b) Association and interaction activities (e.g., networking) involve some cost (e.g., time, money, or opportunity costs) to participants. (c) Association leads to social interaction (e.g., lunch or dinner outing). (d) Interaction gives rise to goal achievement or a reward (e.g., job satisfaction). (e) Satisfaction or the receipt of a goal or reward induces an obligation on part of the recipient. (f) The obligation induces the need for reciprocation to the reward provider. (g) The obligation on part of the reward recipient is not assured to be discharged: therefore, trust is needed on part of the reward provider. Thus, trust forms the basis of social exchange. (h) If the reward recipient discharges the obligation, reciprocation thereby occurs. (i) Trust accorded the recipient of the reward is therefore strengthened and leads to the provision of another, perhaps more risky (larger) reward. The social exchange process therefore becomes self-generating and begins again.

Finally, two additional assumptions are also made for this study: First, it is assumed that managers studied in the sample desire to execute networking activities consciously or unconsciously as a means for achieving some measure of job satisfaction in their present positions and in their careers. Second, it was
assumed that the managers could accurately assess their level of networking and
degree of job satisfaction, and would therefore respond accurately to the survey
questionnaires. Taken together the foregoing assumptions were incorporated into
this study and directed the investigation.

Statement of the Problem

Of the limited research efforts devoted to networking this researcher could
locate, few of them build the study upon theoretical foundations. Much of the
research on networking has been descriptive and to a large extent the research
focused on upper level executives and a single organization. Consequently, very
few studies on networking employ *a priori* hypothetical formulations to confirm
or disconfirm theoretical constructs by which the study is guided.

This research endeavored to investigate three main topics: networking, job
satisfaction, and managers. The independent study of any of these topics is
neither recent nor new. However, the investigator's search of literature indicated
that no study could be located that investigated the interplay of these three topics.

Henry Mintzberg's (1973) classic work, *The Nature of Managerial Work*,
sparked the initial interest of managerial behavior as a research focus.
Mintzberg's unit of analysis (managers) was by no means ground breaking.
Mintzberg's findings, interpretations, and assertions, however, were unequivocally ground breaking. Mintzberg's findings denounced the prevailing classical image of the manager as a proactive, rational, dispassionately analytical, strictly professional, and plan-oriented decision-maker. On the contrary, Mintzberg asseverated managers to spend most of their time involved in large numbers of short, unconnected, oral interactions of a mainly reactive kind (Kotter, 1982; Carroll & Teo, 1996). Indeed, Mintzberg advanced the incipient notion of the reactive, irrational, extensively interactive, highly social, and communicative manager. In interpreting these findings, Mintzberg thus toppled the conventional rational manager-image. His iconoclastic findings thereby called attention to the manager's role as liaison (characterized by making and maintaining contacts outside the formal organization) and information disseminator (broadcasting and distributing information among co-workers and subordinates (Carroll & Teo, 1996)). Mintzberg's groundbreaking, yet influential, findings created a new level of interest surrounding the study of managers.

In light of Mintzberg's ground breaking work, and the ample interest it generated, Carroll & Teo (1996) comparatively maintain that evaluated as a "research program of [more than] 20 years' duration." research on managers in general (and managerial networking activities in specific) finds few replicative studies. very limited sample size studies, narrowly defined managerial sample
population subsets, and overall exiguous attention given to the manager's larger social networks and relationships. The centrality of relationships to managerial jobs, and the lack of theoretical development on the subject of managers, evinces the need for deeper understanding of managerial networking behavior.

Mintzberg's (1973) findings glimpsed the necessity of managers to network by building relationships with co-workers and those outside the formal organization. As Kotter (1982), Kaplan (1984), Yukl & Wall & Lepsinger (1990), Michaels (1991), Ibarra (1993), Carroll & Teo (1996), and other researchers assert, managers are a group that constantly networks to meet job obligations. Notwithstanding, theoretical attention and few empirical developments are extant regarding these assertions. And, to date, this researcher has found no research evidence investigating the interplay between managerial networking behavior and job satisfaction in the related body of literature.

There is evident need, as derived from theory and literature, for a better understanding concerning the relationship between networking and job satisfaction among managers. So few reported studies abound on the networking and job satisfaction nexus that Ibarra (1993) recommended that research be conducted to explore this relationship. In addition, Ibarra specifically proposed the need for such research to formulate and test propositions concerning types of personal networks that lead to desirable outcomes, such as job satisfaction. In a
study on the social networks of managers. Carroll & Teo (1996) augmented Ibarra’s proposition by accentuating the need for study on the networking and job satisfaction interplay. In attempting to spur new research on job rewards that might be associated with [a manager’s] developed social network. Carroll & Teo (1996) concluded that perhaps managers must develop network ties to and relationships with co-workers to perform satisfactorily on the job. Consequently, managers who can develop such network ties may derive the benefits of satisfactory job performance.

In light of the foregoing need, this study addressed the limited knowledge pertaining to the networking and job satisfaction relationship. The researcher examined the relationship between specific managerial networking activities and degree of job satisfaction to explain and predict the phenomena of job satisfaction based on the predictor, managerial networking.

**Research Questions**

This study identified and researched the relationship between managerial networking behaviors and the associated degrees of job satisfaction of managers employed in the 590 largest organizations in Greater Columbus, Ohio. The major area of inquiry pertained to whether or not and the degree to which networking and job satisfaction correlated. Specifically, this research posited the following
question: "Do managers who employ a larger number of networking behaviors experience higher degrees of job satisfaction than managers who employ a smaller number of networking behaviors?" In addition, this study focused on the following questions:

1. What is the current demographic profile of managers listed in *The Largest Employers Directory* (1998) as contact sources for each of the 590 largest employers in Greater Columbus, Ohio?

2. What is the relationship between networking and job satisfaction?

3. What is the relationship among networking, gender, and job satisfaction, when networking or gender is held constant?

4. What is the relationship among networking, race, and job satisfaction, when networking or race is held constant?

5. What is the relationship among networking, age, and job satisfaction, when networking or age is held constant?

6. What is the relationship among networking, number of years with organization, and job satisfaction, when networking or number of years with organization is held constant?

7. What is the relationship among networking, level of education, and job satisfaction, when networking or level of education is held constant?
8. What is the relationship among networking, marital status, and job satisfaction, when networking or marital status is held constant?

9. What is the relationship among networking, salary, and job satisfaction, when networking or salary is held constant?

10. What is the relationship among networking, job position, and job satisfaction, when networking or job position is held constant?

11. What is the relationship among networking, number of promotions, and job satisfaction, when networking or number of promotions is held constant?

12. What is the relationship among networking, functional area, and job satisfaction, when networking or functional area is held constant?

13. What is the relationship among networking, gender, age, tenure, education level, marital status, salary, job position, number of promotions, race, major functional area, and job satisfaction, when networking, gender, age, tenure, education level, marital status, salary, job position, number of promotions, race, or major functional area is held constant?
Delimitations

The data was collected during the months of February, March, April, and May of 1998. The study only addressed variables identified and specified in the Demographic Questionnaire (henceforth, DQ), Networking Practices Questionnaire (Michaels, 1991) (henceforth, NPQ), and the short form ©Minnesota Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (henceforth, MSQ). The population of the study only consisted of managers identified by The Largest Employers Directory (1998) (henceforth, Directory) as the organizations' key contact source. Thus, the study population represented managers (or organizational key contact sources) who individually represents one of the 590 largest employer organizations identified in the Directory. The Largest Employers Directory (1998) is published quarterly by the Greater Columbus Chamber of Commerce located in downtown Columbus, Ohio. The population for the study consisted of a randomly selected cohort of managers.

Limitations

Several limitations place restrictions on this study. The findings of the study can only be generalized to the unique populations of the participants. The findings are limited to the honesty of the respondents in completing the questionnaires. The findings are limited to the thoroughness of the respondents in completing the questionnaires. The findings are limited to the validity and
reliability of the questionnaires. The participants completed the questionnaires based upon their comprehension and understanding of the step-by-step instructions explicated by the questionnaire instructions. Finally, only a few of the many variables that may possibly influence networking and job satisfaction were selected.

**Theoretical Framework**

A theory is a set "...of constructs (concepts), definitions, and propositions that presents a systematic view of phenomena by specifying relations among variables, with the purpose of explaining the phenomena (Kerlinger, 1973, p. 11)." In this section, the theoretical notion of social exchange is elucidated vis-a-vis the hypothesized association between networking (major predictor variable) and job satisfaction (major criterion variable) and other demographic variables.

The impetus of the proceeding theoretical overview is not to explicate an intensive, detailed analysis of the dynamic process of social exchange: nor to extirpate the deep psychological motives which govern decision-making in human interaction: nor to elucidate a systematic theoretical structure on social exchange. Such foci would be far beyond the purview of this research, and even beyond the scope of a text on social exchange (Blau, 1964, p. 2). It is the fundamental intent of this theoretic examination to outline how the simpler processes of social
exchange can be utilized to clarify the more complex, dynamic phenomena of the networking-job satisfaction interplay.

The basic ideas to be illuminated were gleaned from four main sources:

Social Exchange Overview

Most individual satisfactions are grounded in actions by and interactions with others. Friendship, camaraderie, intellectual stimulation, conversation, congeniality, sexual intimacy, prestige, power, recognition, acceptance and other related attainments can necessitate the inducements of others to behave in certain ways. As a sociologist, Georg Simmel (1908) noted in Soziologie "all contacts among men rest on the schema of giving and returning the equivalence." Blau (1964) articulated in Exchange and Power in Social Life, that the social associations individuals establish allow their desires and interests to find expression and realization.
Most human satisfactions are rooted and grounded in interaction with others. The interaction situation may be as simple as a smile in exchange for a smile, or a greeting for a greeting, a hand shake for a hand shake, a free lunch for a previous free lunch, or equal pay for equal work. In giving as well as receiving, the fact that many rewards which an individual seeks can only be achieved and received through interaction with others forms the basis of social exchange (Blau, 1964).

The notion of exchange is so ubiquitous and pervasive in everyday life that its operation is generally assumed. Participants in social exchange are often not cognizant of the complex patterns of behavior, interactive processes, and social conduct at play in the interaction context. In daily life an individual is perennially involved with encounters and situations where he or she gives something (e.g., advice, favor, time, or assistance) in return for something else (a favor, advice, dinner, or assistance) received in the past, or in anticipation of receiving something in the future. Subsequently association pervades the daily intercourse and interpersonal relationships between individuals (Blau, 1968). It is these daily, pervasive interactions and patterns of behaviors that social exchange seeks to explain.

Individuals enter into exchange relationships stemming from two major impetii: First, generally individuals do not have the wherewithal to independently
satisfy all of their needs. Hence, and conversely, individuals are dependent on others. Second, individuals are generally neither inclined nor willing to provide others with resources, advice, products, information, or services completely “free of charge.” In turn, therefore, individuals receiving something in a social exchange interaction tend to offer something in exchange (Baron & Byrne, 1977).

Social exchange theory represents an attempt to explain human interactive behaviors (Blau, 1964). One fundamental construct of the social exchange approach is the assumption that individuals enter new social associations because there is an expectation that such associations provide rewards. These associations are continued, because further association will yield continued rewards. Social exchange theory concedes that not all needs or interests are satisfied directly via the social associations. For example, needs or interests such as hunger, sleep, love, or shelter may not be induced to fulfillment. Nonetheless, the expectation of other rewards to be gained prompts individuals to interact and form associations with other individuals. The desire to fulfill some interest or want is the bedrock of social exchange.

That individuals seek to obtain rewards or satisfy interests through others conceptualizes the interaction process of social exchange (Blau, 1964). If an individual expects association with others will yield some reward or interest, then the individual will interact with others in order to realize those rewards. In
reverse fashion. If others expect association with the same individual will yield some reward or interest, then others will interact with that individual in order to realize the reward or interest. Particularly, either parties’ desire to interact with the other is predicated on the foundational assumption that both expect rewards or interests from the interaction experience. Therefore, both parties must convey the potential for yielding a reward or interest, thus a reason for association, in order for the other party to be interested in interacting with the other (Blau, 1964).

**Social Exchange as a Mosaic**

Social exchange can best be conceived as a mosaic of several theories. Indeed, no single, unified set “…of constructs (concepts), definitions, and propositions…” are extant which systematically specifies the phenomena of social exchange (Blau, 1964). Specifically, the social exchange perspective is an amalgamation of at least five approaches that access and incorporate the basic ideas of social exchange theory.

In a sense each theoretician’s contribution to the perspective of social exchange represents a uniquely colored-tile of the mosaic of social exchange. Subsequently, much of the body of literature related to social exchange conceptualizes the theory as the “theories” of social exchange.
While much of the social exchange perspective is derived from economic theory, other theories of social exchange have originated in the disciplines of psychology, anthropology, sociology, and social psychology. Much of the early work in social exchange was intended to explain interactions within groups. However, as the theories developed, they were applied to broader ranges of associational contexts and social interactions (Ausmus, 1995).

**Five Theories of Social Exchange**

According to the *International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences* (1968), two common themes connect social exchange theories: The common theme is that relationship interactions are viewed by participants in terms of rewards, benefits, satisfaction, and costs. The second common theme conceptualizes the notion of reinforcement. Behaviors perceived as rewarding will tend to be repeated or reinforced. Outside of these two themes, numerous distinctions of nature, antecedents, and consequences of either rewarding or costly behaviors underlie the theories of social exchange. To clarify, a brief explication of the distinctions in theoretical approaches should be illuminating. A brief summary of the five major theories—operant conditioning theory (Homans, 1961), interdependence theory (Thiabut & Kelley, 1959), equity theory (Walster, Walster, & Berscheid,
1978). resource theory (Foa & Foa, 1976) and economic theory (Blau, 1964)—follows:

**Operant Conditioning Theory**

Homans (1961) provided the first comprehensive articulation of social exchange as a means of explaining social exchange behavior. Homans derived his conceptualization from a behavioral psychology viewpoint. Homans applied the principles of operant conditioning to the social interaction process of individuals. The central contribution Homans made to the mosaic of social exchange theory is his postulation that individuals repeat behaviors they find rewarding; and the amount and kind of repeated behavior is related to the amount and kind of reward and punishment (Homans, 1961; Ausmus, 1995).

**Interdependence Theory**

The social exchange theory developed by Thibaut & Kelley (1959) was primarily intended to explain behavior in small groups (Ausmus, 1995). The theory of interdependence is based on an economic metaphor. Interdependence theory conceptualizes social interaction behaviors into one of two functional categories: "valuable" or "not valuable." Interdependence theory also asserts that social behavior depends on the exchange of behaviors. Thibaut & Kelley (1959) believed that individuals seek to maximize rewards (by engaging in valuable
relationships) and minimize (by not engaging in low value relationships) costs associated in relationships (Thibaut & Kelley, 1959; Ausmus, 1995).

Thibaut & Kelley (1959) assumed that individuals were selfish. Individuals will thereby carefully calculate the anticipated payoffs that would result from certain chosen interactions. If the payoff is assured to be profitable, this expected gain becomes the basis for interaction. Only relationships that assure a highest possible payoff-outcome will be chosen for building a relationship. Because individuals are dependent on one another for the realization of these calculated payoffs, Thibaut & Kelley (1959) termed this exchange process as interdependence theory as opposed to social exchange theory (Ausmus, 1995).

**Resource Exchange Theory**

Thibaut & Kelley (1959) provided an expanded model of social exchange that incorporated the ideas of interdependence in relationships and the internal activity of cost/benefit analyzing. Social psychologists, Foa & Foa (1976), further contributed to the mosaic of social exchange theory by proposing "resource exchange." They believed that an individual's perception of an exchange situation is deeply rooted in his or her thought patterns.

Foa & Foa (1976) presented two governing themes of resource dependency theory: (a) relationship behavior consists of giving and/or taking
away one or more resources, and (b) related resources are traded more frequently than unrelated resources (Ausmus, 1995). According to Foa & Foa (1976) an individual will be content to receive love in exchange for prestige since the two resources are viewed to be similar (Foa & Foa, 1976).

**Equity Theory**

Equity theory also contributes to the mosaic of social exchange. Equity theory attempts to explain social exchange relationships and associations from the cognitive point of view. Equity theory has its basis in psychology (Ausmus, 1995). Equity theory centrally asserts that self-interest remains the primary focus in exchange interactions. Equity theory proponents, Walster, Berscheid, & Walster (1976) believed that individuals contribute as well as make withdrawals in their relationships. “Inputs” are conceived as rewards or costs. Therefore, a person can make “positive” or “negative” contributions to the relationship. Equity theory represents positive inputs presented as assets and negative inputs as liabilities (Walster, Walster & Berscheid, 1976). Equity theory contributes to the mosaic of social exchange by being interested in how individuals manage the tension between equitable and inequitable behaviors.

**Economic Theory**

According to the book, *Exchange and Power and Social Life* (1964), the social arena is seen as an extended market in which each individual seeks to
maximize profits (Blau, 1964; Ausmus, 1995). This central thesis of the economic aspect of social exchange was most popularly conceptualized by Peter Blau as the "economic metaphor" of social exchange (Blau, 1964). This economic metaphor is a common tile incorporated throughout the social mosaic conceptualization of all exchange theories. Blau's (1964) understanding of social exchange expanded the earlier works of Homans (1961). According to Blau (1964), participants in the social exchange relationship seek a reward from one another. This sought reward gives rise to mutual attraction on the part of both parties. This attraction leads to an association or interaction. Both participants take a risk in entering the relationship because neither participants' goals are assured being met. Thus, according to Blau (1964), cooperation is not ever guaranteed but is always potentially unstable.

The foregoing paragraphs examined the five theories which conceive basic tenets of social exchange theory. As stated, social exchange can best be conceptualized as a mosaic. The foundational work of each theorists—Homans (1961), Thibaut & Kelley (1959), Walster, Walster, & Berscheid (1978), Foa & Foa (1976), and Blau (1964)—represents a unique tile which contributes to the larger formation of the general theory of social exchange. Thus, social exchange theory is actually a means for categorizing a variation of theories that attempt to explain human social associations.
Process of Social Exchange

The assumptions of social exchange provide the basis for the process of the social exchange interactions. The foregoing elaboration can be encapsulated into several propositions which construct the framework of social exchange.

Each individual actor in the exchange relationship comes with a need. Satisfaction of the need constitutes a benefit reward of the relationship. In addition, the satisfaction of that need initiates the exchange process. Social exchange maintains that individuals will seek to establish a stable relationship only if the relationship is perceived to be profitable and rewarding. An individual will engage in activities (such as networking) as a means of obtaining rewards (e.g., job satisfaction). The anticipation that associating with others will result in attainment of those rewards is a driving reason for establishing the relationship. Individuals will not interact unless both parties believe that their interaction will be mutually rewarding. The profitability of a relationship determines the attractiveness of the relationship to the individual participants. Exchange theory predicts that alternative relationships which are expected to be profitable will be viewed as attractive and thus a reason to establish the relationship.

Association and interaction activities (e.g., networking) involve some cost (e.g., time, money, or opportunity costs) to participants. Association leads to social interaction. Interaction gives rise to goal achievement or a reward (e.g., job
satisfaction). Satisfaction or the receipt of a goal or reward induces an obligation on part of the recipient. The obligation induced is the need for reciprocation to the reward provider.

It is not guaranteed that the obligation on part of the reward recipient is going to be discharged in kind. Uncertainty thereby enters the interaction relationship. The participant who provides a benefit essentially does so taking a chance that a benefit will in like manner be returned. Trust, therefore, is a critical component of the social exchange theory. Trust is needed on the part of both participants—reward provider and reward recipient. Trust forms the basis of social exchange. If the reward participant does not discharge the obligation, trust is compromised. If trust is compromised, the association is obstructed. Consequently the relationship terminates because only activities which provide rewards continue over time.

If the obligation is discharged in kind, reciprocation occurs and trust is thereby strengthened and enhanced. Participants come to grow in trust of one another as the result of their (now) mutually beneficial past experience. Given this equitable experience, participants engage again in an interaction. This new interaction is an outgrowth of the earlier exchange association. Social exchange postulates that this new interaction will yield a larger (hence, more risky) reward
thus commencing the exchange process. The social exchange process therefore becomes self-generating and renewing (Blau, 1964).

**Application of Social Exchange**

Theories of social exchange are attempts to provide comprehensive, explanatory models of social interaction behavior that can be applied to varieties of social interactions.

Several research efforts have used the theoretical framework of social exchange to study various interaction behaviors with positive results as to the importance of networking in human functioning. Tichy et al. (1979) employed the notion of transactional content of networks and the exchange of power, information and favors. Mintzberg (1973) advanced the notion of the manager's role as liaison. In this capacity as liaison managers establish "exchange relationships." Benveniste (1989) posited that network relationships are essentially and fundamentally built upon foundations of exchange (Michaels, 1991). Networking relationships persist therefore because individuals in the network relationship are motivated by exchanges of things each participant needs from the other. Kanter (1977) employed case studies with a small group of managers. Her findings revealed that managers exchange a lot of "I owe you's" as they perform or receive favors from other managers (Michaels, 1991). Kotter's
1982) study on managers concluded with the proposition that managers engage in network exchange relationships as opposed to holding an "I-can-do-anything" mentality. These studies and their findings elucidated and clarified the centrality of social exchange as a guideline for explaining networking behavior.

Social exchange theory was found to be relevant in explaining the networking behaviors to be studied in this research. Therefore, the theoretic construct of social exchange, particularly as espoused by Peter Blau (1964) seemed appropriate as a theoretical guide to this study. The foregoing paragraphs delineate how the social exchange theory was applied to this research.

Social exchange theory is not narrowly circumscribed to rational, disciplined conduct strictly oriented toward material gain. Social exchange engenders a broad range of interactive strivings toward rewarding social experiences. Such strivings may be nested in humanitarian ideals, spiritual values, emotional satisfaction, or philanthropic goals. This aspect of social exchange connects well with the specified population for this study. For example, managers are a group which must constantly interact with others (Kotter, 1982). Managers must interact with a diverse group of individuals inside and outside the organization to get things done (Ibarra, 1993). Therefore, managers engage in a broad range of "strivings toward rewarding social experiences"—in this case, job satisfaction. Also, managers are a group whose decision making and conduct do
not strictly align themselves with order, rationality, and predictability (Mintzberg, 1973; Carroll & Teo, 1996). Rather, managerial behavior exhibits more irrationality and unpredictability. Taken together, the researcher determined that the use of managers as a unit of analysis would be an important component of the study. Further, the use of managers as an analytic group would assist in applying and developing the theory of social exchange.

Networking is a refinement of the economic theory of exchange approach. Networking may be related to the satisfaction of certain unmet needs which participants bring to the context of a social interaction.

The growing interest and inquiry about networking calls for greater sophistication in understanding the relationship of networking strategies to job satisfaction. Thus, this study researched the relationship between networking activities and job satisfaction and was guided by the economic theory of social exchange framework and the theory's assumptions. Hence, the overarching purpose of this study was to offer the theoretical perspective of social exchange as framework for examining the relationship between networking and job satisfaction, using multivariate analytic techniques.
Summary

The main concentration of this research was to explain the interplay of networking and job satisfaction. The foregoing chapter (1) introduced the study, asserted the need for this study, and explained its purpose. From a theory development standpoint, this chapter explicated the social exchange theory as a framework upon which to advance this study and by which to formulate a paradigm so that the hypothesized correlation between managerial networking and the phenomena of job satisfaction might be tested and understood.

Chapter 2 will analyze the research that has been done on networking behaviors, explain major common themes in the literature, identify disparities in the literature, and discuss suggestions related to future, related literature reviews.

Chapter 3 will outline the methodology employed in the research and design of this study.

Chapter 4 will provide the results of the empirical test of the social exchange theory and will attempt to assess the tenability of the major research hypothesis: "Do managers who employ a larger number of networking behaviors experience higher degrees of job satisfaction than managers who employ a smaller number of networking behaviors?" The research utilized statistical procedures to test the hypothetical association between networking and job satisfaction.
Chapter 5 utilizes the descriptive and predictive findings from Chapter 4 and the research study to support or not support prior research. Chapter 5 notes the contributions of this study to the general body of knowledge pertaining to managerial networking and job satisfaction. Also, chapter 5 highlights implications regarding future related research needs appropriate to the refinement of the social exchange theory and the relationship between networking and various demographic factors on job satisfaction. Finally, Chapter 5 concludes with a summary of the findings along with implications and recommendations for future study.

Definition of Terms

The researcher provides a list of terms below to assist the reader in understanding various concepts and terms that are unique to the study, subject to several interpretations, or technical in nature. Listed below are definitions of terms used throughout the study:

**Formal Networking** - Formal networking represents the interaction that takes place with a manager within the organization in which the manager is a part (Ibarra, 1992).
**Homophily** - The tendency for people to interact more with those who are similar to them in some identifiable way (Levinson, 1978). For purposes of this study, homophily was operationally defined as a manager's network that includes managers of similar identifiable characteristics as age, gender, department, organization, position, salary, or functional area.

**Informal Networking** - informal networking represents the interaction that takes place with a manager outside of the organization in which the manager is a part (Ibarra, 1992). Informal networking can take place in a wide area of places and times. Some forums for informal networking include clubs, religious institutions, conferences, clubs, or country clubs.

**Interaction** - "Interaction denotes the reciprocal influencing of the acts of person and groups, usually through communication." (Gould & Kolb, 1964, p. 657).

**Job Satisfaction (JS)** - Job satisfaction is constitutively defined as the extent to which employees like their jobs. It entails a pleasurable emotional state, or feeling, resulting from the appraisal of one's job as achieving or facilitating the achievement of one's job values. (Stamps, 1997). For purposes of this research.
job satisfaction was operationally defined and measured by summated scores on
the self-administered short form of the Minnesota Job Satisfaction Survey (MSQ).
The MSQ is a self-administered questionnaire. Each of the 20-items contains
questions that are related to the notion of attitude toward the respondent's job. The
ratings of all 20-items were summated and a mean networking score was
calculated.

**Manager** - A manager is someone who coordinates the activities, work,
and tasks of others through planning, organizing, coaching, leading, solving
problems, acting as liaison, and controlling behavior (Kotter, 1982). For purposes
of this study, a manager was represented as the individual identified by the
Largest Employer Directory (published by the Greater Columbus, Ohio Chamber
of Commerce) as the key contact source for one of the 590 largest employer
organizations listed in the Directory. The manager represents his or her respective
organization, is employed in one of the largest employer organizations, and has
his or her name and title listed in the Largest Employer Directory for his or her
respective employer. This manager is responsible for the planning, organizing,
coaching and leadership of those employees within his or her sphere of
accountability.
Mentor - An experienced, productive manager who can relate to a less experienced employee while facilitating his or her personal development for the benefit of the individual as well as the organization (Kram, 1985). For purposes of this study, mentor was operationally defined as an experienced individual included in the manager's network of relationships for the manager's personal growth and development.

Mentoring - Willingly sharing one's wisdom, experiences, and resources, usually in a one-on-one relationship with another individual (Fraser, p. 331). For purposes of this study, mentoring was operationally defined as one of the key characteristics of managerial networking behavior.

Network - The contacts of family, friends, social acquaintances, employees with whom one engages in networking (Ibarra, 1992). For purposes of this study, a network was operationally defined as the number and types of contacts a manager maintains. These contacts may include bosses, co-workers, peers, subordinates, vendors, friends, family, neighbors and a broad list of individuals.
**Networking**- "Socializing informally: developing contacts with people who are a source of information and support; maintaining contacts through periodic interaction, including visits, telephone calls, correspondence, and attendance at meetings and social events" (Yukl, 1989, p.129). For purposes of this research, networking was operationally defined and measured by the mean score on the 34-item, 5-point Likert-type measurement instrument, *Networking Practices Questionnaire* (NPQ). The NPQ is a self-administered questionnaire. Each of the 34-items contains questions that relate to the networking behavior characteristics. The ratings of all 34-items were summated and a mean networking score was calculated.

**Social exchange**- Interactions in which one agrees to trade something one possesses or can provide, for something another person possesses or can offer (Baron & Byrne, 1977, p. 509).

**Social network**- The set of interpersonal relationships associated with the position(s) a person occupies (Michner, DeLamater, Schwartz, 1986, p. 571). For purpose of this study, social network was operationally defined as the individuals with whom a manager associates in order to get things done.
CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

This chapter provides a review of the research studies which guided this study. The review attempts to illuminate key themes of networking. Cooper's (1985) article: "A Taxonomy of Literature Reviews" aided this analysis and was the navigating tool that directed this review.

Four sections divide this chapter. The first three sections attempt to answer three distinct questions: (1) "What is networking?" (2) "What are the common themes of networking in the relevant literature?" (3) "What are the disparities in the relevant literature?" The review discovered that a "terminology jungle" is growing around the concept of networking; four themes organized the networking literature reviewed; and minorities and women are secluded and excluded from the full benefits and advantages of networking. The final (fourth) section offers directions for future literature reviews regarding networking.

The following information databases were searched in preparation for the review analysis: ABI/INFORM, ERIC, Wilson Business Abstracts, PsychLit, and Dissertation Abstracts. Twenty-six citations were found using ABI/INFORM.
Fourteen citations were found using ERIC. Fifteen citations were found using Wilson Business Abstracts. Five citations were found using PsychLit. And, Dissertation Abstracts produced three citations. A few of the citations were duplicates. Forty-nine pieces of literature were examined. In total, thirty-eight articles were selected for review. To be selected for review, the article had to meet the following criteria: (1) related to personal networks; (2) job satisfaction; (3) related to social exchange theory; (4) related to networking patterns of managers; or, (5) focused on research outcomes and/or pivotal networking research. Social exchange theory guided this research therefore, scholarly or trade journals represented the bulk of the articles reviewed.

To get a grasp of the historical developments of networking, it is necessary to grasp its etymological and definitional meaning.

What is Networking?

The term “networking” is elusive. “Networking” is not defined or accepted as correct English word usage in standard dictionaries. Of the 38 pieces of literature reviewed, only five used the word “networking” (Michael & Yukl, 1993; Michael, 1991, 1994; Baker, 1994; Fraser, 1994). The references were primarily gleaned from popular texts and one reference was from a dissertation. Of interesting note, only relatively recent journal articles used the word "networking."
Consistent with the standard dictionary use, the remaining articles consistently used the word "network", which is a noun (The American Heritage Dictionary for the English Language, 1992).

The popularity, overuse, and misuse of the word have added to the elusiveness in defining networking. The term "network" or "networking" means different things to different people. Nohria & Eccles (1992, p.2) commented that the popularity of the term networking has been a "mixed blessing", and further argued that the word has become fashionable and trendy. Hence, as the word is so widely used and loosely defined, the term has lost precision.

Various definitions therefore abounded in the literature (Mitchell, 1969; Tishy, Tushman, & Fombrun, 1979; Kotter, 1982; Kaplan, 1984; Benveniste, 1989; Kanter, 1989; Ibarra, 1991, 1992, & 1993; Igbaria & Wormley, 1992; Nohria & Eccles, 1992; Baker, 1994; Rothstein & Davey, 1995; Michaels, 1991; Michael & Yukl, 1993). Of the literature reviewed, only one (Tishy, Tushman, & Fombrun, 1979) made reference to any previous sources for defining or operationalizing their meaning of the word "network[ing].” To this, Burt (1982) candidly commented that in seeking to define the term one finds herself in a "terminological jungle.” In this jungle anyone may come and plant a new definition of the word and the definition will have fertile soil to flourish (Burt, 1982).
Multiple Disciplines of Networking

Sociological literature on networking emphasizes the extent to which networking behavior is "embedded" in networks of interpersonal relationships (Granovetter, 1973). In the field of human resources management the relationship between networking and job satisfaction is tangentially discussed. Human resources management literature also touched on the networking and job satisfaction relationship by focusing attention on the labor exchange dimension and the employment relationship. The literature emphasized the notion of organizational choice of recruitment sources, examining how employers choose between different recruitment methods and how different recruitment sources might affect post-hiring outcomes such as job satisfaction (Granovetter, 1977). As Granovetter (1977) clarifies, most studies found informal sources to be frequently used because of lower average costs. In addition, this literature found informal recruitment methods to be more effective in yielding positive post-hiring outcomes (such as, job satisfaction), but to offer only limited consistency in results concerning specific recruitment sources.

As touched upon in the theory section of Chapter 1, the field of economics also examines networking behaviors and outcomes. While not examining the job satisfaction relationship, economic analysis of networking focuses networking
behavior as being rooted in individuals' motives (Blau, 1964; Granovetter, 1973). Sociologist Mark Granovetter (1973 & 1977) particularly asserted that job seekers rely heavily on existing sets of personal contacts in gaining job leads and obtaining job opening information since high quality information regarding job openings move through personal contacts. In sum, these studies and many in the sociological literature relevant to networking and job satisfaction primarily show informal contact is the most effective means for securing a "good" job in terms of wage and non-wage returns.

**Commonalities**

The literature highlighted common themes related to the career development of individuals in general and managers in particular.

A small but growing aspect of the networking literature is beginning to examine the impact of networking on minority groups' and women's career success. The dominant themes of this body of literature can be categorized into four major factors affecting the careers of women and minority groups. These factors included the following: 1. Types of networks. 2. Gender differences. 3. Career advancement, and 4. Mentorship.
Types of Networks

The literature made distinctions between formal and informal networking (Kaplan, 1984; Daley, 1996; Rothstein & Davey, 1995; Ibarra, 1991, 1992, 1993; Nohria & Eccles, 1992; Michaels & Yukl, 1993; Michaels, 1994; Ram, 1994; Carroll & Teo, 1996). Formal networking refers to developing contacts within avenues available within the organization (Ram, 1994). Informal networking are relationships developed beyond the organizationally designed channels (Nohria & Eccles, 1992; Ram, 1994).

The literature was very consistent in highlighting informal networks as being critical to career advancement. The criticality of informal networks was discussed as even more pronounced for women and minorities. Rothstein & Davey's (1995) study on women in academia suggested that women considered different factors to be more important in career progress than do men. In a survey of corporate executives, Ram (1994) found that 85 percent of the women felt that a desire to succeed or willingness to work was critical to organizational success, while only 45 percent of the men considered these attributes as instrumental to career advancement.

Ibarra (1991 & 1993) noted that while formal career development programs exist within most organizations, her studies suggested that women may
not be extensively integrated in the formal organizational culture, which may thereby adversely affect their future career development. Kanter (1983), Ibarra (1991), and Daley (1996) found that while women were more likely to utilize the formal organizational development and interaction systems than men, access to informal networks and mentors are more crucial for career advancement. Ruderman, Ohlott, & Kram (1995) noted that a prominent reason informal networks are important is because informal networks influence critical human resource decisions such as promotion and acceptance.

**Network Gender Differences**

Rothstein & Davey (1995) analyzed network interaction patterns and organizational influences on women in academia. Their study, along with Ibarra's (1991, 1992, 1993), McPherson & Smith-Lovin (1986), Brass (1985), and Daley's (1996), found that in general, women and men developed separate networks. Men included informal and formal networks in forming their network constellations. Women on the other hand, tended to form only organizational (formal) networks. The authors found, and Ibarra (1993) concurred, that a combination of both—informal and formal—was inextricable to climbing the corporate ladder and effective job performance since advancement is related to degree of integration into male-dominated networks (Brass, 1985; Ibarra, 1991.)
Kanter (1977) described women networks in terms of limited, closed, social circles and its detrimental impacts to the career potential of women. Ibarra (1992) argued that sex-based homophily networks were detrimental, namely to women, as they block participation in informal workplace networks.

Networking patterns and mentoring also contribute to differential promotion dynamics between men and women (Brass, 1985; Igbaria & Wormley, 1992). Ibarra (1992 & 1993) argued that networks play a role in creating and reinforcing race and gender inequalities in organizations. Wanguri (1996) contended that network members can provide information about job opportunities to candidates seeking promotion. Ibarra's (1992) work suggested that decision-makers look at the networks of potential candidates and use this information as a proxy for performance information in evaluation decisions. Therefore, membership in a high-status network sends the signal to decision-makers that the candidate is powerful, influential, integrated, and competent (Igbaria & Wormley, 1992; Ibarra, 1992).

The relationship inquiry of this study may assist in shedding light on the distribution of gender demography and thereby enlarge the knowledge of what relationship may exists given gender differences.
Career Advancement

The large part of the literature attended to issues of career advancement in relation to networking. Carroll & Teo (1996 p. 423) viewed managerial interactions as an aggregate set of "workplace-based social networks." These researchers found that managers had interactional networks with co-workers, peers, and associates that were larger and more heterogeneous than those of non-managers. The researchers along with others (Lin, Ensel, & Vaughn, 1981; Jackall, 1988; Krackhardt, 1987, 1990) used these findings to accord a "career-enhancing" potential to a well-established network.

Specific barriers to career advancement of and by women managers were discussed in studies by Igbaria & Wormley (1992), Ibarra (1993), Rothstein & Davey (1995), Daley (1996), and Wanguri (1996). Ibarra (1993) compared women and racial minorities in management and explored differences in networks developed and used by these groups, along with the mechanisms which produce these networks. Ibarra's (1993) results detailed that women and minorities are excluded or have limited access to formal networks in organizations which are dominated by white males. Igbaria & Wormley's (1992), Ibarra's (1993) and Wanguri's (1996) studies indicated that exclusion from such formal networks
work together to keep minority members out of networks of information and opportunity.

Another fact which works against women and minority employees is that they tend to interact with those who are more like themselves (Granovetter, 1973). and the resulting patterns of interaction entrench in-groups/out-groups and passively exacerbate exclusionary practices (Ibarra, 1993). Prevalent in organizations and work groups that have limited numbers of different others. Wanguri (1996) argued that this process explains the continuation of job segregation in the workplace (McPherson & Smith-Lovin, 1986). The process of continued job segregation repeats itself in patterns of interaction in work groups (McPherson & Smith-Lovin, 1986; Igbaria & Wormley, 1992; Ibarra, 1993; Wanguri, 1996).

Granovetter (1973) asserted that based on attraction to similar others and preexisting network ties the networking isolation of minorities and women are perpetuated (Ibarra, 1993; Rothstein & Davey, 1995; Wanguri, 1996). Similarly, because of the same tendency to interact with similar others (Granovetter, 1973; Igbaria & Wormley, 1992; Ibarra, 1992 & 1995), women are often deficient in their contacts with high-status people because they are inclined to network with other women who tend to be outside the power elite of the organization. Thus.
women candidates have networks which appear less valuable to the hiring boss (Ibarra, 1992).

**Mentors**

The literature was consistent in articulating that network relationships which yielded mentor relationship also contributed to career advancement (Kanter, 1983; Kaplan, 1984; Borch & Huse, 1993; Ibarra, 1991, 1992, 1993; Rothstein & Davey, 1995; Ruderman, Ohlott, & Kram, 1995). Kanter (1983) suggested that those managers who were affiliated with mentors who provided access to those individuals in positions of power influenced their career development. Other studies (Ibarra, 1992; Carroll & Teo, 1996) suggested that mentors and integration into informal networks also influence career development (Brass, 1985). Newton & Fitt's (1981) findings reported that male mentors were disinclined to have women mentees unless the mentee demonstrated the presence of an already existing group of network contacts.

Many of the researchers in the reviewed literature suggested that sources of mentor support in an organization are not equally accessible to women and minorities (Igbaria & Wormley, 1992; Ibarra, 1992, 1993; Rothstein Davey, 1995; Wanguri, 1996), which is a disadvantaging factor for the advancement and career development of these groups.
The literature often identified lack of mentoring as also contributing to differential promotion dynamics between men and women (Kaplan, 1984; Ibarra, 1991, 1992; Igbaria & Wormley, 1992; Rothstein & Davey, 1995; Ruderman, Ohlott, & Kram, 1995; Daley, 1996; Waguri, 1996). Ram (1994) found that male networks provided access to mentors within the organization. Igbaria & Wormley (1992) found that women often had less contact with their supervisors and found it more difficult to have a mentor despite their participation in the company's organizational network.

The literature was not clear in identifying which (mentor relationships or network relationships) was more beneficial to long run career success for minorities and women. Ibarra (1991, 1992) found that both mentors and interpersonal networks may have instrumental value (i.e. enhancing job performance and career advancement) and expressive value (i.e. providing psychosocial support) (Ibarra, 1991, 1992, & 1995). Rothstein & Davey (1995) concurred. Their study also found that both mentorship and network relationships can facilitate career and personal development (Rothstein & Davey, 1995).

Ram (1994) and Igbaria & Wormley (1992) argued that, in comparison to mentorial relationships, informal networks may have more advantages to career advancement for women and minorities. They argued this point particularly since a number of women and men do not have mentors (Nohria & Eccles, 1992 and
Ram, 1994). Igbaria & Wormley (1992) argued that network relationships may be more beneficial to career advancement than mentorial relationships in that network relationships often last longer, are not hierarchical, and involve two-way helping. In addition, while mentors may be particularly important in the early career years, network relationships can be useful at all stages (Wanguri, 1996).

Despite the lack of congruity in terms of which strategy produces more predictable and beneficial outcomes, the literature seemed clear, however, that managerial and professional women and minorities are still less integrated into important organizational networks and mentorial relationships.

The foregoing paragraphs reviewed the common and predominant themes in the literature. The review now examines disparities found in the body of literature.

**Disparities**

What disparities are in the literature? In particular, the literature was quite silent with regard to networking and career advancement as it pertains to race. The only located resource that referenced the impact of networking to race was Wanguri (1996). Wanguri (1996) made race a specific area of inquiry in her research. Also, the bulk of the literature reviewed studied men's networks, with the notable exceptions of Ibarra (1991). Wanguri (1996), and Rothstein & Davey (1995). Ibarra (1991) focused on both race and gender. Ibarra contended that
there are many similarities between race and gender issues in organizations. Rothstein & Davey (1995) illuminated women in academia noting that women perceived several barriers not perceived by men faculty members. Wanguri’s (1996) findings were distinct from the other articles, including Ibarra’s, in that she concluded that black managers rely on networks developed outside the organizations in which they are associated due to sentiments of exclusion and isolation within the formal and informal networks within their current organizations. Wanguri (1996) goes on to add that black managers’ exclusion from in-house informal and formal networks, contributes to the manager’s perception of ineffectiveness and lack of ability.

**Conclusion**

The literature agreed that: (1) a networking terminology jungle exists regarding the definition and operationalization of the term, "networking." (2) Women and minorities are excluded from the benefits to be derived from informal and organizational networking. (3) Networking is considered an important tool for career success. And, (4) mentoring is often identified as a critical aspect of networking. Disparities in the review noted that the literature was silent regarding networking as a career advancement tool for racial minorities; and, that the bulk of the literature focused on men’s networks as opposed to women's. Hence, the
final question to be answered becomes appropriate: "Where does the review go from here?" The following paragraphs suggest recommendations for future reviews:

1. The bulk of the literature reviewed focused solely on individuals within a single organization or individuals in the upper stratum of their organization's hierarchy. Given this approach the literature neglected the nature of the individual's relationships with outside organizational members. Wanguri (1991) touched on this point. For instance, her research pointed out that black managers were apt to form and cultivate network relationships with other friends, colleagues, and resources who they knew and who belonged to other organizations (Wanguri, 1991). By focusing solely on the network patterns of individual[s] at one organization, such an approach fails to take into account relationships and resources (i.e., information, knowledge, contacts) individuals have with others outside their organization. These same resources can be used as tools for career advancement (Granovetter, 1973). Future related literature reviews might examine and incorporate articles which look at the constellation of relationships individuals have, both inside (for example, boss, peers, or subordinates) and outside the organization (suppliers, vendors, community members, or civic organizations).
2. With the exception of Rothstein & Davey (1995) (which is a relatively recent article), most discrepancies between minorities' and women's access to and use of networks were reported by research undertaken in business organizations. Ostensibly, networking gender and racial inequities abound beyond the corporate hierarchy. Rothstein's & Davey's (1995) study was the only study located that investigated gender differences in networks in academia. Future searches should be undertaken to identify networking beyond business settings.

3. The literature supported networking as an important tool for career advancement for minorities and women. The literature review further confirmed that the social and organizational contexts in which women and minority groups operate produce constraints on the two groups. Consequently, their networks may differ drastically from those of more dominant groups (Igbaria & Wormley, 1992). One interesting impact of this constraint is the trend toward increased networking among gender groups or minority groups. Wanguri (1996) noticed this trend highlighting that informal networking involving minority groups is expanding. Future literature reviews might examine new evidence pertaining to this trend to discern if associated career advancement might be discovered as a result.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

This chapter reports the research methodology procedures employed in the conduct of this study. The scope of the study was correlational and descriptive. The study attempted to build upon previous research findings on networking (Yukl & Wall & Lepsinger, 1990; Michaels, 1991; Ibarra, 1993) in order to make the formal prediction about the relevance between varying levels of networking and associated degrees of job satisfaction. The findings of this study also attempted to extend previous research findings concerning managers (Mintzberg, 1973; Kotter, 1982; Kaplan, 1984; Ibarra, 1991, 1993; Michaels, 1994; Carroll & Teo, 1996).

Managers

Mintzberg’s (1973) classic work, The Nature of Managerial Work, re-ignited the study of managers as a unit of research analysis. Kotter (1982), Kaplan (1984), Yukl & Wall & Lepsinger (1990), Michaels (1991 & 1994), Ibarra (1993), Carroll & Teo (1996) and other researchers have continued the study of managers as a research effort. These researchers uniformly assert that managers are a unique group that needs to constantly network to meet job obligations. In
similar fashion, managers were viewed as an appropriate population of focus and unit of analysis for this research study.

In light of the research literature Carroll & Teo (1996) and Michaels (1994) maintain that one major shortcoming of research on managers in general (and managerial networking activities in particular) is “narrowly defined managerial sample population subsets.” The researcher also found that much of the literature reviewed that centered on the research of managers was focused exclusively on upper level managerial executives. In addition these extant studies were limited to upper-level managers employed mainly in the context of private and publicly held companies. This subset limitation avoided the larger, more prevalent subset of managers who do not occupy higher level managerial positions (Kotter, 1982). This contextual constraint created subsequent gaps in the literature concerning managerial networking behavior within social, educational, non-profit, and governmental domains. Consequently, a gap in the managerial networking literature persists concerning the larger population of supervisory, first-level, and middle-level managers. This study, however, attempted to focus on and investigate a wider and more general subset of managers as the accessible population of the study.

This chapter is organized into the following eight sections: (1) research and design, (2) population, (3) sample, (4) instrumentation, (5) data collection
procedures. (6) handling non-responses. (7) reliability and validity, and (8) data analysis.

**Research and Design**

This study attempted to determine the relationship between networking practices employed by managers and their associated degrees of job satisfaction. The study applied a descriptive and correlational design. A field survey method was employed utilizing quantitative research methodologies. Data from this quantitative research was drawn from standardized, close-ended questionnaires. The questionnaires contained self-reported items on the frequency of various networking activities, self-assessments about degree of job satisfaction, and response items regarding personal characteristics. Descriptive statistics and inferential statistics at the .05 level of significance \[\alpha = .05\] were used to investigate the relationship between networking and degree of job satisfaction.

**Population**

The target and accessible population \(N = 590\) for this study included managers listed in the *Largest Employer Directory* as a contact source for one of the 590 largest employers in the City of Columbus, Ohio, during February, March, April, and May of 1998. The managers randomly selected to participate in the
study were identified in the Directory as the chief contact person for each respective organization. Thus, each manager selected for participation in the study represented one of the 590 organizations investigated. The population of managerial contacts must have held the formal title of manager, president, director, general manager, vice-president, team leader, superintendent, supervisor, partner, CEO, owner, dean, provost, crew leader, acting president or interim president, or any job title accorded one who manages subordinates during the data collection period of this study. Table 1 provides a description of the various titles for the sample of respondents in the study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title of Respondents</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accounting Manager</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Manager</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area Manager</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Manager</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Vice President</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banking Manager</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEO</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Recruiting Manager</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Officer</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Relations Manager</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Processing Manager</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Manager</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Marketing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Manager</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Assistant to the President</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Vice President</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Manager</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Operations Manager</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources Manager</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing Partner</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing Manager</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Manager</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations Manager</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Director</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant Manager</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Manager</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Manager</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice-President</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Description of Titles of Managers (n = 74).
The manager surveyed in each position was identified by the Directory as key contact source for each of the respective 590 largest employer organizations in Greater Columbus, Ohio. The questionnaires were mailed directly to the named manager listed in the Chamber of Commerce's Directory. Respondents who were unable to complete the questionnaire for whatever reason were asked to forward it to a designee who was a manager or, as a final resort, to the human resources manager. It was assumed that the respondents were managers and were charged with the responsibility of managing employees. It was further assumed that the respondents were aware of and employed networking skills and desired consciously or unconsciously to have and sustain satisfaction in their jobs.

The accessible population of managers was identified through and selected from The Largest Employers Directory published by the Greater Columbus Chamber of Commerce. The Largest Employers Directory represents 590 employers in Greater Columbus who employ 100 or more employees. The Largest Employers Directory (henceforth, Directory) is updated every three months by the Greater Columbus Chamber of Commerce. The Directory is generated by the Greater Columbus Chamber of Commerce located on 37 North High Street in downtown Columbus, Ohio. Table 2 provides a breakdown of the population distribution of the largest employer organizations (N=590) by sector.
### Population Distribution of Largest Employers by Sector (N = 590)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finance, Insurance, Real Estate</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Care</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Trade</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale Trade</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>41.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>590</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Population Distribution of Largest Employers by Sector (N=590)
Sample

This study was limited to the population of managers identified as the key contact source for each of the 590 largest employers located in the City of Columbus, Ohio. This research utilized stratified random sampling as the selection technique for choosing managerial contacts from the population of largest employers.

By careful design the researcher employed stratified random sampling in this study for two main reasons. The first reason the researcher chose stratified random sampling entailed representativeness. Sproull (1995) advanced that stratified random sampling reduces the amount of variance within each sector subgroup while maximizing variance between groups. In addition, stratified sampling guards against selection error. Through stratification each manager had an equal chance of being selected into the sample. The second reason encompassed randomization. Stratified random sampling is a probability sampling procedure. Kerlinger (1973) regards randomization as the "best way" to control for extraneous variables since, theoretically, randomization controls for all possible variables. The researcher wished to incorporate the advantage of randomization of elements (managers) selected from the strata (sectors) of the population (managers identified in the Directory as the key contact representatives for each of the 590 largest employers). Sproull (1995) rates stratified random
sampling as "excellent" in ensuring bias-free sampling and controlling for reducing variance (Sproull, 1995).

**Appropriate Sample Size**

Determining the appropriate number of subjects for a research design is one of the most problematic aspects of sampling (Rudestam & Newton, 1992). This research subscribed to Pedhazur's (1997, p. 26) assertion that the "emphasis of research in general and determining sample size in particular should be on the substantive meaning of findings..." as opposed solely to the statistical significance of the study.

The researcher determined to sample 20% of the managers identified as the key contact representative for each of the 590 largest employers. The rationale for determining a sampling size of 20% included the following:

1. Some researchers have advocated arbitrarily selecting a percentage (i.e., 10% or 5%) as the basis for the sample of the population (Kerlinger, 1973; Sproull, 1995).

2. The researcher aimed for a substantively meaningful study (Pedhazur, 1997).

3. The researcher employed repeat measurement in order to determine sufficient sample size. Thus instrument data was analyzed.
incrementally as the data was received. Once the instrument data began to stabilize, the researcher was logically led to assume a sufficient number of managers had responded. (This particular statistical strategy is more specifically expatiated later in the chapter.)

The total sample of 119 thus represents a 20 percent proportion of managers sampled from the total population of 590 organizations. The sample of 119 managers also represented the number of managers to be sub-divided by sectors and randomly stratified.

The researcher desired a representative sample. Random selection was determined to contribute to increased representativeness of sampling subjects within each unique sector. Twenty-percent was the determined proportion of elements (numbered index card corresponding to a particular manager in the Directory) to be selected from each sector. A stratified random sample total of 119 managers representing each of the 10 sectors constituted the sample of managers for this study. Table 3 provides a description of the sample distribution of the largest employers in Greater Columbus, Ohio by sector. The sample was randomly selected and stratified by sector for this study.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finance, Insurance, Real Estate</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Care</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Trade</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Sale Trade</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>40.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Communication, Utilities, Government)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Sample Distribution of Largest Employers in Greater Columbus, Ohio by Sector (n = 119).
Stratified Sampling Procedure

The researcher employed the following random stratification and sample selection procedures:

(1) The researcher determined to use proportional random sampling.

(2) The researcher wrote a number from 1 to 590 beside each employer in the Directory.

(3) Corresponding to the consecutively numbered employers in the Directory, the researcher consecutively numbered an element (or 3-inch by 5-inch index card) from 1 to 590.

(4) The researcher placed each element into a standard, grocery-size brown paper bag and shook the bag vigorously to ensure that the elements were evenly and thoroughly mixed.

(5) The researcher stratified the population according to the stratification variable, organizational sectors.

(6) The researcher calculated the number of elements to be drawn from each sector based upon the sector's proportion to the population. (See Table 3: Sample Distribution of Largest Employers in Greater Columbus, Ohio by Sector (n = 119)).

(7) The researcher determined 10 unique types of sectors within the stratification variable, organizational sectors namely, finance and
Reducing Error

The most current Largest Employers Directory (1998) published by the Chamber of Commerce was utilized for this study. The Directory is published quarterly and the most recent publication subsequent to the commencement of the study was used. The Directory was also inspected to ensure that neither a manager nor an organization was listed twice or more in the listing. Using the most current Directory and inspecting the Directory for duplicate contact names and organization names helped reduced selection error.

A telephone call was made to the office of each manager listed in the Directory to confirm and verify that each subject identified for the study was indeed employed with the organization and still holding a current position as manager for his or her respective company or organization. Another purpose for the telephone call was to reduce frame error. Telephone calls were also used to identify managers who would be sent the questionnaire when no contact person was listed in the Chamber of Commerce's Directory.
After the telephone calls were made the researcher removed two names from the listing as they were duplicates. In addition, four names were changed as the manager identified as the key contact was no longer employed with the organization or would not be available for the study.

A computerized listing of organization names, addresses, city, state, zip-code, phone, facsimile number, number of employees, sector, contact first name, contact middle name, contact last name, and titles was secured from the information systems office of the Columbus Chamber of Commerce. This information was secured in computerized form in order that the researcher could more quickly manipulate the data, stratify the sectors, generate labels, develop a database, print laser-quality, personalized letters, and other enhancements to improve response rate.

Table 4 provides the break down of the frequency and percent of questionnaires returned by sector.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Mailed</th>
<th>Returned</th>
<th>Usable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finance, Insurance, Real Estate</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Care</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Trade</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Sale Trade</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Communication, Utilities, Government)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Frequency and Percent of Questionnaires Returned by Sector.
Instrumentation

This research investigated the relationships between managerial networking activities and job satisfaction as well as described a profile of managers identified as key contacts for each of the 590 largest employer organizations in Columbus, Ohio. The questionnaire consisted of three sub-questionnaires: Demographic Questionnaire, Networking Practices Questionnaire, and Minnesota Job Satisfaction Questionnaire. The researcher determined the Networking Practices Questionnaire and the Minnesota Job Satisfaction Questionnaire to be appropriate instruments for this research. The MSQ and NPQ are validated and reliable instruments. In addition, Scarpello & Campbell (1983) assert that the MSQ is the most reliable and widely used instrument for measuring job satisfaction. Finally, the researcher determined that both instruments would be sufficient in gathering data central to the main question of the inquiry: "Is there a relationship between networking and job satisfaction?"

Demographic Information—Part One

Part One of the three-fold questionnaire is the Demographic Questionnaire. The DQ requested demographic information from the participants in the study. This section was constructed to secure basic data information related to the personal and background characteristics of managers in the Directory.
The researcher designed the DQ as the result of a three-stage process: (1) The researcher conducted a review of the relevant literature concerning networking and job satisfaction. (2) The researcher studied several relevant networking demographic questionnaires particularly those of networking researchers--Yukl (1990), Michaels (1991), and Granovetter (1995). (3) Finally, the researcher examined theoretical variables postulated to be potential mediators in the networking and job satisfaction interplay.

Ten specific demographic variables were measured to include the following:

(1) Gender: The specific gender the respondent completed categorized as: female or male.


(3) Age: The age range the respondent completed categorized as: 25-29 years of age: 30-34 years of age: 35-39 years of age: 40-44 years of age: 45-49 years of age: 50-59 years of age: and 60 or more years of age.

(4) Number of years with company or organization: The number of years of service of the respondents categorized as: less than one year: 1 to
5 years; 6 to 10 years; 11 to 15 years; 16 to 20 years; 21 to 25 years; and, 26 or more years.

(5) Level of education: The level of education the respondent completed categorized as: no high school diploma; high school diploma; some college; bachelor’s degree; some graduate study; master’s degree; master’s degree and professional degree; and, doctorate degree.

(6) Marital status: The marital status of the respondent categorized as: single; married; divorced/separated; and widowed.

(7) Salary: The amount of compensation of the respondent categorized as: $0-$24,999; $25,000-$39,999; $40,000-$54,999; $55,000-$69,999; $70,000-$84,999; $85,000-$99,999; and $100,000 or more.

(8) Managerial position: The managerial position currently held by the respondent which the participant completed categorized as: supervisor; first or entry level management; mid-level management; upper level management; and, senior executive.

(9) Number of promotions: The specific number of promotions the respondent completed enumerated as: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10 or more.

(10) Major functional area: The particular functional area of the respondent completed categorized as: accounting/finance; customer
service; human resources; manufacturing; marketing/advertising; purchasing/materials management; operations; sales. and other (please specify).

This demographic information (Appendix F) was requested to obtain a current demographic profile of managers in the Directory. These variables were deemed to be important for the general research purposes of the study and the specific answers to the research questions. The design and format of the demographic items were written and structured following those found in previous research studies.

Networking Practices Questionnaire--Part Two

Part Two of the questionnaire is the Networking Practices Questionnaire. The questionnaire consists of general questions aimed at assessing the networking methods utilized by manager contact sources for each of the 590 largest employers. The Networking Practices Questionnaire (NPQ) was used to obtain data on managerial networking activities. Michael (1991) developed the Networking Practices Questionnaire by taking specific networking activities and behavior measures from the item pool used to develop Yukl’s (1990) Managerial Practices Survey (MPS) to develop the NPQ. Items from the NPQ reflect the
purpose of the networking behavioral activity. Items used on the NPQ incorporate a response format with a 6-point scale from: (1) never; (2) seldom, only once or twice a year; (3) occasionally, several times a year; (4) moderately often, every few weeks; (5) often, almost every week; (6) very often, almost every day. An example of an item from the NPQ is as follows:

Give gifts to people outside of your organization (e.g., clients, suppliers, or sub-contractors) to maintain good relationships.

The Networking Practices Questionnaire represents Part Two of the questionnaire. Thirty-four (34) networking activities and behaviors are identified and incorporated in the NPQ (Part Two of Questionnaire, Appendix G).

**Minnesota Job Satisfaction Questionnaire—Part Three**

The final part (Part Three) of the questionnaire consisted of the Minnesota Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ). The researcher chose the short-form of the Minnesota Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) developed by Weiss, Dawis, England, and Lofquist (1977) as the collection instrument to obtain data on job satisfaction.

The short form of the MSQ is an attitude questionnaire. The short form of the MSQ is composed of a twenty-item, Likert-format, structured questionnaire.
designed to obtain individual measures of job satisfaction. The participants responded to attitude statements pertaining to general and gross measures of job satisfaction. An example of an item from the MSQ is as follows:

The feeling of accomplishment I get from the job.

1. Very unsatisfied
2. Unsatisfied
3. Neutral
4. Satisfied
5. Very satisfied

**NPQ/MSQ Questionnaire Modification**

The Minnesota Job Satisfaction response choices are consolidated into a 5-item response scale. On the other hand, the Networking Practices Questionnaire response choices are consolidated into a 6-item response scale. For purposes of this research and to maintain equal-item response scales, permission was granted by the originator (Dr. James Michaels of Wagner College in New York) of the Networking Practices Questionnaire (NPQ) to change the NPQ response items from a 6-item to a 5-item scale. Creating this parity in scales would avert potential analytic and statistical analytic difficulties and snafus. The resulting scale measures for the NPQ used to collect data during this study include:
1. Never
2. Occasionally (a few times a year)
3. Moderately often (every few weeks)
4. Often (almost every week)
5. Very often (almost every day)

**Data Collection Procedures**

The purpose of this research was to collect pertinent scientific data to resolve the question: "Is there a relationship between networking activities of managers and their degree of job satisfaction?" The primary unit of analysis for this study was managers, with a manager defined as one who coordinates the activities, work, and tasks of others through planning, organizing, coaching, leading, or controlling behavior (Kotter, 1982). The major data collection effort consisted of mailing surveys to the key contact persons (managers) listed in the Chamber of Commerce's *Largest Employer Directory*. In instances where no name was given, the questionnaire was mailed to the president or director of the organization or the human resources manager.

Several cautions were taken by the researcher to ensure confidentiality. The questionnaires mailed to the respondents were systematically coded to assist
in managing and organizing the data, following-up on non-respondents, ensuring
the confidentiality of respondents, and following-up on results. The research
includes a secured master list of subjects. The researcher was the only person with
access to this list.

The data collection periods for the survey were February, March, April,
and May 1998. The first mailing to the sample of managers from The Largest
Employers Directory contained a cover letter (Appendix C), self-addressed,
stamped return envelope, and the three-part questionnaire (Appendix F,G, & H).
The cover letter was signed by the researcher and his adviser. The cover letter
introduced the researchers, posted a return deadline, explained the purpose of the
research study, assured confidentiality, explicated how the managers were selected
for the data collection aspects of the study, urged the respondent to complete and
return the completed questionnaires as soon as possible, offered the opportunity to
gain results of the study, and provided a means for contacting the researcher for
additional information. These coded questionnaires and the cover letters were
initially mailed to the subjects in March of 1998. Of the 119 managers mailed
initial questionnaires 14 (11.7%) responded to this initial mail-out.

Twelve days from the first mailing, a second package was sent to the non-
respondents requesting the completion and return of the questionnaire. Included
in the second package was a revised cover letter (Appendix D), self-addressed.
stamped return envelope, and another three-part questionnaire (Appendix F, G, & H). The revised cover letter reasserted the need for the manager to respond to the survey and reiterated the practical importance of the findings to the manager. Of the managers sent this reminder package, 31 (26.0%) responded to this second mail-out.

A third and final mail-out package was sent to non-respondents at least two weeks after the second mail out. Enclosed in this mail-out package was another revised cover letter (Appendix E), self-addressed, stamped return envelope, and another three-part questionnaire (Appendix F, G, & H). The revised cover letter urged the manager to complete and return the questionnaire by the noted deadline. The researcher also placed a phone call to each non-respondent in efforts of gain a response. Of the managers sent this third and final mail-out, 30 (25.2%) of the managers responded.

Of the stratification of 119 managers sampled from the Greater Columbus Chamber of Commerce, Largest Employers Directory, a total of 74 managers responded to the mail-outs (albeit only 72 of the returned questionnaires were fully usable). Considering usable, returned questionnaires only, a total of 72 usable questionnaires were returned to yield a total response rate of 60.5%. Table 5 provides the break down of the frequency and percent of the total questionnaires returned.
Frequency and Percent of Questionnaires Returned

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of questionnaires mailed</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of questionnaires returned</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>62.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of unusable questionnaires</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of unusable questionnaires returned</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>60.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Frequency and Percent of Questionnaires Returned.

Handling Non-responses

Mail questionnaires can be a very useful data collection method when respondents are geographically scattered; questionnaire items can be easily and quickly answered; a large group of respondents must be surveyed; and there is no need to probe deeper on question items (Sproull, 1995). However, these advantages of using mail surveys may be mitigated due to a major problem with mailed questionnaires—low response rates.

In this research study questionnaires were mailed to a sample size of 119 managers stratified along 10 unique sectors. The stratified sample size of 119
managers represented a 20% proportion of managers identified as key contacts for each of the 590 largest employer organizations in Columbus, Ohio.

Sampling error is related to sample size. Therefore, to guard against sample error, this researcher predetermined to work to obtain a smaller sample size with a higher response rate, than merely to have a large sample with an alternatively low response rate. Some researchers asseverate that a 30% to 40% response rate for social science research is acceptable (Sproull, 1995). Notwithstanding, this research aimed to achieve response rates higher than 30%-40% (Kerlinger, 1973).

Particularly, this research implemented numerous strategies, as suggested by Sproull (1995, p. 195), that were specifically aimed at reducing non-response error and increasing the response rate to thereby evidence that the sample was representative of the population. These strategies follow:

(1) A personalized cover letter was included appealing to the practical benefits that would accrue to respondents.

(2) A post card was mailed to the respondent urging return of the completed questionnaire.

(3) A second questionnaire package with self-addressed stamped envelope was mailed after the post card was sent.
(4) Non-respondents were contacted by phone after the third mailing to encourage response.

(5) Laser printed questionnaire materials (cover letters, envelopes, letterhead, self-addressed stamped envelopes) were utilized to demonstrate professionalism.

(6) The questionnaires were designed using an item-check format to ensure ease and facility of response.

(7) Quality stock paper was used, including letterhead with official, colored "The Ohio State University" name and logo.

(8) The questionnaires were professionally typed and printed.

(9) The respondent data was analyzed incrementally as it was received to observe for stabilization of the data.

(10) Finally, confidentiality of responses was assured to the respondents.
Generalization to the Population

A key concern of this research throughout the data collection process was to assure that sample data could be generalized to the population. Of the 119 managerial contact persons sampled, 72 (60%) responded to the questionnaire.

To control for non-response error, the researcher employed two statistical strategies to ensure that the sample of respondents represented an unbiased sample: First, data was gathered, calculated, and analyzed incrementally as the three sets of questionnaires were returned. Approximately every group of 15 questionnaires returned was analyzed. Results from the Networking Practices Questionnaire (NPQ) and the Minnesota Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) were calculated. Key means for demographic variable means, MSQ items, and NPQ items were identified as significant. The researcher then analyzed these key items and variables using the Pearson Product Moment Correlation, t-tests, F-tests, multiple regression, and analysis of variance results for each group of 15 respondents. Four separate analyses were made. Once the data results from each distinct analysis showed evidence of stabilizing, the researcher determined that the data collection process had reached saturation ranges. Therefore, the researcher logically assumed that data received from non-respondents would have also fallen within saturation ranges. The researcher considered employment of this first strategy to be appropriate action in dealing with non-response. The researcher
determined that the sample of respondents did not represent an unbiased subgroup of the population.

Another statistical strategy the researcher employed to handle non-response error was to sample a group of non-respondents and compare them to the group of respondents. More specifically, this additional approach to handle non-response error and determine if sample data could be generalized to the accessible population was conducted as follows:

(1) The researcher drew a stratified random sample of 20 percent of non-respondents.

(2) The researcher made telephone calls, conducted personal interviews, or re-mailed questionnaires to obtain data from the sample.

(3) Respondents were urged to please respond to the entire questionnaire. Notwithstanding, demographic data from the DQ (namely questions 2 through 10); informal networking behavior data from the NPQ (namely questions 1 and 2; 8 and 9; 14 through 22; and 24, 33, and 34); and job satisfaction data from the MSQ (namely questions 8 through 17 and 20) were identified by the researcher to be most important to the study.

(4) The researcher calculated and compared overall means for the networking and job satisfaction data of the sample non-respondents to the networking and job satisfaction data of respondents. The researcher
conducted t-tests at the .05 level of significance to determine statistical differences between the two groups.

(5) The t-test results concluded that a statistical difference did not exist between the two groups.

(6) Finally, the researcher compared the demographic data of the non-respondents to the demographic data of the respondents and found the non-respondent data to fall within the range of respondents.

According to Sproull (1995), if the demographic comparison of non-respondents shows no difference between respondents, the researcher can logically conclude that the sample was not biased. Based on the results of the t-tests and the key demographic variable comparisons, the researcher was logically led to assume that the non-responding group was similar and that the responding group was not a biased sample of the population. Therefore, the researcher determined that results of this study could be statistically generalized to the accessible population.

**Reliability and Validity**

This study reported tests of a series of research questions regarding the networking-job satisfaction association using data collected from a researcher-designed Demographic Questionnaire, short form ©Minnesota Job Satisfaction
Questionnaire (Weiss, Dawis, England, and Lofquist, 1977), and the Networking Practices Questionnaire (Michael, 1991). The NPQ was based on an original instrument (namely, the Managerial Practices Questionnaire) designed by Yukl (1990) and later modified, adapted, and used by Michaels (1991).

Noting the MSQ and the NPQ, the researcher determined it appropriate to utilize validated and reliable instruments for this study. Notwithstanding, care and caution was taken by the researcher to ensure the validity and reliability of each instrument.

Kerlinger (1973) asserted that ensuring validity is most important in the use and analysis of data generated from questionnaires. Nonetheless, this researcher also took steps to ensure reliability with regards to the instruments employed. Particularly, a major reason the researcher chose the Minnesota Job Satisfaction Questionnaire was because of the credence accorded to the MSQ as a highly valid and reliable instrument. The following paragraphs explain the reliability and validity of the instruments (NPQ, MSQ, and DQ) used in gathering data for this study.

NPQ

According to Michaels & Yukl (1993), principal designers of the Networking Practices Questionnaire, factor analysis of the networking behavior questionnaire was employed to identify underlying categories of networking
behavior. Principally, factor analysis was used to validate the data. The results of the factor loading process indicated support for the expected two-factor solution (internal networking and external networking), which accounted for 45% of the item variance. Michael & Yukl (1993, p. 328) further noted that two criteria were used in determining which items should be retained for interpreting the factors: (1) a loading of at least .45 on the expected factor and (2) a low loading on the other factor (less than .25). Of the 11-items on the internal consistency networking scale, the alpha coefficient was .83. The external networking scale had 8 items and an alpha coefficient of .87. The two scales were moderately inter-correlated ($r = .38, p < .01$). Finally, the researchers noted that high internal consistency was not expected for the measures of internal and external dependency as the components of each index were clearly different and unrelated. The alpha coefficient was .46 for internal dependency and .51 for external dependency.

**MSQ**

Three scales comprise the short-form of the MSQ (Weiss, Dawis, England, and Lofquist, 1977). The scales of the MSQ include general job satisfaction, extrinsic satisfaction, and intrinsic satisfaction. According to the Manual for the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire, the general job satisfaction scale obtains a
measure of the general job satisfaction of the employee (in this case, manager) towards his or her job. The intrinsic satisfaction scale measures the employee's satisfaction with intrinsic factors (such as type of work, achievement, or ability utilization). Finally, the extrinsic satisfaction scale measured satisfaction pertaining to environmental factors (such as working conditions, supervision, co-workers, or company).

Evidence for the validity of the MSQ was mainly derived from the instrument's performance according the theoretically set expectations or construct validity. This study utilized the short form MSQ. The Manual noted that validity for the short form was derived from the validity of the long form MSQ, as well as indirect construct validations from the Minnesota Importance Questionnaire (MIQ) which was based on the Theory of Work Adjustment. Analysis of data from studies concluded that the short MSQ measured job satisfaction in accordance with theoretic expectations and thus yielded good evidence for construct validity. Finally, additional evidence validating the short form MSQ was available, as specified by the Theory of Work Adjustment from studies of occupational differences and the relationship between satisfaction and satisfactoriness (Weiss, Dawis, England, and Lofquist, 1977).

Hoyt reliability coefficients, as reported in the Manual for the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (henceforth, Manual), for the three scales of the short-
form MSQ are as follows: for the intrinsic satisfaction scale, the coefficients ranged from .84 to .91; for the extrinsic satisfaction scale, the coefficients ranged from .77 to .82; and for the general job satisfaction scale, the coefficients ranged from .87 to .92. The Manual further reports that the stability for the short-form MSQ was inferred from the stability of the long-form MSQ.

As Likert-format questionnaires were utilized for the networking (NPQ) and job satisfaction (MSQ) scores, internal reliability for the original instruments—Networking Practices Questionnaire (1991) and Minnesota Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (1967)—was established for networking and job satisfaction using Cronbach's Alpha. The statistical software package, SPSS, was used to calculate Cronbach's Alpha. The results of the reliability tests include: Networking (alpha = .909) and job satisfaction (alpha = .872). The internal consistency scores for this study were within the ranges of both the NPQ and the MSQ.

DQ

The researcher designed the networking demographic questionnaires in light of previous, pertinent demographic questionnaires by networking researchers (particularly, Granovetter (1977), Yukl (1990), and Michaels (1991)). Notably, the demographic questionnaires of these researchers were established to be
reliable. In designing the DQ, the researcher did not depart from the original construction of earlier questionnaires. Thus, the final DQ was very similar in form and technique to the earlier personal and demographic questionnaires of networking researchers.

Data Analysis

The data for this study were collected, coded, and entered using the statistical software, Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). This study centered the data analysis strategy on several statistical techniques. The statistical procedures employed in this research investigation were descriptive and inferential in orientation. These procedural techniques included t-tests, frequency distribution, multiple regression analysis, Pearson Product Moment Correlation, confidence intervals, and ANOVA. An alpha level of .05 was concretized at the onset of this study. Chapter 4 of this study, Data Analysis, will elaborate upon how the data was analyzed. Chapter 5 will discuss the findings, implications, and recommendations for further study.
CHAPTER 4

ANALYSIS OF DATA

The primary purpose of this study was to examine the potential relationship between networking behaviors and job satisfaction. The researcher used as an unit of analysis managers identified as key contact representatives for the 590 largest employer organizations in Greater Columbus, Ohio. Employers are concerned about job satisfaction and work behaviors related to higher degrees of job satisfaction. Heretofore, the researcher could locate no empirical study examining the relationship between networking behavior and job satisfaction. Hence, this effort aimed to generate increased understanding.

This study was guided by social exchange theory. The researcher reviewed relevant literature pertinent to managers, networking, and job satisfaction. The researcher also reviewed several conceptual notions expostulating the social exchange theory in order to ascertain the theoretical constructs by which the research would be guided. The researcher reviewed the related literature to select the appropriate moderating variables—gender, race, age, tenure, education, marital status, salary, position, number of promotions, and job function. These demographic variables were measured in order to account for any
potential moderation in the relationship between the primary predictor variable (managerial networking behavior) and the primary criterion variable (job satisfaction).

One major aim of this research, in general, and the data analysis, in particular, was to illuminate theory. Theory development is the single most important aspect of research (Pedhazur, 1997). Exchange theory directed the research. Hence, the researcher employed statistical analyses utilizing a priori procedures to test the hypothesized association between networking and job satisfaction. Pedhazur (1997, p. 377) notes that the greater the knowledge of a particular theory the researcher has the greater opportunity to formulate and test a priori comparisons. To that end, where research questions allowed, linear or curvilinear multiple regression (enter) techniques were employed to test variable relationships.

This study conducted a multivariate analysis to answer the research questions. Many of the demographic variables were examined simultaneously to predict the outcome of the single criterion variable—job satisfaction. Pedhazur (1997, p. 3) notes: "Multiple regression analysis (MR) is eminently suited for analyzing collective and separate effects of two or more [predictor] variables on a [criterion] variable." In light of this, the researcher selected multiple regression as the appropriate analytic tool for testing the research questions.
The current chapter is divided into four sections: (1) Research Questions, (2) Characteristic of Respondents, (3) Analysis of Instrument Data, and (4) Chapter Summary. The following pages elaborate the analysis of the collected data.

Research Questions

This research inquiry purposes to answer the question: "Is there a relationship between networking activity and job satisfaction?" Unequivocally, this study did not set out to prove a cause and effect relationship. Instead, the inquiry sought only to examine the association between networking and job satisfaction. Under the theoretical framework of social exchange theory, this study examined the relationship between specific networking activities and degrees of job satisfaction for managers employed in the 590 largest organizations in Greater Columbus, Ohio.

The following questions were formulated and researched based on the study's purpose:

(1) What is the current demographic profile of managers listed in *The Largest Employers Directory* (1998) as contact sources for each of the 590 largest employers in Greater Columbus, Ohio?

(2) What is the relationship between networking and job satisfaction?
(3) What is the relationship among networking, gender, and job satisfaction, when networking or gender is held constant?

(4) What is the relationship among networking, race, and job satisfaction, when networking or race is held constant?

(5) What is the relationship among networking, age, and job satisfaction, when networking or age is held constant?

(6) What is the relationship among networking, number of years with organization, and job satisfaction, when networking or number of years with organization is held constant?

(7) What is the relationship among networking, level of education, and job satisfaction, when networking or level of education is held constant?

(8) What is the relationship among networking, marital status, and job satisfaction, when networking or marital status is held constant?

(9) What is the relationship among networking, salary, and job satisfaction, when networking or salary is held constant?

(10) What is the relationship among networking, job position, and job satisfaction, when networking or job position is held constant?
(11) What is the relationship among networking, number of promotions, and job satisfaction, when networking or number of promotions is held constant?

(12) What is the relationship among networking, functional area, and job satisfaction, when networking or functional area is held constant?

(13) What is the relationship among networking, gender, age, tenure, education level, marital status, salary, job position, number of promotions, race, major functional area, and job satisfaction, when networking, gender, age, tenure, education level, marital status, salary, job position, number of promotions, race, or major functional area is held constant?

**Characteristic of Respondents**

The characteristics of the participants selected, examined, and reported for this study were as follows: (1) gender, (2) race, (3) age, (4) tenure, (5) education, (6) marital status, (7) salary, (8) position, (9) number of promotions, and (10) major functional area. Each of the variables was analyzed using descriptive statistics namely standard deviation, mean, median, mode, minimum, and maximum. The figures and tables presented in the proceeding paragraphs show
(in order as enumerated in the demographic questionnaire) the distribution of the 74 managers who responded to the NPQ, MSQ, and DQ.

**Research Question #1**

What is the current demographic profile of managers listed in *The Largest Employers Directory* (1998) as contact sources for each of the 590 largest employers in Greater Columbus, Ohio?

The gender profile for the managers who responded to item #1 of the DQ is reported in Figure 1. The specific questionnaire-item to which respondents were asked to select was categorized as follows: female or male. The data indicated that the majority of managers responding to this question item were overwhelmingly male. Specifically, 52 or approximately 70.3 percent of the managerial respondents were male, while 22 or approximately 29.7 percent of the respondents were female. The characteristic of the sample of 74 managers for the variable gender is reported in Figure 1.
Figure 1: Gender Distribution of Respondent Managers.
Figure 2 depicts the age distribution of the managerial respondents in the study. Participants were asked to specify their age by selecting from one of the following age categories: (1) 25-29 years of age; (2) 30-34 years of age; (3) 35-39 years of age; (4) 40-44 years of age; (5) 45-49 years of age; (6) 50-59 years of age; or (7) 60 or more years of age.

Regarding the variable age, the majority of the managers, specifically 23 or approximately 31.5 percent, were between 50 to 59 years of age. The median age for managers responding to this item ranged from 40 to 44 years of age. Only 5 or approximately 6.8 percent were 60 or more years of age. Figure 2 depicts the age distribution for the 73 managers who responded to this item.
Age Distribution of Respondent Managers
(n=73)

Figure 2: Age Distribution of Respondent Managers.
A description of the race distribution for the responding managers is represented in Figure 3. Participants were asked to select a specific racial background categorized as follows: (1) African-American, (2) Caucasian, (3) Other—Native-American, Asian, Hispanic, or Filipino. Observation of Figure 3 quickly reveals that the majority of the respondent managers, specifically 65 or approximately 89.0 percent, were of Caucasian background. Further observation of the figure reveals that 5 managers or approximately 7.0 percent were of African-American background; and, only 3 managers or approximately 4 percent were of the other background category—Native-American, Asian, Hispanic, or Filipino.
Race Distribution of Respondent Managers
(n = 74)

- Caucasian: 89%
- African-American: 7%
- Other: 4%

Figure 3: Race Distribution for Respondent Managers.
A depiction of the respondents' number of years of service (or tenure) to their respective organizations is presented in Figure 4 and Table 6. Participants were asked to select the number of years of service to their respective organizations. Respondents selected from the following categories: (1) less than one year; (2) 1 to 5 years; (3) 6 to 10 years; (4) 11 to 15 years; (5) 16 to 20 years; (6) 21 to 25 years; or (7) 26 or more years. The data revealed that the majority of managers (14 or 18.9 percent) had rendered 26 or more years of employment to their respective organizations.
Figure 4: Tenure Distribution for Respondent Managers.
Table 6: Tenure Distribution of Respondent Managers.

Figure 5 and Table 7 describes the level of education for the study participants. Respondents selected the highest level of education completed as of administration of the questionnaire. Respondents completed the categories by selecting:

1. no high school diploma
2. high school diploma
3. some college
4. bachelor’s degree
An analysis of Figure 5 and Table 7 indicates that only or approximately 1.4 percent of the responding managers did not hold a high school diploma. On average, the respondent managers had completed some graduate study. Figure 5 and Table 7 display the education distribution of the respondent managers.
Education Distribution of Respondent Managers (n=74)

Figure 5: Education Distribution for Respondent Managers.
Table 7: Education Distribution for Respondent Managers.

Figure 6 describes the marital status for the manager participants in the study. Respondents categorized their marital situation by selecting: single, married, divorced/separated, or widowed. Analysis of Figure 6 shows that the majority of respondents (53 or approximately 72.6 percent) in the study are married. Figure 6 describes the marital status for the manager participants in the study.
Figure 6: Marital Status Distribution of Respondent Managers.

Figure 7 and Table 8 display the salary distribution of the study participants. The participants were asked to enumerate their level of employment compensation by selecting from one of the following salary ranges:

1. $0-$24,999
2. $25,000-$39,999
3. $40,000-$54,999
4. $55,000-$69,999
5. $70,000-$84,999
(6) $85,000-$99,999
(7) $100,000 or more

Figure 7 and Table 8 reveal that the majority—23 or approximately 32 percent of responding managers—were compensated salaries equal to or greater than $100,000. The median salary for managers in the study ranged from $70,000 to $84,000. Figure 6 and Table 8 depict the salary distribution of respondent managers.
Salary Distribution of Respondent Managers (n=73)

Figure 7: Salary Distribution of Manager Respondents.
### Salary Distribution of Respondent Managers
\((n = 73)^*\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category/Salary</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 ($0 - $24,999)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 ($25,000 - $39,999)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 ($40,000 - $54,999)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 ($55,000 - $69,999)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>45.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 ($70,000 - $84,999)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>57.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 ($85,000 - $99,999)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>68.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 ($100,000 or more)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8: Salary Distribution of Respondent Managers.

Figure 8 gives a description of the distribution of job positions held by the 74 managers who responded to the study. Manager participants responded to this questionnaire item by classifying their current positions based upon the following categories:

1. supervisor
2. first or entry level management
(3) mid-level management
(4) upper level management
(5) senior executive.

Analysis of Figure 8 and Table 9 indicate that for the sample of 73 managers who responded to the variable job position, the majority (36%) held mid-level management positions. Thirty percent of the respondents held senior executive positions. Figure 8 and Table 9 display the distribution of manager positions for respondent managers.
Distribution of Manager Positions for Managers (n=74)

- Senior Executive: 30%
- Upper-Level: 27%
- Mid-Level: 36%
- Supervisor: 4%
- First Level: 3%

Figure 8: Distribution of Manager Positions for Respondent Managers.
### Distribution of Manager Position for Respondent Managers

(n = 73)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category/Manager Position</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (Supervisor)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (First of Entry Level Management)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (Mid-Level Management)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>42.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 (Upper-Level Management)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>69.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 (Senior Executive)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>73</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Missing</strong>*</td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>74</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9: Distribution of Manager Position for Respondent Managers.

Figure 9 and Table 10 display the number of promotions respondent managers were awarded by their respective organizations. Managers responded to this item by selecting from one of the following numerical categories: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10 or more.
The data analysis revealed that 73 percent (or 54) of the respondents had received 1 to 4 promotions in the course of their current employment. Twenty-seven percent or 20 managerial respondents received 5 or more promotions. On average, the respondents received approximately 4 promotions relative to their tenure with their respective organizations. Figure 9 and Table 10 display and outline the number of promotions for respondent managers.

**Number of Promotions for Respondent Managers (n=74)**

![Bar chart showing the frequency of promotions for respondent managers.]

**Figure 9:** Number of Promotions for Respondent Managers.
### Number of Promotions for Respondent Managers  
\( (n = 74) \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category/Number of Promotions</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>33.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>52.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>73.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>79.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>89.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>93.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>95.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 10: Number of Promotions for Respondent Managers.**

Figure 10 and Table 11 provide a distribution of the functional areas in which the respondents were currently employed. The managers in the study responded to this item by checking a box next to one of the following categories:
accounting/finance: customer service: human resources: manufacturing:
marketing/advertising: purchasing/materials management: operations: sales: or
other. Managers selecting the "other" category were asked to please specify the
functional area in which they worked. The majority (16 or approximately 21
percent) of respondents selected the "other" category. Figure 10 and Table 11
depict additional statistics regarding the distribution of managerial functional area
for responding managers.
Distribution of Managerial Functional Area for Respondent Managers (n=73)

Figure 10: Distribution of Managerial Functional Area for Respondent Managers.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category/ Functional Area</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (Accounting/Finance)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (Customer Service)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (Human Resources)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>37.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 (Manufacturing)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>46.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 (Marketing/Advertising)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>50.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 (Purchasing/ Materials Management)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>52.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 (Operations)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>72.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 (Sales)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>78.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 (Other; please specify)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11: Distribution of Managerial Functional Area for Respondent Managers.
Analysis of Instrument Data

Research Question #2

The second question, "What is the relationship between networking and job satisfaction?" was analyzed using inferential statistical strategies to include the Pearson Product Moment Coefficient, ANOVA, multiple regression coefficients, F-tests, and t-tests.

Respondents were asked to provide responses to each of the 34-items of the Networking Practices Questionnaire (NPQ) by writing 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5 in the response space. Response items from the NPQ reflected the manager's level of networking behavioral activity. Items used on the NPQ incorporated a 5-point Likert-scale format including the following choices: (1) Never; (2) Occasionally, a few times a year; (3) Moderately, every few weeks; (4) Often, almost every week; (5) Very often, almost every day.

Each manager's summated raw score for each of the 34-items on the NPQ were summated (and later correlated to the manager's Minnesota Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) score). The lowest raw NPQ score to which a manager's questionnaire could summate was 0. The highest raw NPQ score to which a manager's questionnaire could summate was 170.
Table 12 provides an interpretation of NPQ score values.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interpretation of Networking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score Values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 - 68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69 - 102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103 - 136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137 - 170</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12: Interpretation of Networking Mean Score Values.

Respondents were also asked to provide responses to the Minnesota Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) by selecting from 5 attitudinal response categories. Response items from the MSQ reflected the degree to which each manager respondent was satisfied with his or her job. Items used on the MSQ incorporated a response format with a 5-point Likert-scale ranging from (1) Very Unsatisfied; (2) Unsatisfied; (3) Neutral; (4) Satisfied; and, (5) Very Satisfied.
Each manager's raw score for each of the 20-items on the MSQ was summated (and later correlated to the manager's Networking Practices Questionnaire (NPQ) score). The lowest raw MSQ score to which a manager's questionnaire could summate was 0. The highest raw MSQ score to which a manager's questionnaire could summate was 100. Table 13 shows the interpretation of the MSQ score values.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - 20</td>
<td>Very Unsatisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 40</td>
<td>Unsatisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 - 60</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 - 80</td>
<td>Satisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81 - 100</td>
<td>Very Satisfied</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13: Interpretation of Job Satisfaction Mean Score Values.
Table 14 shows that the mean job satisfaction score for respondents in the study was 81.4 indicating that, as a group, the managers were very satisfied with their jobs. Table 14 further reveals that the mean networking score of respondents in the study was 99.5 indicating that the managers, as a group, engaged in networking activity to a moderate degree.

Internal reliability was established for networking and job satisfaction using Cronbach's Alpha. The statistical software package, SPSS, was used to calculate Cronbach's Alpha for the predictor and criterion variable. The results of the reliability tests include: networking (alpha = .909) and job satisfaction (alpha = .872).
Interpretation of Networking and Job Satisfaction Mean Score Values

(n = 72*)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Respondents*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>81.4</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking</td>
<td>99.5</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usable questionnaires*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14: Interpretation of Networking and Job Satisfaction Mean Score Values.
Figure 11 provides an SPSS graphical output for the frequency distribution of the job satisfaction scores (SATISFY) for the 73 managers who responded to the Minnesota Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ).

**Figure 11: SPSS Frequency Distribution of Respondent Job Satisfaction Scores (SATISFY) on the Minnesota Job Satisfaction Questionnaire.**
Figure 12 provides an SPSS graphical output for the frequency distribution of networking behavior scores (coded as NETWRXS) of the 74 managers who responded to the Networking Practices Questionnaire (NPQ).

Figure 12: SPSS Frequency Distribution of Respondent Networking Scores (NETWRXS) from the Networking Practices Questionnaire.
Multiple regression analysis was a major analytic tool employed throughout this study. Pedhazur (1997, p. 3) asserts: "Multiple regression analysis (MR) is eminently suited for analyzing collective and separate effects of two or more [predictor] variables on a [criterion] variable." In addition, multiple regression analysis was used because it allowed the researcher to:

1. deal with curved functions of the predictor variable (e.g., major predictor variable: networking);
2. analyze many different predictor variables and their interrelations;
3. incorporate categorical variables (for example, gender: male/female);
4. assess which predictor variable had the greatest impact on the criterion variable;
5. determine the relationship each predictor had with the dependent variable when all other predictor variables were held constant;
6. and, determine the statistical significance of each predictor in relationship to the criterion variable when other predictors were held constant (Pedhazur & Schmelkin, 1991).

In the analysis of each research question, a regression equation was formulated and tested to determine the relationship of the predictor variables in predicting variance in the criterion variable. Theoretically, each research question
was represented by a multiple regression equation. The SPSS program analyzed the various predictor variables to find values of the intercept, $a$, and slope coefficients—$b_1$, $b_2$, $b_3$ and so on up to $b_n$—which yielded the best fitting regression equation, for example:

$$Y' = a + b_1x_1 + b_2x_2 + b_3x_3 + \ldots + b_nx_n$$

The model is explained as follows: $X$ represents scores on the independent variable (e.g., networking or one of the demographic variables). The constant "$a" represents the intercept and the "$b's" represent the unstandardized regression coefficients. The regression model's slope coefficients represent a different slope for each predictor. These coefficients inform how much $Y'$ (the predicted score) increases (on average) when that predictor is increased by 1 while leaving the other predictor variables constant.

This research is guided by the theoretic constructs of the social exchange theory. Thus, the study employed *a priori* procedures in analyzing the data. In most cases, demographic predictor variables were entered into the multiple regression analysis along with the major predictor (networking) to predict job satisfaction score.
The multiple regression procedure was executed using SPSS to analyze how much contribution each predictor variable added to the explanation of the criterion variable, job satisfaction. The criteria by which variables are entered or removed from the procedure is as follows: (1) if the probability of F is less than or equal to .05, the variable enters the equation; or (2) on the other hand, if the probability of F is greater than or equal to .100, it is removed and not entered into the regression equation (Pedhazur, 1997). In the end, the regression equation solution identified the regression model indicative of the "best fit." The formulated regression equation would best predict and explain the variance of the criterion variable, job satisfaction, based upon the entered predictor variables.

In addition, a hypothesis test was performed testing the relationship between variations in the predictor variable (networking) and its relationship to variations in the criterion variable (job satisfaction). A decision was then made to reject or accept the null hypothesis based on this test. In addition, a t-test was performed to compare the calculated mean square scores for the predictor variable.

Table 15 provides a description of the variables and regression terms used to generate the regression equation.
### Variables and Regression Terms and Equation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$X_1$</td>
<td>Networking (Major Predictor Variable: Continuous)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_2$</td>
<td>Gender (Dummy coded)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_3$</td>
<td>Race (Dummy coded)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_4$</td>
<td>Age (Ordinal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_5$</td>
<td>Number of Years with Organization (Ordinal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_6$</td>
<td>Level of Education (Ordinal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_7$</td>
<td>Marital Status (Dummy coded)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_8$</td>
<td>Salary (Ordinal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_9$</td>
<td>Number of Promotions (Continuous)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_{10}$</td>
<td>Managerial Position (Ordinal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_{11}$</td>
<td>Major Functional Area (Dummy coded)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Y$</td>
<td>Job Satisfaction (Dependent Variable)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Y^*$</td>
<td>$a + b_1X_1 + b_2X_2 + b_3X_3 + b_4X_4 + b_5X_5 + b_6X_6 + b_7X_7 + b_8X_8 + b_9X_9 + b_{10}X_{10} + b_{11}X_{11}$ (Predicted Score)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 15: Variables under Study and Regression Equation.**
Figure 13 depicts the regression equation used to predict the correlation between the actual job satisfaction score of respondents and the predicted job satisfaction score.

\[ Y' = 60.64 + .207X1 \]

**Figure 13: Regression Equation of Networking and Job Satisfaction.**

Part of research question #2 was analyzed using the Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient, \( r \). The Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient indicates the magnitude and direction of the linear relationship between the predictor variable, networking, and the dependent variable, job satisfaction. Categorical variables were dummy coded into interval data in order to perform the regression analysis (Pedhazur & Schmelkin, 1991).

The square of the correlation coefficient (\( R^2 \) or R square) is interpreted as the proportion of the variance in the dependent variable explained by the predictor variable (networking). \( R^2 \) indicates the collective influence of the predictor variable(s) in contributing to the explanation of the variance in the dependent variable score (Pedhazur & Schmelkin, 1991).
Table 16 (Interpretation of Association) depicts the criteria and measurement standards that were used to interpret the correlation of the statistical data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.70 or higher</td>
<td>Very strong association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.50 to .69</td>
<td>Substantial association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.30 to .49</td>
<td>Moderate association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.10 to .29</td>
<td>Low association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.01 to .09</td>
<td>Negligible association</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 16: Interpretation of Associations.

Table 17 shows that results of the Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient indicate a positive, moderate association ($r = .39$) exits between networking and job satisfaction. As networking increases, job satisfaction tends to increase to a moderate degree. Results of the one-tailed statistical test reported
that a statistically significant, positive relationship existed between networking and job satisfaction.

### Table 17: Relationship between Networking and Job Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.001*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p < .05$ *

Figure 14 displays a graphical output from SPSS. The figure presents a graphical description of the correlation between networking and job satisfaction. The positive slope along with the increasing trend line indicate a positive, linear relationship between the criterion variable, job satisfaction (coded. JOBSAT) and the predictor variable, networking (coded. NETWORK).
Figure 14: Graphical Presentation of Networking and Job Satisfaction Association.

Table 18 displays the unstandardized and standardized regression coefficients and the accompanying t-values. All t-values are statistically significant at $p < .05$. The unstandardized regression coefficient, $B$, indicates how much the dependent variable changes. The standardized regression coefficient, $\beta$, indicates the unique contribution the predictor variable is making in explaining the variance in the dependent variable, job satisfaction. $\beta$ is
interpreted as the correlation between the predictor variable and the dependent variable. In general, both coefficients provide an indication of the magnitude and level of contribution each predictor variable makes in explaining variance in job satisfaction scores (Rudestam & Newton, 1995).

Beta is expressed in standard deviation of z scores. Interpretatively, a change in one unit (one standard deviation) in the predictor variable score will result in Beta units of change in the dependent score. Pedhazur & Schmelkin (1991) note that researchers are inclined to report and interpret Beta instead of B. This researcher thus determined it appropriate to report and interpret Beta for this study as well. Table 18 expresses Beta in z scores. According to tabular results, a statistically significant association ($p = .0008$) exists with networking and job satisfaction. A standard deviation change in the networking score predicts a +.38 unit of change in the job satisfaction score. Table 18 presents the multiple regression analysis of job satisfaction on networking.
Multiple Regression Analysis of Job Satisfaction and Networking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor Variable</th>
<th>Regression Coefficients</th>
<th>t Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Networking</td>
<td>.2069</td>
<td>.3849</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$R^2 = .15, F(1, 71) = 12.35^*$

$p < .05^*$

Table 18: Multiple Regression Analysis of Job Satisfaction on Networking.

Table 19 presents the analysis of variance results of job satisfaction by networking. Independently, the variable networking ($R^2 = 14.8\%$) predicted under 15\% of the variance in job satisfaction score. Tabular results indicate that the impact of networking on job satisfaction was statistically significant.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Networking</td>
<td>860.52</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>860.52</td>
<td>12.34*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESIDUAL</td>
<td>4947.54</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>69.68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>5808.06</td>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ R = .38, R^2 = .15, F (1, 71) = 12.35^* \]

\[ p < .05^* \]

**Table 19:** Analysis of Variance of Job Satisfaction by Networking.
Research Question #3

The third research question, "What is the relationship among networking, gender, and job satisfaction, when networking or gender is held constant?" was analyzed using the Pearson Product Moment Coefficient, ANOVA, multiple regression, F-tests, and t-tests.

Research question #3 incorporated gender into the modeling of the Y' (referred to as: Y prime) regression equation. Predictor variables, networking and gender, were included in the formulation of the job satisfaction prediction equation. Variable entry techniques were employed in this analysis. Figure 15 displays a model of the regression equation used in analyzing question #3:

$$Y' = 61.40 + .21X_1 -.96X_2$$

Figure 15: Regression Equation of Networking, Gender, and Job Satisfaction.

When networking and gender are correlated on the criterion variable, job satisfaction, the results of the Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficients indicate a statistically significant, moderate positive association ($r = .39$) for networking on the criterion variable, job satisfaction. Table 20 presents the correlation of networking and gender on the criterion variable, job satisfaction.
Table 20: Correlation of Networking and Gender on Job Satisfaction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.001 *</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* indicates significance at p < .05.

Table 21 displays the multiple regression analysis for networking, gender, and job satisfaction. The unstandardized and standardized regression coefficients and the accompanying t-values are also displayed. A statistically significant association (p = .001) exists between networking and job satisfaction.
Figure 15 represents that the regression model used to analyze this question. The equation predicted a .383 unit change in job satisfaction for every one standard deviation unit change in the networking score.

\[ Y' = 61.40 + .206X_1 - .96X_2 \]

Figure 15: Regression Equation of Networking, Gender, and Job Satisfaction.
Table 21 presents the multiple regression analysis of job satisfaction on networking and gender.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor Variable</th>
<th>Regression Coefficients</th>
<th>t Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Beta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking</td>
<td>.206</td>
<td>.383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.963</td>
<td>-.050</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$R = .39, R^2 = .15, F(2, 70) = 6.206*$

$p < .05 *$

Table 21: Multiple Regression Analysis of Job Satisfaction on Networking and Gender.

Table 22 presents the results of the statistical tests of the combined effect of networking and gender on job satisfaction. The variables networking and gender ($R^2 = .151$) predicted over 15% of the variance in job satisfaction score. The results in Table 22 indicate that the collective impact of networking and gender on job satisfaction was statistically significant.
Analysis of Variance of Job Satisfaction by Networking and Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Networking</td>
<td>874.765</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>437.382</td>
<td>6.206*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESIDUAL</td>
<td>4933.290</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70.476</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>5808.06</td>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$R^2 = .15$, $F(2, 70) = 6.206^*$

$p < .05^*$

Table 22: Analysis of Variance on Job Satisfaction by Networking and Gender.

**Research Question #4**

The fourth research question, "What is the relationship among networking, race, and job satisfaction, when networking or race is held constant?" was analyzed using the Pearson Product Moment Coefficient, ANOVA, multiple regression, F-tests, and t-tests.
Research question #4 incorporated the dummy coded variable—race—into the modeling of the Y' regression equation. Predictor variables—networking and race (dummy: race 1 and dummy: race 2)—are included in the formulation of the job satisfaction regression model. Variable entry techniques were employed in this analysis.

Figure 16 displays a model of the regression equation used in analyzing question #4. This model was used to determine how closely the variables networking, dummy:race 1 (African-American), and dummy:race 2 (Caucasian) predict the actual job satisfaction scores in the sample.

\[
Y' = 57.728 + 0.212X_1 + 1.450X_{\text{Dummy:race 1}} + 2.508X_{\text{Dummy: race 2}}
\]

Figure 16: Regression Equation of Networking and Race on Job Satisfaction.

Table 23 presents the correlation of the three predictor variables—networking, dummy:race 1 (African-American), and dummy:race 2 (Caucasian) on the criterion variable, job satisfaction. When networking and the dummy race variables are correlated on the criterion variable job satisfaction, the results of the Pearson Product Moment
Correlation Coefficients indicate a statistically significant, moderate positive association ($r = .385$) for networking on the criterion variable job satisfaction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>$r$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Networking</td>
<td>.385</td>
<td>.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy:race1</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td>.226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(African-American)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy:race2</td>
<td>-.058</td>
<td>.312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Caucasian)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$p < .05$*

Table 23: Pearson Product Moment Correlation of Networking and Race on Job Satisfaction.

Table 24 displays the multiple regression analysis for networking, race, and job satisfaction. The unstandardized and standardized regression coefficients and the accompanying t-values are also displayed. According to the table, a statistically significant association ($p = .010$) exists between networking and job satisfaction.
Figure 16 displays the regression equation model used to analyze this question:

\[
Y' = 57.728 + 0.212X_1 + 1.450X_{\text{Dummy:race1}} + 2.508X_{\text{Dummy:race2}}
\]

Figure 16: Regression Equation of Networking, Race, and Job Satisfaction.

The regression equation predicted a .212 unit change in job satisfaction score for every one standard deviation unit change in the networking score.

Table 24 presents the multiple regression analysis of job satisfaction on networking and the race dummy variables. Analysis of this table reveals that networking was the greatest contributor to the prediction of job satisfaction. The influence of networking was statistically significant \((p = .002)\). Dummy:race2 (Caucasian) was the second most influential predictor in the regression equation. Dummy:race1 (African-American) was the least influential predictor variable \((\text{Beta} = .0041)\) in the model.
**Multiple Regression Analysis of Job Satisfaction on Networking and Race**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor Variable</th>
<th>Regression Coefficients</th>
<th>T Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Beta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking</td>
<td>.212</td>
<td>.395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race 1 (Dummy)</td>
<td>1.450</td>
<td>.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race 3 (Dummy)</td>
<td>2.508</td>
<td>.083</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$R = .39, \quad R^2 = .15, \quad F (3, 69) = 4.089^*$

$p < .05^*$

**Table 24:** Multiple Regression Analysis of Job Satisfaction on Networking and Race.

Table 25 presents the analysis of variance results and the statistical tests of the combined impact of networking, dummy variable: race 1 (African-American origin), and dummy variable: race 2 (Caucasian) on job satisfaction. Networking, dummy: race 1, and dummy: race 2 combine to explain 15% of the variance in job satisfaction score. The results in Table 25 indicate that the collective impact of networking, dummy: race 1, and dummy: race 2 on job satisfaction was statistically significant.
Table 25: Analysis of Variance on Job Satisfaction by Networking and Race.

**Research Question #5**

The fifth research question, "What is the relationship among networking, age, and job satisfaction, when networking or age is held constant?" was analyzed using the Pearson Product Moment Coefficient, ANOVA, multiple regression, F-tests, and t-tests.

Research question #5 incorporated the variable age into the modeling of the job satisfaction prediction equation. Predictor variables, networking and age
are included in the formulation of the job satisfaction regression equation. Multiple regression variable entry techniques were employed in this analysis. Figure 17 displays a model of the regression equation used in analyzing question #5. This model was used to determine how closely the variables networking and age predict the actual job satisfaction scores in the population.

\[ Y' = 60.42 + 0.214X_1 - 0.0745X_4 \]

Figure 17: Regression Equation of Networking, Age, and Job Satisfaction.

Table 26 presents the correlation of the predictor variables--networking and age--on the criterion variable, job satisfaction. The results of the Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficients indicate that a statistically significant, moderate positive association \((r = .401)\) exits for networking on the criterion variable, job satisfaction.
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Table 26: Correlation of Networking and Age on Job Satisfaction.

Table 27 displays the multiple regression analysis for networking, age, and job satisfaction. The table reveals that, controlling for age, networking had the greatest contributive influence (Beta = .402) in predicting job satisfaction. The contribution of networking in predicting job satisfaction scores was a statistically significant association ($p = .001$). Table 27 further reveals that when networking was controlled, age was the least contributive predictor (Beta = -.014).
Table 27: Multiple Regression Analysis of Job Satisfaction on Networking and Age.

Table 28 presents the analysis of variance results of the combined impact of networking and age on job satisfaction. Over 16% of the variance in job satisfaction score can be explained by the combined influence of networking and age. The results in Table 28 further indicate that the interactive impact of networking and age on job satisfaction was statistically significant.
Analysis of Variance of Job Satisfaction
by Networking and Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Networking + Age</td>
<td>916.255</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>458.127</td>
<td>6.636*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESIDUAL</td>
<td>4763.245</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>69.033</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>5679.500</td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R=.402. R\(^2\) = .16. F (2, 69) = 6.636*

\(p < .05\)*

Table 28: Analysis of Variance on Job Satisfaction by Networking and Age.

**Research Question #6**

The sixth research question, "What is the relationship among networking, number of years with organization (tenure), and job satisfaction, when networking or number of years with organization (tenure) is held constant?" was analyzed using the Pearson Product Moment Coefficient, ANOVA, multiple regression, F-tests, and t-tests.

Research question #6 incorporates the variable tenure in the modeling of the job satisfaction prediction equation. The influence of the predictor variables
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tenure ($X_5$) and networking ($X_1$) were used to predict job satisfaction score ($Y'$). This model was used to determine how closely the variables networking and tenure predict the actual job satisfaction scores in the population. Figure 18 displays a model of the regression equation used in analyzing question #6.

$$Y' = 60.490 + .207X_1 - .180X_5$$

Figure 18: Regression Equation of Networking, Tenure, and Job Satisfaction.

Table 29 presents the Pearson Product Moment Correlation of the predictor variables--networking and tenure--on the criterion variable, job satisfaction. Analysis of this table reports that a statistically significant moderate, positive association ($r = .385$) exits for networking on the criterion variable, job satisfaction.
Correlation of Networking and Tenure on Job Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>$r$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Networking</td>
<td>.385</td>
<td>.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>-.012</td>
<td>.461</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$p < .05 *$

Table 29: Correlation of Networking and Tenure on Job Satisfaction.

Table 30 displays the multiple regression analysis for networking, tenure, and job satisfaction. When tenure was controlled, networking had the greatest contributive influence (Beta = .385) in predicting job satisfaction. The contribution of networking in predicting job satisfaction scores was statistically significant ($p = .001$). Table 30 further reveals that when networking was controlled, tenure was the least contributive predictor (Beta = .007).
Multiple Regression Analysis of Job Satisfaction on Networking and Tenure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor Variable</th>
<th>Regression Coefficients</th>
<th>t Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Beta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking</td>
<td>.207</td>
<td>.385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>.180</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$R = .385, \ R^2 = .15, \ F (2, 70) = 6.090^*$

$p < .05^*$

Table 30: Multiple Regression Analysis of Job Satisfaction on Networking and Tenure.

Table 31 presents the analysis of variance results of the combined impact of networking and tenure on job satisfaction. An analysis of this table shows that approximately 15% of the variance in job satisfaction score can be explained by the combined influence of networking and tenure. The results in Table 31 further indicate that the interactive impact of networking and tenure on job satisfaction was statistically significant ($p = .004$).
Table 31: Analysis of Variance on Job Satisfaction by Networking and Tenure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Networking +</td>
<td>860.828</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>430.44</td>
<td>6.090*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESIDUAL</td>
<td>4947.227</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70.675</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>5808.055</td>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R = .385. R^2 = .15. F (2, 70) = 6.090*  
p < .05*

Research Question #7

The seventh research question, "What is the relationship among networking, level of education, and job satisfaction, when networking or level of education is held constant?" was analyzed using the Pearson Product Moment Coefficient, ANOVA, multiple regression, F-tests, and t-tests.

Research question #7 incorporated the variable level of education to model the job satisfaction prediction equation (Figure 19). The influence of the predictor...
variables--level of education ($X_6$) and networking ($X_1$)--were used to predict job satisfaction score ($Y'$). This model was used to determine how closely the predictor variables networking and level of education predicted the actual job satisfaction scores in the population. Figure 19 displays a model of the regression equation used in analyzing question #7.

$$Y' = 61.847 + .209X_1 - .287X_6$$

Figure 19: Regression Equation of Networking, Level of Education, and Job Satisfaction.

Table 32 presents the Pearson Product Moment Correlation of the predictor variables--networking and level of education--on the criterion variable, job satisfaction. Analysis of this table reports that a statistically significant moderate, positive association ($r = .385$) exits for networking on the criterion variable, job satisfaction. Results of the one-tailed significance test further indicate that the association between networking and level of education on job satisfaction was statistically significant ($p = .001$).
Correlation of Networking and Education Level on Job Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Networking</td>
<td>.385</td>
<td>.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Level</td>
<td>-.019</td>
<td>.436</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$p < .05^*$

Table 32: Correlation of Networking and Education Level on Job Satisfaction.

Table 33 displays the multiple regression analysis for networking, education level, and job satisfaction. When education level was controlled, networking had the greatest contributive influence (Beta = .389) in predicting job satisfaction. The contribution of networking in predicting job satisfaction scores was a statistically significant association ($p = .001$). Table 33 further reveals that when networking was controlled education level was the least contributive predictor (Beta = -.051).
Multiple Regression Analysis of Job Satisfaction on Networking and Education Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor Variable</th>
<th>Regression Coefficients</th>
<th>t Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Beta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking</td>
<td>.207</td>
<td>.385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Level</td>
<td>.180</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R = .385, R² = .15. F (2, 70) = 6.090*

*p < .05*

Table 33: Multiple Regression Analysis of Job Satisfaction on Networking and Education Level.

Table 34 presents the analysis of variance results of the combined impact of networking and education level on job satisfaction. Approximately 15% of the variance in job satisfaction score can be explained by the combined influence of networking and education level. The results in Table 34 further indicate that the interactive impact of networking and education level on job satisfaction was statistically significant (p = .004).
Table 34: Analysis of Variance on Job Satisfaction by Networking and Education Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Networking + Education Level</td>
<td>860.828</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>430.44</td>
<td>6.090*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESIDUAL</td>
<td>4947.227</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70.675</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>5808.055</td>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R = .385. R² = .15. F (2, 70) = 6.090*

*p < .05*

Research Question #8

The eighth research question, "What is the relationship among networking, marital status, and job satisfaction, when networking or marital status is held constant?" was analyzed using the Pearson Product Moment Coefficient, ANOVA, multiple regression, F-tests, and t-tests.
Research question #8 incorporated the predictor variables of marital status ($X_7$) (which was dummy coded as follows: MARSING (single), MARIMARR (married), MARDIVOR (divorced)) and networking ($X_1$) to formulate the model the job satisfaction prediction equation (Figure 20). The influence of the following predictor dummy variables:

MARSING ($X_{dummy:single}$)

MARDIVOR ($X_{dummy:divorced}$)

MARIMAR ($X_{dummy:married}$)

and networking ($X_1$) were used to predict job satisfaction score ($Y'$). The multiple regression entry procedure was performed in formulating the regression equation and analyzing this question. Figure 20 displays a model of the regression equation used in analyzing question #8.

\[ Y' = 64.500 + .209X_1 - 8.258X_{dummy:divorced} - 3.992X_{dummy:married} - 2.895X_{dummy:single} \]

Figure 20: Regression Equation of Networking, Marital Status, and Job Satisfaction.
Table 35 presents the Pearson Product Moment Correlation of the predictor variables—networking and marital status: MARSING ($X_{dummy:single}$), MARDIVOR ($X_{dummy:divorced}$), and MARIMARR ($X_{dummy:married}$)—on the criterion variable, job satisfaction. Analysis of this table reports that a statistically significant moderate, positive association ($r = .385$) exists for networking on the criterion variable, job satisfaction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlation of Networking and Marital Status on Job Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dimension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy: Single</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy: Married</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy: Divorced</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$p < .05$ *

Table 35: Correlation of Networking and Marital Status on Job Satisfaction.
Table 36 displays the multiple regression analysis for networking, marital status (coded into dummy variables)—single (MARSING), divorced (MARDIVOR), and married (MARIMAR)—and job satisfaction. When the variables, single (MARSING), married (MARMAR), and divorced (MARDIVOR) are controlled, the variable networking was the most contributive variable (Beta = .388) in predicting job satisfaction score. When the variables networking, single (MARSING), and widowed (MARIWIDO) are controlled, the variable divorced (MARDIVOR) was the second most contributive variable (Beta = -.273). When the variables networking, single (MARSING), and divorced (MARDIVOR) are controlled, the variable widowed (MARIWIDO) was the third most contributive variable (Beta = .200). When the variables networking, divorced (MARDIVOR), and married (MARMAR) are controlled, the variable single (MARSING) was the fourth most contributive variable (Beta = -.107). The independent contribution of networking in predicting job satisfaction scores was a statistically significant association ($p = .001$).
Multiple Regression Analysis of Job Satisfaction on Networking and Martial Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor Variable</th>
<th>Regression Coefficients</th>
<th>t Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Networking</td>
<td>.209</td>
<td>.388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy: Single</td>
<td>-2.895</td>
<td>-.107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy: Divorced</td>
<td>-8.258</td>
<td>-.273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy: Married</td>
<td>-3.992</td>
<td>.200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R = .428, \( R^2 = .183 \), F (4, 68) = 3.805*

\( p < .05^* \)

Table 36: Multiple Regression Analysis of Job Satisfaction on Networking and Marital Status.

Table 37 presents the analysis of variance results of the combined impact of networking, single (MARSING), divorced (MARDIVOR), and married (MARIMARR) and on job satisfaction. Over 18% of the variance in job satisfaction score can be explained by the combined influence of networking, single (MARSING), divorced (MARDIVOR), and married (MARIMAR). The
results in Table 37 further indicate that the interactive impact of networking single (MARSING), divorced (MARDIVOR), and married (MARIMAR) on job satisfaction was statistically significant ($p = .008$).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Networking +</td>
<td>1062.165</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>265.541</td>
<td>3.805*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESIDUAL</td>
<td>4745.890</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>69.792</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>5808.055</td>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$R = .428, R^2 = .183. F(4, 68) = 3.805^*$

$p < .05^*$

Table 37: Analysis of Variance on Job Satisfaction by Networking and Marital Status.
**Research Question #9**

The ninth research question, "What is the relationship among networking, salary, and job satisfaction, when networking or salary is held constant?" was analyzed using the Pearson Product Moment Coefficient, ANOVA, multiple regression, F-tests, and t-tests.

Research question #9 incorporated the variable level of salary to model the job satisfaction prediction equation (Figure 21). The influence of the predictor variables level of salary ($X_g$) and networking ($X_1$) were used to predict job satisfaction score ($Y'$). This model was used to determine how closely the predictor variables networking and salary predict the actual job satisfaction scores in the population. Figure 21 displays a model of the regression equation used in analyzing question #9.

$$Y' = 60.947 + .213X_1 - .186X_g$$

*Figure 21: Regression Equation of Networking, Salary, and Job Satisfaction.*
Table 38 presents the Pearson Product Moment Correlation of the predictor variables—networking and salary—on the criterion variable, job satisfaction. Analysis of this table reports that a statistically significant moderate, positive association ($r = .386$) exits for networking.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>$r$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Networking</td>
<td>.386</td>
<td>.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.463</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$p < .05^*$

Table 38: Correlation of Networking and Salary on Job Satisfaction.

Table 39 displays the multiple regression analysis for networking, salary, and job satisfaction. When salary was controlled, networking had the greatest contributive influence (Beta = .392) in predicting job satisfaction. The contribution of networking in predicting job satisfaction scores was a statistically significant association ($p = .001$). Table 39 further reveals that when networking was controlled salary was the least contributive predictor (Beta = -.040).
Multiple Regression Analysis of Job Satisfaction on Networking and Salary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor Variable</th>
<th>Regression Coefficients</th>
<th>t Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Beta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking</td>
<td>.213</td>
<td>.392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>.186</td>
<td>-.040</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$R = .388$, $R^2 = .151$, $F (2, 69) = 6.130^*$

$p < .05^*$

Table 39: Multiple Regression Analysis of Job Satisfaction on Networking and Salary.

Table 40 presents the analysis of variance results of the combined impact of networking and salary on job satisfaction. Over 15% of the variance in job satisfaction score can be explained by the combined influence of networking and salary. The results in Table 40 further indicate that the interactive impact of networking and salary on job satisfaction was statistically significant ($p = .004$).
Table 40: Analysis of Variance on Job Satisfaction by Networking and Salary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Networking + Salary</td>
<td>876.014</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>438.007</td>
<td>6.130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESIDUAL</td>
<td>4930.431</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>71.456</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>5806.444</td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R = .388, R² = .151, F (2, 69) = 6.130*

p < .05 *

Table 40: Analysis of Variance on Job Satisfaction by Networking and Salary.

Research Question #10

The tenth research question, "What is the relationship among networking, job position, and job satisfaction, when networking or job position is held constant?" was analyzed using the Pearson Product Moment Coefficient, ANOVA, multiple regression, F-tests, and t-tests.

Research question #10 incorporated the variable level of managerial position to model the job satisfaction prediction equation (Figure 22). The
influence of the predictor variables level of managerial position ($X_9$) and networking ($X_1$) were used to predict job satisfaction score ($Y'$). This model was used to determine how closely the predictor variables networking and managerial position predict the actual job satisfaction scores in the population. Figure 22 displays a model of the regression equation used in analyzing question #10.

$$Y' = 55.338 + .189X_1 - 1.896X_{10}$$

**Figure 22: Regression Equation of Networking, Managerial Position, and Job Satisfaction.**

Table 41 presents the Pearson Product Moment Correlation of the predictor variables—networking and managerial position—on the criterion variable, job satisfaction. Analysis of this table reports that a significantly significant moderate, positive association ($r = .384$) exits for networking and a statistically significant low, positive relationship ($r = .272$) exits for managerial position on the criterion variable, job satisfaction.
Table 41: Correlation of Networking and Managerial Position on Job Satisfaction.

Table 42 displays the multiple regression analysis for networking, managerial position, and job satisfaction. When managerial position was controlled, networking had the greatest contributive influence (Beta = .352) in predicting job satisfaction. The contribution of networking in predicting job satisfaction scores was a statistically significant association ($p = .002$). Table 42 further reveals that when networking was controlled, managerial positions was the next most contributive predictor (Beta = .219). The contribution of managerial position to the prediction of job satisfaction is statistically significant ($p = .049$).
Multiple Regression Analysis of Job Satisfaction on Networking and Job Position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor Variable</th>
<th>Regression Coefficients</th>
<th>t Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Beta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking</td>
<td>.189</td>
<td>.352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Position</td>
<td>1.896</td>
<td>.219</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R = .441. R² = .195. F (2, 69) = 8.338*

p < .05*

Table 42: Multiple Regression Analysis of Job Satisfaction on Networking and Job Position.

Table 43 presents the analysis of variance results of the combined impact of networking and managerial position on job satisfaction. Nearly 20% of the variance in job satisfaction score can be explained by the combined influence of networking and managerial job position. The results in Table 43 further indicate that the interactive impact of networking and job position on job satisfaction was statistically significant (p = .001).
Table 43: Analysis of Variance on Job Satisfaction by Networking and Job Position.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Networking + Job</td>
<td>1129.477</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>564.739</td>
<td>8.338*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESIDUAL</td>
<td>4673.398</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>67.730</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>5802.875</td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R = .441, R^2 = .195, F (2, 69) = 8.338*

p < .05 *

Research Question #11

The eleventh research question, "What is the relationship among networking, number of promotions, and job satisfaction, when networking or number of promotions is held constant?" was analyzed using the Pearson Product Moment Coefficient, ANOVA, multiple regression, F-tests, and t-tests.

Research question #11 incorporated the variable number of promotions to model the job satisfaction prediction equation (Figure 23). The influence of the
predictor variables, number of promotions \( (X_{10}) \) and networking \( (X_1) \), were used to predict job satisfaction score \( (Y') \). This model was be used to determine how closely the predictor variables networking and number of promotions predict the actual job satisfaction scores in the population. Figure 23 displays a model of the regression equation used in analyzing question #11.

\[
y' = 59.598 + .198X_1 + .532X_{11}
\]

Figure 23: Regression Equation of Networking, Number of Promotions, and Job Satisfaction.

Table 44 presents the Pearson Product Moment Correlation of the predictor variables—networking and number of promotions—on the criterion variable, job satisfaction. Analysis of this table reports that a statistically significant moderate, positive association \( (r = .385) \) exits for networking on the criterion variable, job satisfaction.
Correlation of Networking and Number of Promotions on Job Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Networking</td>
<td>.385</td>
<td>.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Promotions</td>
<td>.182</td>
<td>.061</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$p < .05^*$

Table 44: Correlation of Networking and Number of Promotions on Job Satisfaction.

Table 45 displays the multiple regression analysis for networking, number of promotions, and job satisfaction. When number of promotions was controlled, networking had the greatest contributive influence (Beta = .368) in predicting job satisfaction. The contribution of networking in predicting job satisfaction scores was a statistically significant association ($p = .001$). Table 45 further reveals that when networking was controlled number of promotions was the next most contributive predictor (Beta = .138).
Multiple Regression Analysis of Job Satisfaction on Networking and Number of Promotions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor Variable</th>
<th>Regression Coefficients</th>
<th>t Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Beta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking</td>
<td>.198</td>
<td>.368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Promotions</td>
<td>.532</td>
<td>.138</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$R = .408$, $R^2 = .167$, $F (2, 70) = 7.007^*$

$p < .05^*$

Table 45: Multiple Regression Analysis of Job Satisfaction on Networking and Number of Promotions.

Table 46 presents the analysis of variance results of the combined impact of networking and number of promotions on job satisfaction. Nearly 17% of the variance in job satisfaction score can be explained by the combined influence of networking and number of promotions. The results in Table 46 further indicate that the interactive impact of networking and number of promotions on job satisfaction was statistically significant ($p = .002$).
### Analysis of Variance of Job Satisfaction by Networking and Promotions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Networking + Number of Promotions</td>
<td>968.823</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>484.412</td>
<td>7.007*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESIDUAL</td>
<td>4839.231</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>69.132</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>5808.055</td>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[R = .408, \ R^2 = .167, \ F (2, 70) = 7.007**\]

\(p < .05\)*

Table 46: Analysis of Variance on Job Satisfaction by Networking and Number of Promotions.

#### Research Question 12

The twelfth research question, "What is the relationship among networking, functional area, and job satisfaction, when networking or functional area is held constant?" was analyzed using the Pearson Product Moment Coefficient, ANOVA, multiple regression, F-tests, and t-tests.

Research question #12 incorporated the variable functional area to model the job satisfaction prediction equation (Figure 24). The influence of the predictor
variables functional area ($X_{11}$) and networking ($X_1$) were used to predict job satisfaction score ($Y'$). This model was used to determine how closely the predictor variables networking and functional area predict the actual job satisfaction scores in the population. The frequency of some functional area categories was less than or equal to 5 (e.g., sales (1), purchasing/materials management (1), marketing/advertising (3), and customer service (5)). The researcher determined that aggregating these smaller categories into larger, related functional categories would be appropriate to this analysis. The initial nine categories of functional area were subsequently aggregated into four dummy variable categories ($X_{Dummy1}$, $X_{Dummy2}$, $X_{Dummy3}$, $X_{Dummy4}$) to predict the actual job satisfaction scores in the population. Figure 24 displays a model of the regression equation used in analyzing question #12.

$$Y' = 59.875 + .318X_{Dummy1} - 1.377X_{Dummy2} + 1.065X_{Dummy3} + 3.076X_{Dummy4} + .206X_1$$

Figure 24: Regression Equation of Networking, Functional Area, and Job Satisfaction.
Table 47 presents the Pearson Product Moment Correlation of the predictor variables—networking and functional area (dummy coded)—on the criterion variable, job satisfaction. Analysis of this table reports that a statistically significant moderate, positive association ($r = .385$) exits for networking on the criterion variable, job satisfaction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>$r$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Networking</td>
<td>.385</td>
<td>.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy Function 1</td>
<td>-.098</td>
<td>.204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy Function 2</td>
<td>-.109</td>
<td>.179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy Function 3</td>
<td>-.054</td>
<td>.326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy Function 4</td>
<td>.147</td>
<td>.107</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$p < .05^*$

Table 47: Correlation of Networking and Functional Area on Job Satisfaction.
Table 48 displays the multiple regression analysis for networking, functional area, and job satisfaction. The unstandardized and standardized regression coefficients and the accompanying t-values are also displayed. According to the table, a statistically significant association \( (p = .001) \) exists between networking and job satisfaction. The regression model predicts a .383 unit change in job satisfaction for every one standard deviation unit change in the networking score. Table 48 illustrates that networking is the only significant predictor variable of job satisfaction score.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor Variable</th>
<th>Regression Coefficients</th>
<th>t Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Beta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking</td>
<td>.206</td>
<td>.383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy Function 1</td>
<td>.318</td>
<td>.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy Function 2</td>
<td>-1.377</td>
<td>-.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy Function 3</td>
<td>1.065</td>
<td>.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy Function 4</td>
<td>3.076</td>
<td>.154</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( p < .05 \) *

Table 48: Multiple Regression Analysis of Job Satisfaction on Networking and Functional Area.
Table 49 presents the analysis of variance results of the combined impact of networking and functional area on job satisfaction. Nearly 18% of the variance in job satisfaction score can be explained by the combined influence of networking and functional area. The results in Table 49 further indicate that the collective impact of networking and functional area on job satisfaction is statistically significant ($p = .021$).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Networking + Functional Area</td>
<td>1024.012</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>204.802</td>
<td>2.868*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESIDUAL</td>
<td>4784.043</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>71.404</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>5808.055</td>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$R = .420, R^2 = .176, F (5, 72) = 2.868*$

$p < .05^*$

Table 49: Analysis of Variance on Job Satisfaction by Networking and Functional Area.
**Research Question #13**

The thirteenth research question, "What is the relationship among networking, gender, age, tenure, education level, marital status, salary, job position, number of promotions, race, major functional area, and job satisfaction, when networking, gender, age, tenure, education level, marital status, salary, job position, number of promotions, race, or major functional area is held constant?" was analyzed using the Pearson Product Moment Coefficient, ANOVA, multiple regression, F-tests, and t-tests.

Research question #13 incorporated all potential demographic variables in the modeling of the job satisfaction prediction equation (Figure 25). Therefore, the predictor variables included the following demographic variables—networking ($X_1$), gender ($X_2$), race ($X_3$), age ($X_4$), tenure ($X_5$), education level ($X_6$), marital status ($X_7$), salary ($X_8$), job position ($X_9$), number of promotions ($X_{10}$), and major functional area ($X_{11}$)—in predicting job satisfaction score ($Y'$).

Each predictor was subjected to stepwise regression analysis. Pedhazur (1997, p. 214) explicates the selection process as follows: First, the predictor with the highest zero-order correlation is entered into the analysis. Second, the predictor with the highest squared semi-partial correlation ($R^2$) relative to the criterion variable is entered, noting the predictor already in the equation. Third.
the next predictor with the highest squared semi-partial correlation ($R^2$) relative to
the criterion variable, noting the previous predictors already in the equation is
entered into the equation, and so forth. The computer thereby determined which
of the variables best predicted job satisfaction.

This solution procedure was executed using SPSS to analyze how much
contribution each predictor variable added to the explanation of the criterion
variable, job satisfaction. In the end, the equation solution presented identifies the
regression model indicative of the "best fit" that will predict and explain the
variance of the criterion variable, job satisfaction, based upon the predictor
variables.

Figure 25 presents the regression equation of networking, gender, race,
age, tenure, education, marital status, salary, managerial position, number of
promotions, functional area, and job satisfaction. Figure 25 is a representation of
the regression equation modeled as the result of the SPSS multiple regression
(stepwise) procedures. This regression equation was ultimately used to determine
how closely the predictor variables—networking, gender, race, age, tenure,
education level, marital status, salary, job position, number of promotions, and
major functional area—predicted the actual job satisfaction scores in the
population.
Viewing figure 25, it can be quickly observed that of all the demographic variables entered into the regression modeling procedure, only networking was included in the final regression equation.

\[ Y' = 59.866 + .216X_1 \]

Figure 25: Regression Equation of Networking, Gender, Race, Age, Number of Years with Organization, Level of Education, Marital Status, Salary, Managerial Position, Number of Promotions, Functional Area, and Job Satisfaction.

Table 50 presents the Pearson Product Moment Correlation of the predictor variables— networking, gender, race, age, tenure, education, marital status, salary, managerial position, number of promotions, and functional area—on the criterion variable—job satisfaction. When networking and all demographic variables are correlated on the criterion variable, job satisfaction, tabular results of the Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficients indicate that only networking \( r = .402 \); positive, moderate association) and job position \( r = .251 \); low, positive association) were statistically significant and all other demographic variables were insignificant.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>$r$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Networking</td>
<td>.402</td>
<td>.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.047</td>
<td>.351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race (Dummy 1,2)</td>
<td>.084, -.216</td>
<td>.244, .136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>-.033</td>
<td>.392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Education</td>
<td>-.046</td>
<td>.352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status (Dummy--Divorce, Married, Single)</td>
<td>-.114, .011, .011</td>
<td>.116, .465, .464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>-.022</td>
<td>.428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managerial Position</td>
<td>.250</td>
<td>.018*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Promotions</td>
<td>.170</td>
<td>.080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional Area</td>
<td>-.112, -.120,</td>
<td>.177, .162,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Dummy 1, 2, 3, 4)</td>
<td>.046, .187</td>
<td>.353, .060</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$p < .05$ *

Table 50: Correlation of Networking, Gender, Race, Age, Number of Years with Organization, Level of Education, Marital Status, Salary, Managerial Position, Number of Promotions, and Functional Area on Job Satisfaction.
Table 51 displays the multiple regression analysis for networking, gender, race, age, tenure, level of education, marital status, salary, managerial position, number of promotions, and functional area on job satisfaction. As a result of variable exclusion in the course of the stepwise analysis, the single most contributive predictor variable was networking (Beta = .402). Table 51 provides the multiple regression analysis (stepwise) analysis for networking, gender, race, age, tenure, education level, marital status, salary, managerial position, number of promotions, and functional area on job satisfaction.
Multiple Regression Analysis (Stepwise) of Job Satisfaction on Networking, Gender, Race, Age, Tenure, Education, Marital Status, Salary, Managerial Position, Number of Promotions, and Functional Area on Job Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor Variable</th>
<th>Regression Coefficients</th>
<th>t Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Beta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking</td>
<td>.216</td>
<td>.402</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R = .402, R² = .162, F (1, 68) = 13.113

p < .05 *

Table 51: Multiple Regression Analysis (Stepwise) of Job Satisfaction on Networking, Gender, Race, Age, Number of Years with Organization, Level of Education, Marital Status, Salary, Managerial Position, Number of Promotions, and Functional Area.

Table 52 presents the analysis of variance results of the combined impact of the unexcluded predictor variable, networking, on job satisfaction. Tabular analysis reveals that over 16 percent of the variance in job satisfaction can be explained by networking.

The results in Table 52 further indicate that the impact of networking on job satisfaction was statistically significant (p = .001).
### Analysis of Variance of Job Satisfaction

by Networking, Gender, Race, Age, Number of Years with Organization, Level of Education, Marital Status, Salary, Managerial Position, Number of Promotions, and Functional Area on Job Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Networking</td>
<td>916.883</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>916.883</td>
<td>13.113*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESIDUAL</td>
<td>4754.559</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>69.920</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>5671.443</td>
<td>69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R = .402, R² = .162, F (1, 68) = 13.113*

*p < .05*

Table 52: Analysis of Variance on Job Satisfaction by Networking, Gender, Race, Age, Number of Years with Organization, Level of Education, Marital Status, Salary, Managerial Position, Number of Promotions, and Functional Area on Job Satisfaction.
Chapter Summary

Of the 119 managers sampled from the 590 contact sources listed in the Columbus Chamber of Commerce’s Largest Employers Directory, 72 usable questionnaires were returned. The returned questionnaires yielded a total response rate of 60.5% for managers as a group.

Characteristics of Respondents

The characteristics of the managerial respondents were as follows: 52 or approximately 70.3 percent of the managerial respondents were male while 22 or approximately 29.7 percent of the respondents were female. The mean age of the managers was between 40-44. Sixty-six of the managers were of Caucasian background. The majority of managers—14—had been employed at their respective organizations for 26 or more years. The median education level of the respondent managers included some graduate study. An overwhelming majority (53) of managers were married. The majority (23) of the managerial respondents earned a yearly salary of $100,000 or more. On average, the managerial respondents held upper level management positions and had received 3 promotions with their respective organizations. Finally, the majority of the respondents were employed in a functional area designated as “other.”
The mean job satisfaction score for the entire group of managers in the study was 81.42 out of 100 indicating that the entire group of managers was very satisfied with their jobs. The mean networking score for the entire group of managers in the study was 99.50 out of 170 indicating that the entire group of managers in the study engaged in moderate networking.

In answering the research questions, the analysis of question #2 revealed that there was a significant, moderate association for networking and job satisfaction when the single predictor variable, networking, was correlated with the criterion variable, job satisfaction. Analysis of question #10 revealed that there was a significant, moderate association for networking and a low association for managerial job position when networking and managerial job position was correlated with the criterion variable, job satisfaction. The remaining analyses of instrument data and research questions revealed statistically insignificant associations on the criterion variable, job satisfaction.
CHAPTER 5
SUMMARY, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter provides a summary, implications, and recommendations derived from this study. The following sections divide this chapter: (1) a summary of the study. (2) a reiteration of the research purpose. (3) research questions. (4) the research design and methodology. (5) related findings. (6) relevant conclusions. (7) implications regarding future related research, and (8) recommendations.

Study Summary

Networking has been hailed by academics, experts, authors, and practitioners as being directly related to beneficial outcomes such as job satisfaction. Managers are a population that must network in anticipation of job rewards. Job satisfaction is often highlighted as a very important concern for employees, employers, and academics. The review of extant literature regarding networking, managers, and the phenomena of job satisfaction reveals that few conclusive studies were located regarding the networking and job satisfaction interplay. Thus, there was evident need, as derived from theory and literature, for
a better understanding concerning the relationship between networking and job satisfaction among managers and its theoretic underpinnings.

This study gathered and analyzed scientific data in order to provide an expanded understanding of specific networking activities that are related to job satisfaction. The study was guided by the theoretic tenets of social exchange theory. The study used *a priori* procedures to investigate increased networking activity as a potential, predictive correlate to increased degrees of job satisfaction. In addition, the study elaborated on managers as the unit of research inquiry and analysis. Thus, the general objectives of this investigation were trilaterally aimed to (1) expand the knowledge base about modern managers; (2) contribute to the current knowledge about networking; and. (3) generate useful data for managers, workforce educators, employers, and employees who are concerned about the phenomenon of job satisfaction.

**Research Purpose**

The theoretically-based efforts of this research attempted to answer the question: "Is there a relationship between networking activity and job satisfaction of managers?" More specifically, the study examined the relationship between specific networking activities and degree of job satisfaction for managers listed in
The Largest Employers Directory as contact sources for each of the 590 largest employers in Greater Columbus, Ohio.

This research also sought to build upon previous research studies on networking (Mintzberg, 1973; Kanter, 1977; Kotter, 1982; Kaplan, 1984; Yukl & Wall & Lepsinger, 1990; Michaels, 1991&1994; Ibarra, 1993; Carroll & Teo. 1996) in order to make the formal prediction about the interplay with job satisfaction. To this end, the dissertation utilized the constructs of social exchange theory to attempt to analyze and predict the phenomena of job satisfaction as it relates to the interaction activity of networking. By drawing from the tenets of social exchange theory, the research could produce a more expansive, yet distinct, understanding regarding the predicted association between networking and job satisfaction.

Notably and quite specifically, this research sought not to prove anything. Narrowly and determinably, this inquiry proceeded only to examine the hypothesized association between networking behavior and job satisfaction. Unless the association of networking and job satisfaction could be empirically tested and explored, the current fanfare regarding networking and its menagerie of benefits would, for the most part, remain pure speculation.

Finally, this research aimed to contribute to the general body of knowledge necessary to lead to the possible resolution of the current problem of job
dissatisfaction with which employers, academics, managers, and workforce educators must grapple.

Research Questions

This study researched the correlation between managerial networking behaviors and attendant degrees of job satisfaction of managers representing each of the 590 largest employer organizations in Greater Columbus, Ohio. The researcher reviewed the relevant literature regarding networking, job satisfaction, and the social exchange theory in formulating the following research questions that guided this study:

(1) What is the current demographic profile of managers listed in The Largest Employers Directory (1998) as contact sources for each of the 590 largest employers in Greater Columbus, Ohio?

(2) What is the relationship between networking and job satisfaction?

(3) What is the relationship among networking, gender, and job satisfaction, when networking or gender is held constant?

(4) What is the relationship among networking, race, and job satisfaction, when networking or race is held constant?

(5) What is the relationship among networking, age, and job satisfaction, when networking or age is held constant?
(6) What is the relationship among networking, number of years with organization, and job satisfaction, when networking or number of years with organization is held constant?

(7) What is the relationship among networking, level of education, and job satisfaction, when networking or level of education is held constant?

(8) What is the relationship among networking, marital status, and job satisfaction, when networking or marital status is held constant?

(9) What is the relationship among networking, salary, and job satisfaction, when networking or salary is held constant?

(10) What is the relationship among networking, job position, and job satisfaction, when networking or job position is held constant?

(11) What is the relationship among networking, number of promotions, and job satisfaction, when networking or number of promotions is held constant?

(12) What is the relationship among networking, functional area, and job satisfaction, when networking or functional area is held constant?

(13) What is the relationship among networking, gender, age, tenure, education level, marital status, salary, job position, number of
promotions, race, major functional area, and job satisfaction, when networking, gender, age, tenure, education level, marital status, salary, job position, number of promotions, race, or major functional area is held constant?

Research Design and Methodology

This study attempted to determine the relationship between networking practices employed by managers and their level of job satisfaction. The study applied a descriptive and correlation design. The study employed a field survey method and quantitative research methodologies.

Data Collection

Data from this quantitative research was drawn from standardized, close-ended questionnaires. The data was collected using three questionnaires. The questionnaires contained self-reported items on the frequency of various networking activities, self-assessments about degree of job satisfaction, and response-choices regarding personal characteristics. Descriptive statistics and inferential statistics at the preset .05 level of significance ($\alpha = .05$) were used to investigate the relationship between networking and degree of job satisfaction. The completed questionnaires were returned to the researcher via the United
Population and Sample

The target and accessible population (N = 590) for this study included managers listed in the *Largest Employer Directory* as a contact source for one of the 590 largest employers in the City of Columbus, Ohio. The managers held the formal title of manager, president, director, general manager, vice-president, team leader, superintendent, supervisor, partner, CEO, owner, dean, provost, crew leader, acting president, or interim president and were employed in one of the largest employer organizations in the City of Columbus, Ohio. The managers surveyed in each position encompassed a sample of managers listed in the *Largest Employer Directory* as a key contact for one of the 590 largest employers in Columbus, Ohio.

The accessible population of managers was identified through use of *The Largest Employers Directory* (1998) published by the Greater Columbus Chamber of Commerce and representing 590 employers employing 100 or more employees in the Greater Columbus community. The Greater Columbus Chamber of Commerce is located on 37 North High Street in downtown Columbus, Ohio.
Subject Selection

A proportional sampling procedure was used to draw a total of 119 managers. An appropriate sample size for the statistical needs of this research was determined to be approximately 20 percent of the 590 managers listed in the Largest Employer Directory as a contact source.

Reducing Frame Error

A telephone call was made to the office of each manager selected for participation in the study. The researcher made the phone call to confirm and verify that each subject identified in the Directory was indeed holding a current position as manager for his or her respective organization. The researcher determined that phone calls made prior to distribution of the questionnaires might help reduce frame error.

Instrumentation

This study reported tests of a series of research questions regarding the networking-job satisfaction nexus using data collected from a researcher-designed demographic questionnaire, the short form ©Minnesota Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (Weiss, Dawis, England, and Lofquist. 1977), and the Networking Practices Questionnaire (Michael. 1991). This dissertation research constituted an
attempt to generate new findings using objective measures and a random sample garnered from a wide array of managers employed in a diverse set of organizations in Greater Columbus, Ohio.

Internal reliability for the original instruments—NPQ and MSQ—was established. The researcher used SPSS to calculate Cronbach's Alpha. The results of the reliability tests included the following: networking (alpha = .909) and job satisfaction (alpha = .872).

Data Analysis

The data was analyzed using various descriptive and inferential statistics. The analysis methods and procedures included correlation statistics, F-tests, t-tests, ANOVA, and multiple regression statistics in answering the generated research questions. The collected data was then analyzed by means of a personal Compaq Presario 7222 computer using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). The researcher acquired the SPSS package from the University Technology Services (UTS) at The Ohio State University.
Related Findings

Testing Research Questions

A specific statistical test of significance was employed and applied to each research question. This research employed predictive and correlative procedures. The researcher formulated and tested *a priori* comparisons regarding networking and job satisfaction including potential mitigating variables. The research sought neither to prove any cause and effect relationships, nor to make any causal inferences. The following paragraphs elucidate the findings of this research:

1. What is the current demographic profile of managers listed in *The Largest Employers Directory* (1998) as contact sources for each of the 590 largest employers in Greater Columbus, Ohio?

   Of the 74 managers who responded to the survey, the majority (73%) were male, married (73%), and of Caucasian background (89%). On average, the participants ranged between 40 to 44 years of age. The majority (19%) of respondents had been employed 26 or more years and held a Master's degree (30%). Thirty-one percent of the managers were compensated $100,000 or more annually; and 36% (26) of respondents held upper-level management positions. The majority (20%) of managers been promoted four times and categorized their functional area of employment as being in the "other" (22%) category.
The mean job satisfaction score for the managers in the study was 81.42 (very satisfied) out of a possible score of 100. The mean networking score for managers in the study was 99.50 (moderate networking) out of a possible score of 170.

2. What is the relationship between networking and job satisfaction?

A statistically significant, positive moderate \( r = .390 \) association existed between networking and job satisfaction. This association was statistically significant at an alpha level of .05.

3. What is the relationship among networking, gender, and job satisfaction, when networking or gender is held constant?

A statistically significant, positive moderate \( r = .390 \) association existed for networking on the criterion variable, job satisfaction at an alpha of .05.

4. What is the relationship among networking, race, and job satisfaction, when networking or race is held constant?

A statistically significant, positive moderate \( r = .390 \) association existed for networking on the criterion variable, job satisfaction at an alpha level of .05.
5. What is the relationship among networking, age, and job satisfaction, when networking or age is held constant?

A statistically significant, positive moderate (r = .401) association existed for networking on the criterion variable, job satisfaction at an alpha level of .05.

6. What is the relationship among networking, number of years with organization (tenure), and job satisfaction, when networking or number of years (tenure) with organization is held constant?

A statistically significant, positive moderate (r = .385) association existed for networking on the criterion variable, job satisfaction at an alpha level of .05.

7. What is the relationship among networking, level of education, and job satisfaction, when networking or level of education is held constant?

A statistically significant, positive moderate (r = .385) association existed for networking on the criterion variable, job satisfaction at an alpha level of .05.

8. What is the relationship among networking, marital status, and job satisfaction, when networking or marital status is held constant?

A statistically significant, positive moderate (r = .385) association existed for networking on the criterion variable, job satisfaction at an alpha level of .05.
9. What is the relationship among networking, salary, and job satisfaction, when networking or salary is held constant?

A statistically significant, positive moderate ($r = .386$) association existed for networking on the criterion variable, job satisfaction at an alpha level of .05.

10. What is the relationship among networking, job position, and job satisfaction, when networking or job position is held constant?

A statistically significant, positive moderate ($r = .384$) association existed for networking and a statistically significant, positive low ($r = .272$) association existed for job position on job satisfaction at an alpha level of .05.

11. What is the relationship among networking, number of promotions, and job satisfaction, when networking or number of promotions is held constant?

A statistically significant, positive moderate ($r = .385$) association existed for networking on the criterion variable, job satisfaction at an alpha level of .05.

12. What is the relationship among networking, functional area, and job satisfaction, when networking or functional area is held constant?
A statistically significant, positive moderate \((r = .385)\) association existed for networking on the criterion variable, job satisfaction at an alpha level of .05.

13. What is the relationship among networking, gender, age, tenure, education level, marital status, salary, job position, number of promotions, race, major functional area, and job satisfaction, when networking, gender, age, tenure, education level, marital status, salary, job position, number of promotions, race, or major functional area is held constant?

When networking and all demographic variables were correlated on the criterion variable, job satisfaction, only networking \((r = .402; \text{positive, moderate association})\) and job position \((r = .251; \text{low, positive association})\) were statistically significant at the .05 alpha level.

Conclusions

Several important conclusions can be drawn as a result of this descriptive, correlational inquiry regarding networking and job satisfaction. The following paragraphs elucidate the relevant, important conclusions derived from the findings:

1. This study was undertaken to answer the following query: "Do managers who engage in higher levels of networking activities experience higher degrees of job satisfaction?" Based on the analyzed data, as managers engaged in
higher levels of networking activities they tended to report higher degrees of job satisfaction than managers who engaged in lower levels of networking activities tended to report. These conclusions confirm the researcher's initial hypothesis which spawned this inquiry. Further, the findings in the study corroborate Ibarra's (1993) proposition as well as Carroll & Teo's (1996) assertion that a study aimed at testing and elucidating the networking-job satisfaction interplay would be a valuable effort.

2. The research findings also provided evidence regarding which variable makes the greatest contribution in explaining the variance in degree of job satisfaction. Overwhelmingly, the data analysis supported the conclusion that networking behavior was a more significant predictor variable than gender, age, tenure, education level, marital status, salary, job position, number of promotions, and functional area. Demographic variables such as functional area, job position, and race tended to enhance or mitigate the prediction power of networking. The data from this study, however, consistently indicated that networking was the most significantly contributing variable in predicting job satisfaction independently.

These findings amplify the constructs of the social exchange theory. The findings of this study support the theory's central tenet. Blau (1964) and other social exchange theorists advanced that individuals (e.g., managers) engage in
exchange behaviors with others (e.g., networking) that are associated with certain benefits (e.g., job satisfaction). The more rewarding the behavior or activity, the more likely the individual will engage in the associated behavior or activity. The less rewarding the behavior or activity, the less likely the individual will engage in the associated behavior or activity (Thiabut & Kelley, 1959; Homans, 1961; Walster, Walster, & Berscheid, 1978; Foa & Foa, 1976; Blau, 1964). This study provided evidence that managers who tended to engage in increased levels of networking exchange activities also tended to report increased degrees of job satisfaction. And, managers who tended to engage in decreased levels of networking exchange activities also tended to report decreased degrees of job satisfaction. The research findings indicated that a significant relationship existed between networking and job satisfaction. Also, the research indicated that networking was a major contributor in the prediction of job satisfaction. Thus, in applying the overarching constructs of social exchange to the study of networking, job satisfaction, and managers, this study provides greater understanding about the social exchange theory.

3. The strongest contribution of this study is that the inquiry begins to fill the current research gap regarding networking and job satisfaction. Michael & Yukl (1993) noted that there have been few empirically-based studies on networking activities cited in the relevant literature. This researcher could not
locate any examining the interplay between networking and job satisfaction. This study was therefore launched to attempt to fill this need. Thus, this study has answered the specific call for research as proposed by Ibarra (1993) and advanced by Carroll & Teo (1996). In so doing, the research also makes a contribution to the general body of literature regarding managerial networking and its association with job satisfaction.

4. Thus, this research study contributed to the continued data dissemination and generation through the use of the Minnesota Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) as a research instrument. Managers in the research study were on average very satisfied with their jobs (mean MSQ score: 81.42 out of 100). The statistical software package, SPSS, was used to calculate Cronbach's Alpha. The results of the internal reliability for the MSQ reported an alpha = .872. The internal consistency job satisfaction score for this study were within the range of the MSQ. Published job satisfaction data on managers (N=135) was presented in the Manual for the Minnesota Job Satisfaction Questionnaire which accompanied the MSQ. Weiss, Dawis, England, and Lofquist (1977) indicated that, quite like managers in this study, managers from their studies reported a mean satisfaction core of 82.37. It is also of interest to compare the mean scores of other related occupations reported in the Manual: Accountants (N = 53: MSQ = 76.51), Buyers (N = 39: MSQ = 78.54), and Supervisor Nurses (N =197: MSQ =
It can be deduced from these findings that the degree of job satisfaction of managers in this sample tended to equate to the degree of job satisfaction of managers in the MSQ study. Stamps (1997) noted that even with well established measurement instruments (like the MSQ), it is important to continue the validation and reliability process. The results from this study increased the dissemination of information concerning use of the MSQ as a reliable instrument for measuring job satisfaction.

**Research Implications**

Meaningful results were found in this study regarding the relationship between networking and job satisfaction. The important implications of the research findings for the social exchange theory are enumerated as follows:

First, the most important contribution of this study is the results of tests to questions posed in chapter 1, 3, and 4.

less quantifiable outcomes of networking and contributes to the networking literature by quantifying, testing, and purveying the results of a specific hypothesized relationship namely, networking vis-à-vis job satisfaction.

Third, this study examined a diverse group of managers employed in a diverse group of business sectors to build on previous research studies on managers. The research investigated managerial representatives employed in the 590 largest organizations in Greater Columbus, Ohio as the unit of analysis. Key contacts analyzed in this study included managers at various levels in their organizations and numerous sectors to include finance and real estate, health care, transportation, retail trade, wholesale trade, service, construction, education, or manufacturing. Mintzberg's (1973) landmark study along with Kanter's (1979) case research were primarily circumscribed to upper-level managers. Mintzberg studied only 6 chief executive officers. Kotter (1982) studied a small, specialized group of managers—general managers—in a few organizations. Kanter (1989) examined a small group of managers in a single firm through case study analysis. Michaels (1991) studied a larger number of managers in a wider array of organizations. Micheal's study utilized a convenience sample of 259 managers from 19 companies. The research methodology employed, limited samples sizes, or job classifications of managers investigated in these studies limited their generalization. The findings of this dissertation generate new understanding from
managers occupying various job positions, employed in diverse functional areas, and employed in a wide array of organizational sectors.

Fourth, the findings built upon previous research findings on networking (Mintzberg, 1973; Kotter, 1982; Kaplan, 1984; Yukl & Wall & Lepsinger, 1990; Michaels, 1991; Ibarra, 1993) by testing and confirming the formal prediction about the relevance between varying levels of networking and associated degrees of job satisfaction. The findings of this research confirm Kotter's (1982) proposition that managers who network as opposed to holding an "I-can-do-anything" mentality tend to experience higher levels of job performance and satisfaction. The findings provided support to Kaplan's (1984) assertion that managers open "trade routes" of formal and informal relationships where they obtain what they need by providing others with what they need. The study also paralleled Kanter's (1977) findings that managers maintain inventories of "I-owe-you's" as strategy associated with increased job performance and rewards. The study extended Ibarra's (1993) and Carroll & Teo's (1996) proposition about related activities potentially correlated with job satisfaction.

Fifth, as Kotter (1982), Kaplan (1984), Yukl & Wall & Lepsinger (1990), Michaels (1991 & 1994), Ibarra (1993), Carroll & Teo (1996), and other researchers asserted, managers are a group which needs to constantly network to meet job obligations. This study seems to support this assertion. The findings of
this study overcome the paucity of relevant literature lacking theoretical attention and empirical support regarding managerial networking.

In general the findings of this study align with those of other networking experts in the field who have hypothesized networking as a critical managerial strategy related to job satisfaction and the ongoing research program on managers. Taken together, the refinements to the concept of social exchange theory that this research has advanced, and the relationship between networking and job satisfaction that this research has proposed, contributes to a new line of inquiry in the study of managers.

**Practical Implications**

This research was also practical by design. From the literature and this research, networking appears to be a very important element relative to managers' degree of job satisfaction. Therefore, the findings in this study have several practical applications for managers in a variety of settings—educational, government, school, vocational, workforce development, corporate, social service, or non-profit. The following paragraphs explicate the practical implications of these findings to managers and practitioners:

1. Evidence from this research indicated that as managers engaged in higher levels of networking activities, they tended to report higher degrees of job
satisfaction than managers engaged in lower levels of networking activities tended to report. The significant relationship in these findings provides support for networking training for employees who are currently engaged in managerial job classifications.

2. The research data indicated that there was a significant relationship between job position and job satisfaction. Therefore the evidence would suggest the inclusion of networking training for employees seeking higher-level managerial job positions. As Michaels and Yukl (1993) noted, such networking training would include teaching a wide variety of networking activities as well as effective approaches and strategies for networking.

3. The findings also suggest that employers provide opportunities for managers to come together and network, since the data indicates that increased networking is positively related to increased levels of job satisfaction. Thus, employers may organize social events, golf outings, holiday celebrations, or birthday celebrations to facilitate networking situations. Peters & Waterman (1982) and Peters (1992) note that such extracurricular events can be prime opportunities for managers to build and reinforce networking relationships.

4. The findings of this research support the evidence as to why many organizations have begun to adopt a networking perspective (Ibarra, 1991; Bahrami, 1992; Nohria & Eccles, 1992; Baker, 1994) and are dismantling
traditional, centralized hierarchical structures and redesigning themselves into network firms (Baker, 1994; Nohria & Eccles, 1992). The findings indicate that a correlation existed between networking and job satisfaction. Thus, relational evidence from the findings of respondent managers in this study provided support as to why organizations such as General Electric, Advanced Data Products (ADP), Fruit of the Loom ® and others offer in-house training programs teaching their employees the importance of, and techniques for, networking (Nohria & Eccles, 1992; Baker, 1994).

**Recommendations**

This section presents recommendations for future research and current practice. There is clear need as derived from the relevant body of literature and theory, for a keener comprehension concerning the relationship between networking and job satisfaction among managers. The following recommendations have been formulated based on the findings of this research effort:

1. The reported study contributes to the increased understanding of managerial networking and job satisfaction. Additional replicative field research study is needed to validate, verify, and expand upon the reported data.
A number of related issues require fuller understanding before the networking and job satisfaction interplay can be fully integrated into a broader theory of social exchange. The social exchange theory provides an ideal model for explaining why individuals engage in exchange relationships. Less than ideal, yet realistic personal issues (e.g., race, age, gender, or personality differences) and environmental issues (e.g., organizational, culture, competitive situation, organization size, organization age, or organizational sector) are not taken into full account by the theory. Nevertheless, the reality of these factors needs to be incorporated through future testing in order to expand the social exchange theory. All of these factors affect the explanatory power of social exchange theory. Therefore, further future research is needed to assimilate these issues into the broader constructs of social exchange theory.

Further research should be endeavored exploring how managers acquired their particular networking skills. Social exchange theory is supportive in articulating why managers engage in networking activities. Field research is needed to understand the reasons for a manager's conscientious decision to network. Such research would more likely lend itself to in-depth case analysis in order to glean the rich details and strategies of these managers. For example, in addition to the use of structured, objective questions in the Networking Practices Questionnaire, a qualitative component may be included which seeks to glean
strategies not captured by the NPQ. Understanding how managers gained networking skills can assist in understanding some pertinent questions illuminated by this study such as: (1) Why do some managers network and others do not? (2) Why do some positions seem to require greater networking than others? (3) What are more efficient strategies for networking and building effective, interpersonal relationships? (4) How long does it take to build up a significant cadre of network contacts?

(4) In the book, Workforce Education: The Basics, Gary & Herr (1998, p. 73) argue that the key to gaining an advantage in the labor market is to have a set of unique skills that may yield the employee (or prospective employee) a labor market advantage. This point paralleled the findings of a study conducted by the United States Department of Labor's Secretary's Commission on Achieving Necessary Skills (SCANS). The SCANS report identified interpersonal skills (such as networking) as one of five competencies and a three-part foundation of skills and personal qualities needed for solid job performance (The Secretary's Commission on Achieving Necessary Skills. U.S. Department of Labor, 1992). Hence, employees and managers alike should focus on additional credentials and skills (networking) that will lead to such labor market advantages. Therefore, it is recommended that workforce educators consider the instruction of interpersonal
networking skills as a strategy for equipping students, clients, and learners with labor market advantage.

(5) More correlational studies are needed to confirm the relationship between job satisfaction and networking. The focus of future correlational studies should be two-fold: (1) to confirm the empirical results borne out by this study, and (2) to confirm that the relationship between networking and job satisfaction can be borne out consistently.

(6) More field-intensive research should be done regarding the networking-job satisfaction nexus. A paucity of field research, in general, and networking field research, in specific, is present (Nohria & Eccles, 1992). It is understandable why so few field-intensive research on networking and managers is extant (Kotter, 1982). Gaining access to busy managers is very difficult. Seeking to study their networking activities over the course of several days may be intrusive. Many managers in the course of a day deal with highly-sensitive employee and organizational information to which a researcher would not be privy. To further complicate, seeking to conduct such intensive-field studies with hundreds of hectic managers becomes more even daunting. The time commitment and costs can become quickly overwhelming. Nonetheless, the richness of the data will be essential in expanding the social exchange theory and understanding the networking job satisfaction relationship.
APPENDIX A

HUMAN SUBJECTS RESEARCH APPROVAL
APPLICATION FOR EXEMPTION FROM HUMAN SUBJECTS INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD REVIEW

All research activities that will involve human beings as research subjects must be reviewed and approved by the appropriate human subjects Institutional Review Board, or receive exemption status, prior to implementation of the research.

Principal Investigator: Professor Anthony Olinzock (Adviser: ____________)

Academic Title: Professor ________________ Phone No. 262-5077 Fax No. 292-0100

Department: Workforce Education & Lifelong Learning Department No. 1270

Campus Address: 44125-4242 Hall 1945 W. 12th St.

Room Number ____________ Building ____________

Co-Investigator(s): Iwesuikhe, John C. ____________

Phone No. ____________ Fax No. 292-0100

SOURCE OF FUNDING FOR PROPOSED RESEARCH: (Check A or B)

A. OSURF: Sponsor ________________ RF Proposal/Project No. ________________

B. Other (identify) John Iwesuikhe's personal funds

** Principal investigator must submit a protocol to the appropriate Human Subjects IRB.

IMPORTANT NOTICE TO INVESTIGATORS: Exempting an activity from review DOES NOT absolve the investigators of the activity from ensuring that the welfare of human subjects in the activity is protected and that methods used, and information provided, to gain subject consent are appropriate to the activity.
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MINNESOTA QUESTIONNAIRE APPROVAL LETTER
Mar 5, 1998

John G. Igwebuike
1980 Belcher Drive B-8
Columbus, Ohio 43224

Dear John G. Igwebuike:

We are pleased to grant you permission to use the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire short form 1977 for use in your research.

Vocational Psychology Research is currently in the process of revising the MSQ manual and it is very important that we receive copies of your research study results in order to construct new norm tables. Therefore, we would appreciate receiving a copy of your results including 1) demographic data of respondents, including age, education level, occupation and job tenure; and 2) response statistics including scale means, standard deviations, reliability coefficients, and standard errors of measurement. If your tests are scored by us, we will already have the information detailed in item #2.

Your providing this information will be an important and valuable contribution to the new MSQ manual. If you have any questions concerning this request, please feel free to call us at 612-625-1367.

Sincerely,

Dr. David J. Weiss, Director
Vocational Psychology Research
APPENDIX C

COVER LETTER
March 9, 1998
To: PARTICIPANTS IN NETWORKING AND JOB SATISFACTION STUDY

Because you work in a capacity that requires you to manage people and thereby get things done through others, we would greatly appreciate your taking a few minutes of your time to respond to the enclosed questionnaire. Response choices are provided for each section and you are asked not to let your answer for one question influence your answer for another question.

Results of this study will determine the relationship between managerial networking and job satisfaction. Your name was randomly selected from *The Largest Employers Directory* published quarterly by the Greater Columbus Chamber of Commerce located in downtown Columbus, Ohio.

You will not be identified by name. All individual information provided will remain confidential and only summaries of all responses will be reported. Finally, your responses will be aggregated with the responses of other managers from different organizations.

The questionnaire should take you about 20-30 minutes to complete. Please return the completed questionnaire in the self-addressed envelope by March 23, 1998.

This research is the first of its kind. The effort you make in completing this questionnaire will assist in better understanding managerial behavior and job satisfaction. Your participation is greatly appreciated and will allow us to gather data on one of the most critical employment issues as identified by experts and managers, such as you, in the field.

Thank you in advance for your cooperation.

Respectfully,

John Gugum Igwebuike
Doctoral Candidate
College of Education
The Ohio State University

Dr. Anthony Olinzock
Associate Professor
College of Education
The Ohio State University

If you should desire a summary of the results of the study, please call: (614) 268-7516 after August 30, 1998 and it will be mailed or faxed to you.
APPENDIX D

REMINDER LETTER
Date: March 21, 1998
From: Researchers Dr. Anthony Olinzock and John G. Igwebuike
To: PARTICIPANTS IN NETWORKING AND JOB SATISFACTION STUDY

Thank you, for your willingness to participate in the Networking and Job Satisfaction Survey. We wish to thank those of you who have already returned your completed Networking and Minnesota Job Satisfaction Surveys.

If you have not yet completed the survey, we would greatly appreciate your taking a few minutes out of your busy schedule to respond (to the enclosed questionnaire). As you can see in the graph below, we are still in great need of having all outstanding surveys to be returned to us as soon as possible for analysis. Please complete the survey and return it as soon as you possibly can.

Results of this study will determine the relationship between managerial networking and job satisfaction. Your name was randomly selected from The Largest Employers Directory published quarterly by the Greater Columbus Chamber of Commerce located in downtown Columbus, Ohio.

The questionnaire should take you about 20-30 minutes to complete. Please return the completed questionnaire in the self-addressed, stamped envelope and send it in by March 31, 1998.

This research is the first of its kind. The effort you make in completing this questionnaire will assist in better understanding managerial behavior and job satisfaction. Your participation is greatly appreciated and will allow us to gather data on one of the most critical employment issues as identified by experts and managers, such as you, in the field.

Thank you in advance for your cooperation.

Should you desire a summary of the results of the study, please call: (614) 268-7516 after August 30, 1998 and it will be faxed to you. or, check Yes and the results will be mailed to you at:

Mailing Address: ____________________________________________

please return in the self-addressed, stamped envelope

---

Columbus Chamber of Commerce Networking Study Survey Results (to date)

□ Respondents
■ Non Respondents

You will not be identified by name. All individual information provided will remain confidential and only summaries of all responses will be reported.

92%

8%

This research is the first of its kind. The effort you make in completing this questionnaire will assist in better understanding managerial behavior and job satisfaction. Your participation is greatly appreciated and will allow us to gather data on one of the most critical employment issues as identified by experts and managers, such as you, in the field.

Thank you in advance for your cooperation.
APPENDIX E

FINAL REMINDER LETTER
Date: April 14, 1998

RE: COLUMBUS CHAMBER OF COMMERCE NETWORKING STUDY
From: Researchers Dr. Anthony Olinzock and John G. Igwebuike
To: Participants in the Networking & Job Satisfaction Study

We need your help. If you have not completed the Networking and Minnesota Job Satisfaction Surveys, we ask that you please do so as soon as possible. As you can see in the graph below, we are still in need of all outstanding surveys to be returned to us as soon as possible for analysis. The success of our research effort depends upon your support and cooperation.

In the event that you may have misplaced the questionnaire, another copy is provided for your convenience. Results of this study will determine the relationship between managerial networking and job satisfaction. Your name was randomly selected from The Largest Employers Directory published quarterly by the Greater Columbus Chamber of Commerce.

You will not be identified by name. All individual information provided will remain confidential and only summaries of all responses will be reported. The questionnaire should take you about 20-30 minutes to complete. Please return the completed questionnaire in the self-addressed, stamped envelope by April 23, 1998.

Once again, thank you for taking time out of your busy schedule to complete this questionnaire. Your cooperation is greatly appreciated.

Enclosure

Should you desire a summary of the results of the study, please call: (614) 268-7516 after August 30, 1998 and it will be faxed to you; or, check Yes and the results will be mailed to you at:

Mailing Address: ____________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

please return in the self-addressed, stamped envelope
Part I: Demographic Data

Your completed responses to the following demographic data will help to compile a current profile of managers in the sample population. Please place a mark in the category which best fits your situation, and fill-in the appropriate blanks.

1. MANAGERIAL TITLE: ________________________________

2. GENDER:  □ Female  □ Male

3. RACE:
   □ African-American  □ American Indian  □ Asian
   □ Caucasian  □ Hispanic  □ Filipino

4. AGE:
   □ 25-29  □ 30-34  □ 35-39  □ 40-44
   □ 45-49  □ 50-59  □ 60 or over

5. NUMBER OF YEARS WITH COMPANY OR FIRM (INCLUDING PRESENT POSITION):
   □ Less than one year  □ 1 to 5 years  □ 6 to 10 years
   □ 11 to 15 years  □ 16 to 20 years  □ 21 to 25 years
   □ 26+ years

6. LEVEL OF EDUCATION:
   □ No high school diploma
   □ High School Diploma
   □ Some college
   □ Bachelor’s Degree
   □ Some Graduate Study
   □ Master’s Degree
   □ Master’s Degree + Professional Degree
   □ Doctorate Degree

7. MARITAL STATUS:
   □ Single  □ Married  □ Divorced/Separated  □ Widowed
Response Choice (Part 1 Continued)

8. SALARY RANGE:
   $0-$24,999  $25,000-$39,999  $40,000-$54,999
   $55,000-$69,999  $70,000-$84,999  $85,000-$99,999
   $100,000 or more

9. WHAT IS YOUR MANAGERIAL POSITION?
   SUPERVISOR
   FIRST OR ENTRY LEVEL MANAGEMENT
   MID-LEVEL MANAGEMENT
   UPPER LEVEL MANAGEMENT
   SENIOR EXECUTIVE

10. PROMOTIONS: HOW MANY TIMES HAVE YOU BEEN PROMOTED SINCE THE FIRST TIME YOU WERE GIVEN RESPONSIBILITY FOR SUPERVISING THE WORK OF OTHERS? (INCLUDE THIS INITIAL PROMOTION IN YOUR TOTAL):
    1 2 3 4 5 6
    7 8 9 10 or more

11. WHAT IS THE MAJOR FUNCTIONAL AREA FOR YOUR POSITION?
   ACCOUNTING/FINANCE
   CUSTOMER SERVICE
   HUMAN RESOURCES
   MANUFACTURING
   MARKETING/ADVERTISING
   PURCHASING/MATERIALS MANAGEMENT
   OPERATIONS
   SALES
   OTHER (PLEASE SPECIFY) __________________________
APPENDIX G

NETWORKING PRACTICES QUESTIONNAIRE©
Part II: NETWORKING PRACTICES QUESTIONNAIRE (NPQ)

Please indicate how often you do each of the following networking behaviors. Use the following response choices for Part II, and write the number of the choice you select on the line next to the item:

1. Never
2. Occasionally (a few times a year)
3. Moderately often (every few weeks)
4. Often (almost every week)
5. Very often (almost every day)

___1. Initiate contacts with people who can be a useful source of information, resources, and political support.

___2. Socialize with people in other work units and departments in your organization who are useful sources of information, resources, or political support.

___3. Socialize with people outside of your organization who are useful sources of information, resources, or political support (e.g., clients, suppliers, subcontractors, etc.)

___4. Call or visit to keep in touch with people in other work units who can provide information about important developments and events.

___5. Call or visit to keep in touch with people outside of your organization who can provide information about important developments and events.

___6. Meet with outside suppliers, vendors, or subcontractors to negotiate agreements and coordinate plans with them.

___7. Meet with important clients and users to discover how to better satisfy their needs.

___8. Meet with managers from other units/departments in the organization to coordinate plans with them and solve mutual problems.

___9. Spend time talking informally to people in other work units about things unrelated to the work (e.g., sports, hobbies, recreation, family, etc.).

___10. Attending meetings, ceremonies, and social events in the organization to keep in touch with people and discover what is happening in different part of the organization.
Response Choice (Part 2 continued):

1. Never
2. Occasionally (a few times a year)
3. Moderately often (every few weeks)
4. Often (almost every week)
5. Very often (almost every day)

11. Talk or write to people outside of your work unit to pass on information or gossip that you think they will find useful.

12. Congratulations someone outside of your work unit about a promotion, award, or special achievement.

13. Offer to help someone outside of your work unit solve a problem for which you have some relevant expertise.

14. Tell jokes or entertaining stories at meetings and social events.

15. Offer helpful advice to someone outside of your work unit about how to advance his or her career (e.g., people to cultivate, events to attend, assignments or positions to seek, traps to avoid, etc.)

16. Do favors (e.g., provide information, assistance, political support, or resources) to maintain a good working relationship with people in other units whose cooperation and support are important.

17. Form alliances with people in other units in your organization to work toward mutual objectives.

18. Consult with people in other work units before making decisions or changes in plans that will affect them.

19. Promptly inform people in other units and outsiders after making decisions or changes in plans that will affect them.

20. Offer to help a manager in another unit to change a policy or gain approval for a new product, project, or program.

21. Offer to help a manager in another unit get a promotion for one of his or her subordinates.

22. Go to lunch or dinner with people in other work units in your organization.

23. Go to lunch or dinner with people outside of your organization (e.g., clients, suppliers, subcontractors, etc.).
Response Choice (Part 2 continued):

1. Never
2. Occasionally (a few times a year)
3. Moderately often (every few weeks)
4. Often (almost every week)
5. Very often (almost every day)

____ 24. Attend or host parties or social events at which members of other work units in your organization are invited.

____ 25. Attend or host parties or social events at which people outside of your organization (e.g., clients, suppliers, subcontractors, etc.) are invited.

____ 26. Attend trade shows or professional conferences and meetings.

____ 27. Participate in recreational or leisure activities (e.g., play golf, tennis, or handball, join a social club, play bridge or poker, etc.) with people in other work units in your organization.

____ 28. Participate in recreational or leisure activities (e.g., play golf, tennis, or handball, join a social club, play bridge or poker, etc.) with people in other work units outside your organization.

____ 29. Give gifts (e.g., tickets to sporting events, shows, food, liquor, flowers) to people in other work units in your organization to maintain good relationships.

____ 30. Give gifts to people outside (e.g., tickets to sporting events, shows, food, liquor, flowers) to people in other work units in your organization to maintain good relationships.

____ 31. Attend social club activities (e.g., Rotary meetings).

____ 32. Perform social club activities.

____ 33. Learn about others’ interests, likes, and dislikes.

____ 34. Walk around your organization’s facilities to observe what is going on and chat informally with people.

Please enclose the survey instrument in the provided self-addressed, stamped envelope and mail it TODAY.

---

Note: This Networking Practices Questionnaire is copyrighted by James Michael and is reproduced with his permission. Many items in this questionnaire are from earlier questionnaires copyrighted by Gary Yukl and Manus Associates and are reproduced with their permission.
The purpose of this questionnaire is to give you a chance to tell how you feel about your present job, what things you are satisfied with and what things you are not satisfied with.

On the basis of your answers and those of people like you, we hope to get a better understanding of the things people like and dislike about their jobs.

On the next page you will find statements about your present job.

• Read each statement carefully.

• Decide how satisfied you feel about the aspect of your job described by the statement.

Keeping the statement in mind:

— if you feel that your job gives you more than you expected, check the box under "Very Sat." (Very Satisfied);

— if you feel that your job gives you what you expected, check the box under "Sat." (Satisfied);

— if you cannot make up your mind whether or not the job gives you what you expected, check the box under "N" (Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied);

— if you feel that your job gives you less than you expected, check the box under "Dissat." (Dissatisfied);

— if you feel that your job gives you much less than you expected, check the box under "Very Dissat." (Very Dissatisfied).

• Remember: Keep the statement in mind when deciding how satisfied you feel about that aspect of your job.

• Do this for all statements. Please answer every item.

Be frank and honest. Give a true picture of your feelings about your present job.
Ask yourself: How satisfied am I with this aspect of my job?

**Very Sat.** means I am very satisfied with this aspect of my job.

**Sat.** means I am satisfied with this aspect of my job.

**N** means I can't decide whether I am satisfied or not with this aspect of my job.

**Dissat.** means I am dissatisfied with this aspect of my job.

**Very Dissat.** means I am very dissatisfied with this aspect of my job.

---

**On my present job, this is how I feel about . . .**

1. Being able to keep busy all the time

2. The chance to work alone on the job
   - Disat.  N  Sat.

3. The chance to do different things from time to time

4. The chance to be "somebody" in the community

5. The way my boss handles his/her workers

6. The competence of my supervisor in making decisions

7. Being able to do things that don't go against my conscience

8. The way my job provides for steady employment

9. The chance to do things for other people

10. The chance to tell people what to do

11. The chance to do something that makes use of my abilities

12. The way company policies are put into practice

13. My pay and the amount of work I do

14. The chances for advancement on this job

15. The freedom to use my own judgment

16. The chance to try my own methods of doing the job

17. The working conditions

18. The way my co-workers get along with each other

19. The praise I get for doing a good job

20. The feeling of accomplishment I get from the job
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