

A Race/Ethnic Comparison of Career Attainments in Healthcare Management

American College of Healthcare Executives
Association of Hispanic Healthcare Executives
Executive Leadership Development Program, Indian Health Service
Institute for Diversity in Health Management
National Association of Health Services Executives

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Tables	ii
Background and Study Objectives.....	1
Methods.....	2
Findings.....	3
1. Demographic Comparisons	3
2. Career Outcomes	4
3. Human Capital Differences	8
4. Attributes of the Current Position and Organization	14
5. Career Expectations	22
6. General Attitudes and Policies Promoting Equity	24
Conclusions and Recommendations	30
Study Committee	31

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1	Population, Sample, and Response Rates
Table 2	Demographic Information
Table 3	Position by Race/Ethnicity and Year
Table 4	Current Area of Responsibility
Table 5	Employing Organization
Table 6	Role as Mentor
Table 7	Salary and Bonus
Table 8	Mean Salary by Position
Table 9	Median and Predicted Median Salary Controlling for Education and Years of Experience
Table 10	Job Satisfaction
Table 11	Job Commitment
Table 12	Undergraduate Education
Table 13	Graduate Education
Table 14	Early Socialization Experiences in Healthcare Management
Table 15	Most Influential Mentor
Table 16	Career Origins
Table 17	Career Experience Overview
Table 18	Withdrawal from the Workforce
Table 19	Attitudes Affecting Career Progression
Table 20	First and Current Position within Current Firm
Table 21	Promotion within Current Firm by First Position
Table 22	Likelihood of Respondent's Promotion in Next Year
Table 23	Current Organization: Racial Composition
Table 24	Current Organization's Policies
Table 25	Professional Hours Worked Per Week
Table 26	Involvement in Recruiting
Table 27	Interracial/Ethnic Socializing with Other Executives at Least Monthly
Table 28	Fairness of Current Organization
Table 29	Opinions on Racial/Ethnicity Issues in Current Organization
Table 30	Work Environment Five Year Review
Table 31	Intent to Leave Current Employer in Next Year
Table 32	Certainty of Career Plans
Table 33	Preferred Setting for Future Employment in 5 Years
Table 34	Career Aspirations to be a CEO
Table 35	Ranking of Resources that Would Be Called Upon if Job Changed Was Planned
Table 36	Attitudes Concerning Racial Interactions in Healthcare Management
Table 37	Opinions Concerning Inequities in Healthcare Management
Table 38	Opinions Concerning Policies
Table 39	Best Practices Promoting Diversity in Healthcare Management

Table 40 Non-Response Analysis

A Race/Ethnic Comparison of Career Attainment in Healthcare Management

Background and Study Objectives

In 1992, a joint study by the American College of Healthcare Executives (ACHE), an international professional society of 30,000 healthcare executives, and the National Association of Health Services Executives (NAHSE), whose members are predominantly black, compared, for the first time, the career attainments of a group of black and white healthcare executives. The study had three objectives (1) to describe and compare the career attainments of the two racial groups; (2) to suggest what factors might account for any differences in their attainments and (3) to elicit opinions on public policy initiatives that might bring about greater equity of opportunity in the field of healthcare management.

The findings showed that fewer blacks held CEO positions or positions reporting to the CEO; fewer blacks worked in hospitals and financial remuneration for blacks was 13 percent lower than for whites. Blacks expressed less satisfaction than whites in pay and fringe benefits, job security and the respect they received from their supervisors. Nevertheless, blacks and whites had achieved comparable levels of formal education and blacks had accrued one year less experience compared to whites.

The study was replicated in 1997, this time including Hispanic and Asian healthcare executives in the sample. The results showed that disparities in the proportions of top level management positions continued to exist between white women and minority women but that there were no significant differences in the proportion of top positions held by male managers in the various race/ethnic groups. Other measures of career attainment continued to show disparities between whites and minorities: whites more often being employed in hospitals and in general, expressing higher levels of satisfaction with various aspects of their jobs. And, while the earnings gap grew between white and black women, it narrowed between white and black men. (Other minorities took on intermediate earnings between the white and black poles.)

When the results of the prior studies were published, the leadership of the sponsoring organizations published recommendations. These were intended to redress what appeared to be continuing unfair discrimination against minority healthcare executives. They included such positive actions such as urging practicing executives: to publicize career advancement opportunities such as continuing education, networking events and job vacancies inside the organization and elsewhere; developing and specific criteria for advancement in management and reviewing senior management salaries to ensure they are equitable and non-discriminatory.

Several suggestions were directed to four different audiences. For example, practicing healthcare executives were asked to publicize career advancement opportunities such as continuing education, networking events and job vacancies inside the organization and elsewhere; they were also asked to develop specific criteria for advancement in management that could be used to help identify and promote qualified minorities. Executive search consultants were counseled to use the resume banks of NAHSE and ACHE when conducting senior level searches and to urge their clients to consider minority executives for senior level positions. Professional societies were encouraged to meet

annually to discuss progress and issues related to diversity in healthcare management and to conduct a follow-up survey in five years. Finally, minority executives were encouraged to obtain graduate degrees, pursue postgraduate fellowships and approach practicing executives to serve as mentors and coaches.

Following the study's publication, the American Hospital Association, the ACHE, and NAHSE sponsored the initiation of the Institute for Diversity in Health Management (IFD). Later, the Association of Hispanic Healthcare Executives (AHHE) and the Catholic Health Association (CHA) became sponsors as well. The Institute for Diversity in Health Management is committed to expanding healthcare leadership opportunities for racially/ethnically diverse individuals and increasing the number of these individuals entering and advancing in the field.

When the time came to conduct a third study, leaders of the four professional associations, ACHE, NAHSE, AHHE and IFD saw fit to broaden the study objectives to focus on Native Americans. Toward that end, they enlisted the support of the Executive Leadership Development Program, Indian Health Service. Together with some members of ACHE, this organization assisted in identifying executives in the field who were Native Americans.

Methods

This report focuses mostly on replicating the questions of the 1992 and 1997 studies; it is a third cross-sectional study. Its central objective is to determine if the race/ethnic gap in healthcare management careers has narrowed since 1997 based on a similar group of respondents.

The sample for the 1992 study was derived from two sources: names of blacks were obtained from NAHSE; while ACHE affiliates were used as the source for the comparison sample of white executives. (At that time, the ACHE did not record the race/ethnicity of its affiliates.) As displayed in Table 1, the gender distribution of blacks was approximately 50 percent male and 50 percent female. The white sample was drawn to approximate the gender distribution of the blacks to facilitate the comparisons.

In 1997 and 2002, the white sample was again drawn from ACHE's membership files to facilitate the comparison with the NAHSE membership listing--again approximately 50 percent of the sample and respondents were women and 50 percent were men. In 1997 and 2002, however, it became possible to enlarge the NAHSE listing of blacks by including ACHE members who were black. This was done to obtain a more complete representation of black healthcare executives in the U.S.

All Hispanic affiliates of ACHE and of AHHE were surveyed in 1997, and all of the Asian executives in ACHE (Asian healthcare executives do not have their own national organization). In 2002, Native American executives were drawn from the membership files of the Executive Development Leadership Program of the Indian Health Service (ELDP) and were supplemented by the members of the ACHE who indicated that they were American Indian/Aleuts.

The questionnaire was administered in the spring of 2002. Non respondents were sent a second questionnaire and, to the extent possible, e-mails and telephone calls were made to encourage completion of the 22-page questionnaire.

The response rates to the cross-sectional study questionnaire are presented in Table 1. Of the 1573 blacks sampled, 526 or 33 percent responded. However, because some were unemployed and a few failed to provide their gender, 29 were eliminated from the analysis. Of the 1608 whites who were sampled, 48 percent responded. Of 449 Hispanics sampled, 48 percent responded. Of 240 Asians sampled, 49 percent responded. Finally, of 153 Native Americans sampled, 44 percent responded.

A non-response analysis is presented in Table 40. It shows that respondents were not significantly different from non-respondents in age, field of highest degree, position level attained or employing organization. However, more non-respondent women had attained a bachelors degree only. The significant chi square noted in position level among men is due to the fact that we do not know the current position levels of some of the non-respondents. The non-response analysis was of necessity confined to the ACHE sample which included members of all race/ethnic groups.

Because the composition of the groups differed in gender, and because of the importance of gender in career attainments, we present the findings for women and men separately. Thus, women constitute 55 percent of black respondents, 52 percent of whites, 38 percent of Hispanics, 43 percent of Asians and 42 percent of Native Americans. (Refer to Table 1.) Such separation is essential in order to partial out the effects of gender from the effects of race/ethnicity.

We determined statistical significance by using chi-square tests for categorical variables and t tests for continuous variables using a two-tailed significance level of 0.05 or less.

Findings

Section 1: Demographic Comparisons

Table 2 presents the general table configuration for all the data in the study. Each table is divided into female responses and males. This allows us to control for the effects of gender on career attainments and focus only on race/ethnicity. The first two columns present the 1992 results comparing blacks and whites; the following columns present the 1997 results comparing blacks, whites, Hispanics and Asians; the rightmost columns present the 2002 results comparing blacks, whites, Hispanics, Asians and Native Americans. Statistical tests of significance are made between the comparison groups for each year.

Age. In contrast to previous waves of the research where there were no significant differences between the race/ethnic groups by age, in 2002, we see that whites and Native Americans were older than blacks, Hispanics and Asians. The women respondents ranged from a median of 37 for Asians to 49 for Native Americans; while men's median age ranged between 43 for Asians to 50 for whites.

Gender. Table 1 describes the gender composition of the groups. Women constituted 55 percent of the black group; and by design, 52 percent of the white group. They constitute 39 percent of the Hispanic group, 43 percent of the Asian and 42 percent of Native Americans.

Marital Status. In 1992 and 1997, we observed that a lower proportion of blacks was married. Today this is still true among the women but over 80 percent of black males are married. The lowest

proportion of married respondents are Asian, only 49 percent of Asian women and 75 percent of Asian men are married. Women today vary in the number of children they have by race/ethnicity; blacks and whites on average, have one child, Asians have none while Hispanics and Native Americans have an average of two. But men in all the race/ethnic groups average two children.

Level of education. As was true in previous years, white women today are more likely to have completed a graduate degree than black, Hispanic and (today) Native American women. Asian women resemble whites in education attained. Among men, today, Asian men were more likely than others to have a post-graduate degree. We will return to consider these differences in educational preparation in Section 3 below.

Overall, the groups are dissimilar in age; the Asian group is somewhat younger and the white group is somewhat older than median age of others. Fewer Hispanics and Native Americans have attained graduate degrees.

Section 2: Career Outcomes

Positions attained. In 1992, 31 percent of black women had attained top positions (CEO or COO/Senior vice president); in 1997 this proportion was reduced to 23 percent and today it stands at 26 percent. In contrast, white woman expanded their share of top positions—from 35 percent in 1997 to 40 percent in 2002. Hispanic, Asian and Native American women today occupy about as many top positions as blacks. These data are corroborated in respondents' reports of the number of levels between them and their CEO. (Refer to Table 3.)

The position information comparing men shows that white and Native American men are more likely than blacks, Hispanics and especially Asian men to be CEOs. Conversely, fewer white men (and more Asian men) are in department head positions. Recall however, that the age disparities noted above may help to account for these findings. Compared to previous research, more white men are now CEOs while about the same proportion black and Hispanic men are CEOs.

Area of Responsibility Today, as was true in 1997, the proportion of black women in general management remained at about a third while 45 percent of white women retained general management responsibilities. Other race/ethnic minorities resembled blacks in their areas of responsibilities. Blacks are disproportionately represented in sector management including HMO/PPOs, ambulatory services and associations. (Refer to Table 4)

For men, we observe a repeat of the differences observed between blacks' and whites' area of responsibility in 1992. Then, as now, about half of the black men and nearly 70 percent of the white men were in general management. These differences are made up by more black men and fewer white men taking responsibility for single business disciplines (e.g., finance, human resources) and for sector management. Table 4B also shows that a disproportionate number of Asian men manage clinical and ancillary services.

Note: Based on a survey conducted by the ACHE and American Hospital Association in 2002 we estimate the following race/ethnic distribution of hospital CEOs: 1.6% black, 95.2% white, 2.0% Hispanic; 0.6% Asian and 0.6% Native American.

Employing organization. Table 5 shows that white women today are more likely than their race/ethnic minority peers to work in freestanding hospitals. Over a third of them compared to less than a quarter of the minorities work in such places. In contrast, a higher than expected proportion of black women work in public health agencies (and non-hospital venues of the military). Overall, hospitals and systems constitute the major employer for all groups ranging from 53 percent of black women to 72 percent of white women. For those that work in hospitals, few differences exist among the race/ethnic groups relative to hospital size except that black women are less represented in small hospitals (under 200 beds).

Considering both hospital and other employers, women respondents reported the median budget for the current fiscal year as \$95 million for whites, \$25 million for Native Americans with the remaining race/ethnic groups taking intermediate positions. This is a departure from 1997 where white women managed firms with the lowest median budget of the race/ethnic groups, \$14 million. Finally, ten percent of white women compared to only 3 percent of black women and no Native Americans work in investor-owned organizations while a smaller proportion, 12 percent of white women compared to 81 percent of Native Americans work for the government.

The pattern noted above for the type of employing organization for women is repeated for men: white men are disproportionately employed by freestanding hospitals; black and Native American men are seen especially in public health settings and among black men who work in hospitals, few are found in small ones while more are found in hospitals with more than 600 beds. These patterns are similar to those discerned in 1997.

Considering both hospital and other employers, male respondents reported the median budget for the current fiscal year as \$150 million for blacks, \$19 million for Native Americans with the remaining race/ethnic groups taking intermediate positions. Finally, 65 percent of Native American and 38 percent of Asian men work in governmental organizations compared to only 18 percent of whites. That nearly two-thirds of Native American men are employed by the government is to be expected due to the reliance of the sample group on the Executive Leadership Development Program of the Indian Health Service. Compared to 1997, fewer whites and Hispanics are employed by government but Asian men have maintained their representation there.

In contrast to 1997, today, it is Asian men and women rather than Hispanic men and women who are disproportionately found in organizations under governmental auspices. Among all the males, the modal employing organization continues to be the system hospital. Blacks and whites typically work in not for profit secular settings; Asians and Native Americans most typically are employed in governmental settings.

Role as Mentor. How involved are the respondents in mentoring activities? We defined mentoring activities in the questionnaire as “Someone in the field of health administration who has provided you with sponsorship, enhanced your exposure or visibility, coached you, protected you, or provided challenging work assignments.” In 2002, about 60 percent of black and white women said they had served or were currently mentors for someone in healthcare management. Less than 50 percent of Hispanic women serve or have served and even fewer—less than 40 percent Asian and Native American women serve as mentors. These results are similar to those found in 1997 although there have been small declines for Hispanics and Asians.

Minority men are more likely to be involved in mentoring activities than minority women. Table 6B shows that among all race/ethnic minorities, about 10 percent more of each group is involved in mentoring when compared with their female counterparts. When compared to 1997, fewer Hispanic and Asian men are mentors today.

As was observed in previous years, each race/ethnic group tends to mentor persons of their own race/ethnicity. Thus, Blacks are more likely to acquire black protégés; whites attract white protégés, Hispanics attract Hispanic protégés Asians attract Asian protégés and Native Americans tend to mentor their own race as well. Within each race/ethnic group, each gender tends to mentor a greater number of its own, e.g., black men mentor a greater number of black men than black women while black women find more black women than black men protégés.

Salary. Table 7 displays a key outcome in this career attainment study--the median salary earned in 2001 including bonus, if any, from professional work from their employers before deducting retirement contributions and taxes. The reader is cautioned that these salaries are not necessarily representative of the actual salaries earned by healthcare executives today since survey responses from executives earning higher salaries may have been disproportionately low.

In calendar year 1991, black women earned 6 percent less than white women. In 1996, black women earned 16 percent less than white women and in 2001 black women earned 23 percent less than white women. In 1996, Hispanic women earned 18 percent less than white women, in 2001, they earned 23 percent less than white women. In 1996, Asian women earned 21 percent less than white women; in 2001 this gap grew to 31 percent. Native American women earned 41 percent less than white women in 2001.

Also presented in Table 7 are the mean earnings which contain some very high salaries. White women are seen to earn substantially higher salaries when compared to their race/ethnic counterparts.

Over time, the gap in income has continued to grow between white and minority women. For men, the story is similar except for blacks. Thus blacks in calendar year 1991, earned on average, 17 percent lower salaries than the whites. By 1996, the gap had narrowed where blacks earned on average, 12 percent less than whites. But in 2001, the trend reversed and black men again earned 17 percent less than white men.

In 1996, Hispanic men earned 11 percent less than whites; by 2001, they earned 13 percent less. In 1996, Asian men earned 4 percent less than white men; in 2001 they earned 27 percent less than whites. Recall, however, that Asian men in this sample were significantly younger than the whites. Finally, Native Americans earned 28 percent less than white men in 2001.

To a great extent, salary is dependent on position attained. Table 8 considers the salary differentials within position group. Thus, if individuals attain high level positions, can they expect to receive comparable pay irrespective of their race/ethnicity? Comparisons within position group are hampered by few observations and by several outliers that skewed the groups' means upward. Overall, given the sample size in this study, incomes within position groupings are quite comparable with two exceptions: female Hispanic COOs or senior vice presidents earn significantly less than female whites in the same or similar positions. Also, female Black and white department heads (and

staff) earn significantly more than Native Americans. Also, white women at this position level earn significantly more than their Asian department head counterparts.

For men, the only significant difference is observed at the CEO level where Blacks, whites and Hispanics earn more than Native Americans. Visual inspection of the salary data for COOs and vice presidents strongly suggests that Native Americans earn lower incomes compared to their peers in other race/ethnic groups. However, these differences are not validated statistically due to an insufficient number of cases.

Even though the actual median salary and bonus data earned are reported in Table 7, strictly speaking, we are not comparing like groups. Since whites in the sample were older, they also accrued more experience and therefore could be expected to earn higher salaries. To achieve a better indicator of income disparity, we tried to determine what the salary and bonus outcomes would be for all of the groups if they had the same experience and education that the whites had. The data show that indeed, minority women would have earned higher salaries than they report but they would continue to earn less than white women do. Thus, even if minority women had achieved the same levels of experience and education that white women achieve, their incomes continue to be lower. Of the three minority groups considered, Hispanic women appear to be more highly remunerated than blacks and Asians.

Among men, whites again earned highest salaries, \$118,800 followed by Hispanics at \$103,700. What would happen if the minority groups achieved the same education and experience levels of the white men? Here the picture is different. The data show that with education and experience levels identical to the whites, black and Hispanic men's salaries and bonuses would have approximated that of their white counterparts. Because there were so few Asians and Native Americans with high levels of experience, it is difficult to estimate what salaries highly experienced Asians actually would have. This initial attempt to consider the experience of whites relative to minorities' salaries has shown that unexplained income disparities continue to exist among women but less so among men.

Job satisfaction. In 1992, 1997, and again in 2002, black women expressed less satisfaction than the whites relative to pay and fringe benefits, security, sanctions and treatment received when they made a mistake, and respect from supervisors. In 2002, black women and Asian women as well, were less satisfied than white women with the respect they received from subordinates. However, there were no important differences among the race/ethnic groups relative to their satisfaction with their autonomy. As in prior years, Hispanic, Asian (and Native American) women's satisfaction generally fell between the level of blacks' and whites'. (Refer to Table 10)

Men showed a mixed picture with respect to job satisfaction. For example, in 1992, blacks and whites did not differ in regard to satisfaction with pay and fringe benefits nor with regard to supervisors' respect. But in both 1997 and 2002 black men expressed significantly less satisfaction with their pay and fringe benefits than whites or the other race/ethnic minorities did. Likewise, blacks along with Native Americans today are less satisfied than other groups with their treatment when they make a mistake and the respect they received from their supervisors. Interestingly, all of the responding groups expressed high levels of satisfaction with their autonomy and to a lesser extent, the security of their positions.

Job Commitment. Using a previously validated scale, the data show that overall, black women express lowest levels of commitment and whites express highest levels (Table 11). In most cases, Hispanic, Asian and Native American respondents fell between those ratings given by the whites and the blacks.

For example, compared to the others, black women are less likely to say they have a strong feeling of belonging to the organization, nor do they feel as emotionally attached to it. Black men are somewhat more committed than black women. For example, more of the black men than the black women said their organization had great personal meaning for them and that they would be happy to spend the remainder of their careers with their current employer. Significantly, there were only small differences in the groups' responses to the ease of becoming attached to another organization--most--including black respondents--expressed doubt about this.

Overall, the findings of career attainment show that while hospitals continue to hold the main employer role, other providers are attracting sizable proportions of minorities with Native Americans and to a lesser extent Asians disproportionately present in public health agencies. Minority men more than women indicated they serve as mentors--focusing especially on protégés from their own race/ethnic and gender group.

We noted that the salary gap between white and minorities of both gender groups grew in the past half decade, reversing the trend observed for men. However, within position levels, salaries among the race/ethnic groups were roughly comparable although sample size precluded a definitive statement on this issue. Controlling for education and experience, white women's incomes are higher than blacks, Asians and Native Americans. But among men, whites were seen to earn more than Native Americans only. Blacks continue to express less satisfaction with regard to their pay and fringe benefits. Black women are the least satisfied group in regard to job security and how they are treated when they erred. Finally, job commitment is generally lower among the blacks when compared to the other race/ethnic groups.

Section 3: Human Capital Differences

The first group of factors that might account for the disparate career achievements of the race/ethnic groups concerns human capital differences. Included here are education, experience and motivation to achieve high level positions.

Undergraduate education. Table 12 compares the undergraduate experiences of the various groups. Except for 15 percent of Native American women, nearly all of the respondents had completed college. Approximately one quarter of the blacks, attended a historically black college, a finding that has been quite consistent over time. Corresponding to their older age, more white women and men graduated college in the 60s and fewer of them graduated in the 90s when compared to the race/ethnic minorities.

In contrast to the 1997 findings comparing race/ethnic group undergraduate majors, women in 2002 showed fewer differences than men did. The only notable difference in college major among women was the fact that a larger percentage (34 percent) of white women majored in nursing when compared

to women in the race/ethnic minority groups. In contrast, men in 2002 showed several differences by race/ethnicity. Thus, Asian men were more likely to have majored in biological science and were less likely than others to have majored in general business. Also, white men were more likely than other race/ethnic groups to have majored in general business and were less likely than others to have majored in social science.

In each of the surveys, 1992, 1997 and 2002, minorities were more likely than whites to have received 50 percent or more of their tuition from grants, scholarships etc. For example, in 2002, almost two thirds of Native American women, and half of Hispanic and black women received assistance compared to 28 percent of white women. Lower proportions of men got such aid—ranging from a high of 44 percent of Native American men and 43 percent of black men to a low of 18 percent of white men. Except for Asian women, a majority of those who received such aid said that such support was a determinant in their decision to complete college.

Graduate education. In 1992, 9 out of 10 black and white women had graduate degrees. In contrast, 8 out of 10 black men compared to 9 out of 10 white men took graduate degrees then (Table 13). These differences are no longer evident today; black men are as likely to have a graduate degree as white, Asian or Hispanic men. Native Americans in the sample are however, less likely to have obtained a graduate degree; just over half of the women and less 78 percent of Native American men report such achievements.

With the exception of Hispanic women and Native Americans, the majority of all respondent groups took their graduate degree in healthcare management. Compared to 1992 where two thirds of the blacks took such specialized degrees, today, the percentage has declined about 10 percent. Whites have not changed very much in the types of majors they took since 1992; 55 percent of the women and 61 percent of the men have healthcare management degrees. Hispanics tend to mirror the whites except more of the women have degrees in public administration and more of the men have other majors. About 60 percent of the Asians have healthcare management degrees.

If we compare the proportion of blacks and whites that received 50 percent or more of their graduate tuition from grants, scholarships or fellowships over time, we note a declining pattern for black women from 52 percent in 1992 to 38 percent in 2002 and the proportion declined from 58 percent in 1992 to 45 percent in 2002 for black men. For whites however, the proportion that received such aid has hovered around a third for women and a quarter for men. Hispanics and Asians parallel the findings for whites (except for a decline in aid received by Hispanic men between 1997 and 2002). Among all the groups, more Native Americans were recipients of graduate scholarships—58 percent of Native American women and 46 percent of Native American men report such support. The importance of such support in pursuing a healthcare management graduate degree appears to have increased over time; today half or more of all groups (except white males) stated that such support was a major decision factor to pursue a healthcare management career.

Internships, Residencies and Fellowships. The early socialization experiences of young professionals can exert a profound influence on their careers. In 1992, more blacks took internships than whites. Today, among men, there are no major difference between the race/ethnic groups and participating in either internships, residencies, fellowships or in having a mentor to coach and support them. However, some variation is seen among women: Asian women are more likely than others to

have taken an internship but fewer white and Native American women did so. Also, more black and Asian women and few white Hispanic and no Native American women reported taking fellowships. The findings for white women correspond to their older ages since fellowships are a relatively recent phenomenon. Likewise since only about half of Native American women completed a graduate degree, we would expect fewer to have taken a fellowship. (Refer to Table 14)

For everyone except Native American women, the second most common socialization experience after having a mentor was the internship. Residencies were more prevalent among the males—however that has been a decline from 44 percent of the white males who took a residency in healthcare management in the 1997 sample to 31 percent reporting residency experience in 2002. Fellowship continues to be the least common early socialization experience; they are most often seen in the careers of black and Asian women.

Jobs were actually obtained by sizable proportions of those who took residencies and especially fellowships. For example, hiring of residents ranged from 33 percent that recruited Asian women residents to 71 percent in organizations that recruited white women. Those taking fellowships were in most instances even more successful—half or more of the fellows said they obtained jobs in the organizations where they took their fellowship.

Mentors. Of these early socialization experiences, having a mentor is most common—a majority of all respondent groups identified a mentor. Of those who report not having a mentor, more than 60 percent stated that they would have liked to have had one. When asked why they did not have a mentor, various reasons were cited. Asian and Native American women cited time constraints contributed to their not having a mentor more than the other groups. Three out four white women who were unable to connect with a mentor said that mentors were uncommon in their early career. Half of the Hispanic women said they were unable to find a compatible mentor.

Men often said that the reason they couldn't find a mentor was that they were uncommon in their early career. This was especially true for white men where 89 percent acknowledged this to be the case. More than half of Hispanic and Asian men said one contributing factor was their not being able to link to a mentor. Clearly, these responses deserve further investigation in future research. One respondent wrote:

Minority entrants into the field are less likely to have a significant and well placed mentor in the first five years of their career. This lack of mentoring leaves minority candidates in a deficit from a development and experience standpoint and then they never overcome this as they are compared to their white counterparts in job searches.

While it was noted earlier that respondents who served as mentors most often selected protégés of their own race/ethnicity, the converse is not true—mentors' race ethnicity varied by group. For example, all race/ethnic minority women reported a higher mean number of white men than individuals of their own gender and race/ethnicity. White women also reported the highest mean number of mentors were white men. Among men, similar findings are evident. The largest number of mentors is white men for all groups. This means that only white men did not have to take direction from individuals unlike themselves in gender and race/ethnicity.

Table 15 shows the gender and race/ethnicity of the respondents' most influential mentor. Today, as was true five years ago, approximately 50 percent of blacks--both males and females--claim their most influential mentor was white and the other half claim their most influential mentor was black. In addition, both black and white women cited women as mentors more than men did.

The pattern of citing white men most often as the most influential mentor is evident for women in the other race/ethnic minorities as well. Asian women resembled white women's selection of white women as the second most common chief mentor. But blacks and Hispanics were more likely to chose members of their own race/ethnicity after white men. Compared to 1997, the largest increase in mentor type among black and white women was women of the respondents' own race/ethnicity; thus, black women were principal mentors for 19 percent of black protégés in 1997 but rose to 27 percent by 2002. This may be interpreted as a positive finding because it suggests that more black women are in positions to serve as mentors than heretofore.

Among men, only small differences are apparent when comparing 1992, 1997 and 2002 responses. White males continue to mentor 86 percent of white men. However, 42 percent of black men respondents said their mentors were white males; another 45 percent said they most influential mentor was a black male. Hispanics rely mostly on white mentors -- 61 percent stated that a white male was their most influential mentor; 60 percent of Native American men agree. Asians, relied almost exclusively on whites as their most influential mentors.

This year for the first time, we included questions about the position held by the main mentor at the time that the relationship was initiated. Table 15 shows that the majority of both men and women said their main mentor was their immediate supervisor. For example, one military respondent wrote:

The Army Medical Department is a great proponent of mentoring. Mentoring has been the "key" to my success to date. Performance counseling of all subordinates is required. This assures all subordinates get feedback on strengths and weaknesses.

Apart from this main finding, a third of black women and a third of Asian men said they found their main mentor at another position in their employing organization.

When asked about their satisfaction with various features of the mentor/protégé relationship, respondents from all groups were quite similar. Overall, over 90 percent were satisfied or very satisfied. High marks were given especially for career advice, getting new ideas about work, opportunities to improve their interpersonal skills and networking opportunities. Women were less satisfied than men with the time allocated for the mentorship. Respondents were generally less satisfied with their mentor/protege relationship in three areas: (1) initiating dialog about race/ethnic issues, (2) obtaining promotions and/or salary raises and (3) personal problems.

Key differences when comparing the groups were that white women were significantly less satisfied than the others relative to personal problems. White women and men were less satisfied with their relationship than others about initiating dialog about race/ethnic issues; conversely black women and men were more satisfied about this aspect of their mentor/protégé relationship than the other groups.

Career Origins. Table 16 shows that first position obtained fails to differentiate the race/ethnic groups. About equal proportions obtained positions in various locations of the organizational hierarchy when they began their careers as healthcare managers. However, differences in the focus of their first area of responsibility are re-emerging. For example, in 1992, white women were more likely to begin as clinical/ancillary service managers compared to blacks; this difference was less pronounced in 1997 but has reappeared in 2002. In addition, Asian women are now much more likely to have started their careers in sector management such as ambulatory care settings, association management etc. There are no important differences when comparing men's first areas of responsibility.

Differences between blacks and whites in the type of first organization they worked for are more evident among women than men though the pattern is similar for both gender groups. Thus, whites were more likely than minorities to begin their careers in a freestanding hospital. They were less likely than minorities to start their careers in a public health agency or in the military.

Whites, both men and women were more likely to begin their careers in organizations under not for profit, church ownership and were less likely than other groups to begin their careers in government settings. However, over 60 percent of all groups (except Native American women) picked their first firm expecting to build their careers in that kind of organization e.g., hospital, consulting firm etc. This was a recommendation of the previous study since it was established that first employing organization was strongly correlated with the current employing organization.

Finally, a new question was developed to probe how respondents learned about the availability of their first position. While there are no important differences among the groups, it is interesting to note that the most prevalent sources of information about the first positions for women and men was a friend (or family member) and accounted for about a fifth of all placements. This was followed by respondent's professional network and advertisements.

Career experience. Table 17 provides an overview of the years of experience attained--another potential explanation for differences in career outcomes. Considering the total number of years of experience in healthcare, white women worked about five years longer than black women and 10 years longer than Asian women in 2002. The average white women had accrued 25 years of work experience in healthcare overall and 18 years of healthcare management experience. Nevertheless, most of the respondents had been employed in about 3 organizations during their careers although, corresponding to their longer tenure in the workforce, white women had held about one more position (4.7 total) than their minority counterparts.

While black men had about the same number of years of experience as black women, white, Hispanic and Asian men generally acquired more experience than the women in their race/ethnic group. In other respects the men's results paralleled that of women in 2002. White men had more experience (an average of 24 years) and held more positions (an average of 5.6). than other minority men except for Hispanic men who held an equal number of positions on average as whites. These differences in experience underscore the importance of controlling for human capital variables in determining the equity of career outcomes. Compared to previous years, all groups are seen to have accrued more experience both in healthcare generally and in healthcare management.

If acquiring experience is important to attain higher level positions, then withdrawing from the workforce would be expected to exert a negative influence on career attainments. Table 18 examines this issue and shows black and Hispanic women are disadvantaged in that compared to the other groups--notably whites and Asians--they took less desirable jobs because of financial need and lack of opportunity. Black, Hispanic and Asian men also reported taking less desirable jobs because of lack of opportunity. Black women and men especially, took part time employment for the same reasons. These patterns were evident in the 1992 and 1997 studies as well.

I have noted numerous African American women who have become self-employed after numerous lateral moves in healthcare management. Many of us found our career tracks interrupted by childbearing, and were not able to regain status or similar opportunities to our white male counterparts of similar educational backgrounds and experience. I also see fewer minority executives in senior-level positions across the country than I did 10 years ago. Executives no longer seem to appoint people to positions based on their talent and potential, but on their prior experience and comfort with someone's "precise" prior experience. In order for minorities in healthcare to advance, because we are few, executives will need to place (hire) for talent, not just on precise replication of experience.

In 1992, white women, to a greater extent than blacks, told us they had taken less desirable jobs because of family needs. However, while still a factor in one out five respondents, since 1997, there have been no important differences among the race/ethnic groups.

Attitudes affecting careers. Attitudes about preparation for careers can help us understand what early careerists encountered when they entered the workforce. Are there differences among the race/ethnic groups in their appraisal of their pre-professional education? In Table 19, respondents indicated their appraisal of the adequacy of their education. Between two thirds and three quarters of the women and even higher percentages of men stated that their education was adequate preparation for their first management position. There were no important differences between the race/ethnic groups.

Other possible attitudes that might affect career trajectories are willingness to relocate and the impact of their family obligations on the respondents' careers. In 2002, between 50 and 60 percent of women but fewer Hispanic women reported they were willing to relocate when compared to their peers. Among men, high proportions—nearly 80 percent among all race/ethnic groups (except Asians) said they were willing to relocate for a better position. Overall, women continue to be more reticent to move than men in every race/ethnic category.

The converse is also true, that is, more black, white and Hispanic women than men in these groups agreed that family obligations presented an obstacle to their accepting more responsibility. Still it is remarkable that only about 20-30 percent of women in these race/ethnic groups cited family obligations as a barrier to their rising. Black men were the least hampered by such concerns—only 13 percent said that family obligations present an obstacle to accepting more responsibility.

In 1992, we observed that blacks were significantly more willing to move to a different city for an attractive career opportunity than whites, and this appeared again this year. More than 60 percent of

black women and more than 70 percent of black men said they would move to another city—compared to less than half of white women and 59 percent of white men. Hispanic and Asian women were similar to white women in willingness to move. Hispanic men were as willing to move to a different city as Blacks; but fewer Asian men were willing to move than whites.

As one respondent wrote, *I believe that minorities are more favored and advance at a faster pace in larger cities where diversity is embraced beyond the workplace.*

Willingness to move to a rural or semi-rural area for career opportunity revealed a completely different picture. Less than a third of most women and fewer than half of men would move to such areas. Of all the groups, fewer Asian women were inclined to move to rural areas—15 percent said they would do so. These findings are similar to what was observed for women in the previous research. But fewer white, Hispanic and Asian men expressed a willingness to move to rural areas over time.

Finally, two questions were asked about more general issues concerning discrimination and overall satisfaction in achieving career goals. To the question of whether the respondent had been negatively affected by race/ethnic discrimination, 55 percent of black women compared to six percent of white women said yes. Hispanic, Asian and Native American women took on intermediate values between these two extremes. These results are similar to those reported in 1992 and 1997. The same pattern was evident among the men.

As far as being satisfied with the progress made toward meeting their overall career goals, 58 percent of black women said they were satisfied--the lowest proportion of the race/ethnic groups in the study. In contrast, the white women had the highest proportion of respondents who were satisfied with their career progression—78 percent. Again, these patterns are repeated for the men. These findings were evidenced in the 1997 study as well.

Section 4: Attributes of the Current Position and Organization

Another possible explanation for disparate career outcomes might include the experiences and perceptions job holders have in their current organizations. It is through the organization's challenges that managers acquire a broad array of experiences both in tasks accomplished and interpersonal relationships. And by carefully examining an organization's structure, its demographic makeup, and policies we may begin to understand how commitment can be fostered and promotions facilitated. This section seeks to shed light on structures and processes in place that give rise to the outcomes already discussed--positions held, salaries earned, satisfaction with and commitment to the job.

First and Current Position Do members of the race/ethnic groups vary in terms of the positions they are recruited for? And do their promotional patterns vary? Table 20 examines these questions by comparing the respondents' first and current positions in their current organization. The table shows that the plurality of women were recruited as department heads but 22 percent of white women were recruited at the vice president level—more than was the case for the race ethnic minorities. Among the men again, a plurality of blacks, Hispanics and Asians were recruited as department heads. But the largest proportion of whites—31 percent--were recruited as CEOs to their current

organization. (A third of Native Americans were recruited for Department Staff positions.). The disproportionately high number of whites recruited as CEOs is likely related to their older age and greater experience than the race/ethnic minorities.

Even though there were few differences among women's first positions in their current firms, the picture is quite different today. Thus, the plurality of minority women continue to serve as department heads, but white women are most often found in vice presidencies; and a higher proportion of white women than of other race/ethnic groups has attained CEO or COO status. One possible explanation for these findings is the greater number of years white women have worked in their current firm: a median of 6 years, compared to 4 years for black and Hispanic women. White women also have served in their current job on average, over three years--somewhat longer than the other race/ethnic groups. (Native American women show a totally different pattern; despite having worked in their current organization for a median of 12 years, 44 percent are in department head positions—jobs they have held for on average, over 3 years.)

Similar patterns in current positions hold for men. Compared to whites, twice as many black and Hispanic men and three times as many Asian and Native American men are in department head positions. Conversely, while nearly 40 percent of whites are CEOs, about half as many black, and a third as many Asian men hold CEO posts. Again, white men show somewhat longer tenures than many of their minority counterparts---over 6 years in their current firms and 4.2 years in their current positions. But this is not a complete explanation—black men are seen to have served nearly as many years as whites in their organizations and positions. (Again, Native Americans display a unique profile; about a third are in department head positions, a third are in CEO positions and the remainder are split between vice presidencies and all other positions. Like the white men, they have worked in their current firms for over six years, on average.)

How did respondents find their first position in their current firms? Table 20 shows that for both women and men, about 20 percent learned about the position from their professional network; somewhat fewer (except for Hispanic women) learned about the position from a friend. Most of the remainder learned about it from an official of the organization who recruited them and through a printed advertisement. (More Native Americans learned about their first positions in their current organizations from a friend than from other sources.) Overall, it can be seen that with the exceptions noted, more respondents learned about positions from their professional network—in contrast to their first position in the field—where respondents relied on friendships (and family) for their source of job information. Here is how one respondent characterized the importance of a personal network:

Personal networking contributes to many, many job placements. If minorities are not visible because they're in public hospitals, long-term care, etc., and if they're not known through LOCAL programming (and to a much lesser extent, national programming) of professional organizations, hospital or health system executives don't think of them or even know them to include them as candidates for management positions.

Some respondents remain in the same position that they took when they first joined their current organization. Still, we have observed some mobility and therefore, we wanted to know how each respondent learned about their current positions. Table 20 compares the race/ethnic groups and shows

there were no important differences. For example, about 20 percent of all race/ethnic groups were promoted and about as many black and white women were recruited by an official of the organization. But for the other race/ethnic groups, respondents variously relied on their professional network, internal transfers and, to a lesser extent, on their friends (and family).

Table 21 considers the patterns of promotion from first to current position within the employing organization by race/ethnicity. The table shows that nearly all the executives who began as CEOs remained at that level. It also shows that more black and white women who were recruited as senior vice presidents were promoted to CEOs than the other groups. However since the number of respondents was low in the case of Hispanics, Asians and Native Americans, the findings should be considered suggestive only. The table shows that over half of the white men compared to a third of black men rose from COO to CEO positions in their current firm.

Likelihood of Promotion Do the respondents anticipate a promotion within the next year? Table 22 shows that as was true in 1992 and 1997, the groups are all about equally optimistic or pessimistic about their promotion probabilities. Between 15 and 20 percent of both women and men expect promotions within the coming year. (However, white men were somewhat more pessimistic about their chances of promotion.)

Thus far, we have portrayed the recruitment and promotional patterns within respondents' organizations. The data show that many of the race/ethnic minority executives were recruited at the same level but that whites are somewhat different than the others. More white women began their tenure in their current firm at a vice president level while their minority counterparts began as department heads. Also, more white men began at a CEO level when compared to their minority colleagues. Moreover, more white women rose to achieve a COO level position and more white men than minority men reached the pinnacle CEO level in their current positions. How different are the organizations that these executives work for? Table 23 compares them in terms of their race/ethnic composition and Table 24 considers specific policies that might enhance or hinder career advancement.

Race/ethnic Composition Table 23 shows that the organizations these executives manage are typically peopled by whites. Thus, the race/ethnicity of the respondents' predecessors is predominantly white, the organizations' employees are predominantly white as is the service area. In the case of blacks and Hispanics, there are sizable minority populations like themselves--but the single largest race/ethnic group continues to be white. Even in the departments that these managers lead, the dominant race/ethnicity is white. However, here is what one black respondent observed:

Many hospitals may serve 50 percent African American people and have an even larger proportion of African American employees, and yet have no representation at the senior managerial level. Then, when the hospital loses money year after year, the question of what to do continues to go unanswered. Many hospitals fail to attach themselves to the communities they serve or who is serving them!

Comparing 1992, 1997 and 2002 data shows that changes observed between 1992 and 1997 were maintained. For example, while the race/ethnicity of predecessors was similar among blacks and whites in 1992, for black executives, the service area's race/ethnicity composition changed from

predominantly black to white. And, among black men, the employees' race/ethnicity in their organizations also changed from predominantly black to predominantly white. We believe these findings were evidenced because of the fact that in 1997 and 2002, blacks in the sample were recruited from those who were not only in NAHSE but also from blacks who were ACHE members.

Table 23 also shows that even though the preponderance of direct reports and supervisors for each race/ethnic group was white, each group tends to manage and report to disproportionately more individuals of their own race/ethnicity. The findings for Native Americans are unique: basically, their organizations appear to be islands of homogeneity where their predecessors as well as the organization's employees and the population of their service area are Native American as well. While this pattern persists for supervisors of Native American women, more Native American men report to whites. Here is what a white supervisor of Native American managers wrote:

There are obvious inequities in whites (i.e., the minority) achieving certain senior level executive positions due to "Indian preference" which allows for discrimination based on race. This is a federally recognized practice which is not always helping the Indian people as there are very committed and culturally sensitive non-Indian candidates for some of these jobs who are far more qualified to assure proper healthcare is rendered. I do believe that we need to promote Native Americans going into the healthcare field and eventually (hopefully soon) qualifying for these senior executive jobs. But in the meantime, protecting the dwindling resources and dealing with things appropriately should be paramount. Indian lives are being affected by this reverse discrimination (in my opinion).

Organization's Policies: Table 24 shows that respondents in the previous waves of this research characterized their organizations differently than those who responded in 2002. For example, in 1992, we discerned significant differences between the policies of blacks' and whites' employing organizations. Then, more white women than black women reported that their organizations offered educational support programs and childcare services. But by 2002 these differences were more muted—more black and other minority women reported educational support programs were being offered and fewer white women reported childcare services were offered. In contrast, job sharing appears to continue to be more prevalent in white women's organizations than in organizations employing minority women.

In 1992, more black than white men reported their organizations held recruiting events targeted toward minorities; in 1997 and again in 2002, both white and black men's organizations held such recruiting events to the same extent. Again, this may have resulted from the larger population groups used to sample respondents in the later studies. Even though similar proportions of respondent groups report policies in place that address recruiting and hiring minorities, many recruiting events appear to fall short of their goals as evidenced by this respondent:

The organization in which I work has great leadership, most of which has developed from within the organization. Unfortunately, there is not a lot of diversity among leadership. I've observed that it's difficult to recruit candidates of color when the culture is so white. Despite good intentions and a very relational caring culture of leadership, we have trouble attracting candidates of color to the organization when we

usually don't look too far outside the organization to start with. A more formal commitment to increasing diversity is being developed. I'm optimistic, but progress needs to be made.

Other initiatives were explored in the 1997 and again in 2002 research that might show preferential treatment of minorities by their employing organizations. The information displayed in Table 24 shows that most of these policies were not more likely to be in place in the comparison groups' organizations. The most prevalent policy affirmed by about 20 to 30 percent in the 1997 research -- that the organizations tied diversity goals to business objectives appears to be less common in 2002 (except for black women's firms). A similar decline is evident in the proportions stating that senior executives in their organizations were encouraged to mentor minorities. A new question was incorporated to learn how prevalent senior executives were evaluated based on mentoring minorities. Such a criterion is used by less than ten percent of respondents' organizations. This proportion needs to rise as one respondent asserts:

Minorities interested in career progression should seek out mentors who can coach them in relationship building. Companies interested in promoting leadership diversity should invest in formal mentoring programs as a performance requirement for senior executives.

In fact, about 20 percent of all respondent groups said their organization did have a formal mentorship program. But such programs are only rarely tied to senior level executives' criteria for evaluation. Few respondents (5 to 15 percent) reported that their organizations set targets for hiring minorities, set targets for promoting minorities, provide rotations for them or required minority candidates to be on the short list for senior-level executive positions. One senior executive stated his dilemma this way:

I think there are some inequities in minorities attaining senior level executive positions today. I do not know if this is truly discriminatory behavior or the lack of candidates in our region. We promote internally when there is a diverse workforce, but fewer minorities apply. When balancing out our internal search, I cannot say we target minority groups as much as casting a wide net to attract them. This may or may not produce minority candidates depending on those that respond and the numbers available to respond.

Today's healthcare organizations are challenged to embrace diversity and reach out to their communities. One recommended way is to encourage fluency in the language of the service area. Data in Table 24 show that only about a quarter of respondents' organizations reward fluency in Spanish and only about 8 to 13 percent of the organizations employing Hispanic executives are more likely to reward fluency in Spanish with such perquisites as additional pay, or offering them more promotional opportunities.

Finally black men--but not women--reported their organizations were more likely to fill upper management positions with persons from outside the organization rather than through internal sources. As one respondent suggests, more organizations should develop its executives internally:

I believe some white executives and board members view a black person in a senior position in much the same way as those within the NFL view a black quarterback or head coach. Due to ignorance, I believe those in decision-making positions believe a black person cannot lead a healthcare organization. Across the board in healthcare there is not a lot of succession planning. Organizations are starting to realize they need to develop their own leaders. When organizations develop their own leaders they need to include and select minority candidates. By developing minority candidates for the future, healthcare may see an even racial balance in executive leadership.

The outstanding finding in terms of the context and policies of the employing organizations of racial/ethnic minorities and whites is that with few exceptions, the policies are similar. Again, Native Americans' organizations appear to be unlike others in the sample. Both women and men Native Americans report greater efforts by their employers to hire, promote and provide rotations to minorities and usually fill upper level management positions by promoting from within the organization.

Daily workstyle Having studied the positioning and transitions of the executives within their employing firms and the policies designed to promote a more diverse corps of executives, we now consider the day to day work life characteristics of the executives in their jobs. One key measure is the hours worked per week. Table 25 shows that just as was discovered in 1997, today, white women state they work about 2.4 hours more than blacks and 2.6 more hours than Hispanic women. That white women work more hours is consistent with their higher position levels. On the other hand, black women say they work about 1.3 hours more than white women, away from the office. Men on average, worked approximately 48 hours per week at the office; black men work more hours outside the office and at home when compared with whites and Asians.

Apart from putting in hours, what specific activities might distinguish the race/ethnic groups? Tables 26 and 27 consider each group's involvement in recruiting for the organization and socializing with other executives. In 1992, we observed that whites were significantly more involved in recruiting for physicians than black healthcare executives. In 1997 and 2002, the disparity continues with regard to physician

recruitment and includes recruitment of administrators and among the white women recruiting nurses as well. Overall, black men report less involvement in recruitment than other men. It is unclear from the data if lower involvement in recruiting is the result of lower positions held or if the organizations employing black executives are less involved in recruiting per se.

Table 27 describes the extent to which healthcare executives socialize with both minority and white fellow managers within their organizations. In 1992, we noted that whites reported more non-work socializing with both black and white managers at lunch and by participating in sports. In 1997, white women again report more socializing at lunch than blacks. But by 2002, these differences have disappeared and socializing appears not to differentiate the race/ethnic groups for women.

Greater participation in sports no longer distinguishes white from black men; it appears as if whites have reduced their participation in sports with their colleagues since 1992. In fact the greater involvement of Hispanic executives with other managers observed in 1997 relative to having dinner and attending cultural events has disappeared in 2002 as well. The only difference of note in 2002 is

that Asian men state they are more involved in socializing with their colleagues after work than other men.

Native American men appear to attend sporting events with other managers who are not of their race/ethnicity. One respondent commented,

I think minorities who prove themselves to be capable and socialize with the majority race are also recognized by the organization. In our health system, there are blacks who hold senior VP positions. There are also minority managers who are well respected by their peers or supervisors.

Another respondent wrote:

I think there is a general misperception that if you are not white and have an accent, you are not bright and competent enough to be promoted. I have attained a CEO position because I worked much longer hours and harder (took on more assignments) just to prove my competence. Even then, there were always others who doubted whether or not I was adequate! I have seen other less competent whites move ahead much faster than me, and I realized retrospectively, that they were promoted because they were in the social network.

Minorities tend to be excluded from the inside events and parties, so they can never penetrate through the mental prejudices. "Inside" organizational information is not shared freely, as if minorities would not be smart enough to comprehend.

Finally, a black women conscious of the differences in class often evidenced between races wrote:

As an African American female having to come up through the ranks, it's difficult to assimilate into the executive healthcare community when you are playing "catch up." As positions become available, minorities are often left out from the professional network because they aren't readily available in the finest neighborhoods, not seen at the theatre, can't afford tickets to sporting events, etc. The average white person is totally clueless as to how past circumstances of African Americans still affect the present and the future.

Fairness of organization. Apart from formal policies of recruitment and employment and their workstyles, how do the groups personally perceive their employing organizations? In 1992, whites believed their organizations were more fair than blacks in four out of eight areas surveyed. These perceptions did not alter after 5 years but how about after 10 years?

Table 28 shows that blacks continue to feel their organizations are less fair than whites in salaries paid, promotions offered, recognition given and professional membership dues underwritten. In addition, Hispanic women feel their organizations are not as fair relative to support provided for continuing education and physical facilities as whites do. Fewer Native American men than other groups feel their organizations are fair relative to paying their professional membership dues and support for continuing education..

Here's how one respondent perceives the inequities in promotions to arise:

When many of these positions become vacant, they are filled with individuals who are either familiar with the peer group of similarly employed people or have similar interests to them. While a minority candidate might be equally qualified as a white candidate, because individuals influencing candidate selection may feel that they have little in common with the minority candidate, they may feel ill positioned to assess the candidate and therefore choose the familiar (one).

Further indication of the dissatisfaction expressed by blacks with their employing organizations is demonstrated by data presented in Table 29. Approximately 70 percent of blacks compared to an average of five percent of the whites agreed with the statement that, "Minority managers usually have to be more qualified than others to get ahead in my organization." Hispanics (65 percent) and Asians (65 percent) fell between the poles established by whites and blacks.

One black healthcare executive said that minorities need a high emotional quotient and must be more visible in order to advance:

White and black professionals in healthcare do not often socialize in the same arenas, thus giving white up-and-coming professionals an advantage because most of senior leaders in healthcare are white and many socialize in these same settings. When whites and blacks do socialize together, often the conversations are superficial. Black professionals have to make a special effort to endear themselves to white senior leaders so they can get to know that (black professional) person on a more in-depth level, which leads to opportunities to show one's skill and talent in healthcare administration.

Often white up-and-coming professionals are afforded greater (because of relationships) access to visible projects, than up-and-coming black professionals. Thus, senior leaders more often see the ability of the white healthcare professional than the black healthcare professional. Lastly, stereotypes of black healthcare professionals cloud our performance. We have to be 10 times better to get any recognition.

Finally, to the general statement, "Race relations within my organization are good," similar divergent views again appeared between race/ethnic minorities and whites. Almost 80 percent of white women and 90 percent of white men thought race relations in their organizations were good. The comparable statistics for blacks was 41 percent of women and 53 percent of men agreeing with the statement. Comparing the responses to this question with 1997, shows that today, blacks and whites continue to hold widely separate opinions about race relations in their organizations.

Acts of discrimination A final measure of the work environment concerned specific probes about what acts of discrimination respondents had experienced since 1997. Table 30 shows that approximately one third of the blacks compared to 5 or fewer percent of the whites said they were not hired because of their race/ethnicity in the past five years. The proportion of blacks who experienced this has declined by about 11 percent when compared with findings of the 1997 study.

Nearly half of black women and a third of black men stated that they failed to be promoted because of their race/ethnicity and as many said they failed to receive fair compensation over the past five years. Again, less than 4 percent of whites stated this happened to them. Only small improvements were evident when compared with the 1997 findings.

Hispanics, Asians and Native Americans also experienced these acts of discrimination but almost always, to a lesser extent than blacks. In addition about 30 percent of blacks compared to about 10 percent of the whites said they were evaluated with standards they believed to be inappropriate. These results for the blacks represent a 15 percent improvement when compared to the 1997 findings.

Another question focused on stalled careers because of having an accent or speaking in a dialect. This was affirmed by from approximately ten to fifteen percent of Hispanic and Asian respondents.

Finally, respondents were asked if in the past five years, they had received preferential treatment because of their race/ethnicity. In view of the shift on the advisability of affirmative action, it is interesting to note that black women report little change in their being preferentially hired or promoted. However, fewer black men now report that they were hired or promoted because of their race than in 1997.

Hispanics and Asians reporting on preferential treatment showed little change when compared to the 1997 findings. The group that appears to have received the most preferential treatment was Native Americans; approximately 40 percent of women and men were hired and 25 percent were promoted in the past five years because of their race/ethnicity. Thus while considerable proportions of minorities experienced career setbacks because of their minority status, a small group benefited from their minority status as well. This issue evoked many comments from white women like the following:

The same inequities exist for minorities as with females. It's a historically white male dominated area. There is still a good-ole-boy network. The good-ole boys don't/can't/won't empathize with issues facing women and minorities. On the other hand, minorities hurt themselves by expecting to be promoted over more qualified non-minorities. I think affirmative action programs hurt minorities because they cause major resentment by non-minorities. Many minority people act if they expect handouts. They need to earn what they get.

Section 5: Career Expectations

A third set of factors thought to give rise to different career attainments is the executives' level of career expectations and aspirations. Differences in career plans and desires can result from psychological bases such as childhood socialization patterns, sociological factors such as perceived or real discrimination or even consciously chosen goals like preferences for more time with family. This section of the report compares the race/ethnic groups on intent to remain in their current position, preferred future jobs and the kinds of resources that would be called upon if a job change was planned.

Intent to leave One measure of how content the groups are with their present position is their intent to leave within the next 12 months. The question resulted in significant differences among the race/ethnic groups. As shown in Table 31, twice as many black and 2.5 times as many Asian women as white women said there was either a good chance or they definitely would leave their current employer in the next year. For men, fewer important differences are evident although a high proportion of whites than minorities said they definitely would not leave their positions in the next year.

Future aspirations Thinking more long term, respondents were asked first, whether or not they currently had a career plan in place. Table 32 shows that about a half or more of the men but fewer of the women in all race/ethnic groups had a definite career plan. Next, we asked in what type of organization they wanted to work 5 years hence. Table 33 shows that more blacks and Hispanics than whites wanted to work in provider settings other than hospitals or systems such as ambulatory care facilities, long term care facilities, managed care organizations or community health centers. These findings were evident in previous years as well. In addition, more blacks than whites expressed interest in working in “other” settings including public health agencies, associations, suppliers and sites outside of healthcare.

Another key indicator of career aspirations concerns the expectation to achieve a CEO position (Table 34). As we reported in 1992 and 1997, there continues to be no significant difference in the proportion of race/ethnic minority women and white women who aspire to be CEOs. In all years, less than 20 percent express such aspirations. But major differences between black and white men are noted for the first time in 2002. Today, about 45 percent of white men compared to 26 percent of black men aspire to be CEOs in five years. The other race/ethnic groups take on intermediate values between these two poles. These patterns persist for the period ten years hence as well. But in 15 years, the proportion of white men who want to be CEOs drops to a third, which is probably correlated with their older age and plans for retirement.

Resources for job change We conclude this section on career expectations by presenting respondents’ ranking of resources that would be used to change jobs. Table 35 gives an indication of the resources the members of the race/ethnic groups would call upon to achieve their career plans. All ten groups said the first source they would turn to when changing jobs would be their personal network. Then, interesting differences appear by gender and race/ethnicity.

For example, blacks and whites of both genders and Hispanic men would seek out executive search firms as a second source. Hispanic women would turn to as their second choice either to a professional society (e.g., ACHE, AHHE, IFD etc.) or to an electronic job listing. Asian women and men said the second source they would turn to would be an electronic job listing followed by a search firm and published advertisements. Native Americans showed a unique pattern—women said they would turn to an electronic job list and their healthcare management program while the men stated they would look to their professional society for job assistance.

Section 6: General attitudes and policies promoting equity

Attitudes about racial/ethnic relations in organizations Attitudes are thought to affect actions. Therefore, to understand precursors of change, it is useful to gauge attitudes to see how groups differ and what actions each thinks is needed to redress existing inequities. In Tables 36 and 37, we contrast the views of the five groups and consider changes in views expressed in 2002 compared to previous years.

Do minority managers receive greater, the same amount, or less support in healthcare organizations than whites? We asked the groups about the support given to minority managers by their subordinates, supervisors and colleagues. Table 36 shows that black and Hispanic respondents more than whites believe that minority managers receive more support from their subordinates. Native American women also believe this.

On the other hand, the respondents of all groups including whites continue to deny, as they did in previous studies, the suggestion that minority managers get more support from their supervisors than do whites. Blacks in both gender groups especially denied that such preferential treatment is given.

One specific example of possible unequal treatment by supervisors concerns the thoroughness with which they conduct their evaluations. In this regard, whites and minorities continue to hold vastly different views. Over half of the blacks today feel supervisors don't evaluate minorities as carefully or thoroughly as whites. Fewer, about 30 percent of Hispanics and Native Americans, and 20 percent of Asians, concurred with this view--but less than 10 percent of whites felt this was the case.

One white respondent complained the African-Americans are improperly evaluated:

I work in a section of the country that has a high-level of African-American population. I am appalled by the lack of African/American individuals in mid to high-level management positions within the organization. I am more appalled by the fact that less-than-adequate African American managers are allowed to continue in their roles, even in the face of incompetence. Senior leadership is unwilling to deal with this because of Board or community backlash. In effect, tolerance of this incompetence is very harmful to the promotion of diversity in the organization. All it does is reinforces the wrongful concept that African-American individuals are not competent in leadership roles—to both African Americans and to whites. This to me is true discrimination and a major way to prevent true diversity.

Lack of inter-racial/ethnic collegiality among managers is again evident in 2002 as it was in previous studies. A clear majority of blacks disagreed with whites who thought that white managers share vital growth and career related information with minority managers. Hispanic, Asian and Native American managers fell between the two poles established by blacks and whites.

Following is an example of whites' excluding minorities from key networking events:

I believe education and exposure play a major role in minorities not attaining senior-level positions. White counterparts are given first priority when networking

opportunities become available. The information regarding a networking session is disseminated through internal networks.

A more general question also focusing on collegial relationships was posed. Respondents were asked if they thought that the quality of relationships between minority and white managers could be improved. While 85 percent of blacks thought so, only about 35 percent of whites agreed. Many other whites were “neutral” in their responses. Again Hispanic, Asian, and Native American respondents fell in the midrange between blacks and whites.

Asked if respondents thought the quality of relationships between minorities from different race/ethnic groups could be improved, nearly 90 percent of blacks, and approximately two thirds of Hispanics, Asians, and Native Americans agreed compared to about half of whites.

Here is a sample of four written-in comments about minority interrelationships:

In conservative cities such as Pittsburgh, the 1 or 2 (minorities) who are lucky enough to make it into the executive ranks tend to shy away from bringing others along either due to fear or a comfort of being the only one.

Minorities do not help one another. We are either

- *afraid of being ostracized by white co-workers*
- *jealous – we want to be the "only" black*
- *truly not in a position to help but try to make others think we are*

There are inequities in Hispanics attaining not only senior-level positions but in just getting our foot in the door. Not only are Hispanics discriminated against by whites but also by Blacks. The few openings available are quite competitive. Since Blacks get there first, it becomes doubly hard for a Hispanic to break through. Public hospitals are run primarily by Blacks, while there is still no significant presence by Hispanics. The voluntary sector is run by whites, and again with no visible representation by Hispanics. Other minorities do not seem to be suffering as much from the heavy hand of exclusion through subtle discrimination.

Minority leaders must be cautioned not to hire only individuals from that minority which I have seen on several occasions.

Thus, minorities are more ready to acknowledge their relationships with whites as well as with other minorities could be improved. Again the same caveat cautioned above exists--many white respondents who were neutral may not have experience working with minority managers.

Three attitudinal questions were then posed concerning respondents' views on general career attainment issues. As was the case in both previous studies, the prevailing view among blacks (90 percent) was that white managers have greater opportunities to advance than minority managers and that there are limited opportunities for minority managers to advance in their careers. About half of the white respondents tended to disagree with these views. For example, one white male wrote:

Actually I believe it's more difficult for white males to find jobs in our society in general and healthcare specifically. There is such a focus on diversity that it has had negative consequences for the white male. About three years ago I was laid off during a 20% reduction in force of a large integrated health delivery organization. When I was given notice, my boss at the time (white female) informed me that I was selected over others to lose my job because as a single white male I'd have an easier time finding another position!

Hispanic, Asians and Native Americans concurred with the blacks that whites have greater opportunities to advance than minority managers but they were more divided on minorities' having limited opportunities for career advancement. Following are examples of the complex reactions we received:

I feel that the minority group that suffers the most is the group whose first language is not English. I feel that Latinos are seen as the group to become waiters, gardeners, work in homes, etc. This is evident in schools and work places at all levels.

Most boards are composed of whites. I served as an executive for a for-profit company and when I presented minority candidates to non-minority hospitals they were rejected. Some board members were honest enough to say a minority candidate (CEO) would not be happy there. I learned first hand some amazing lessons. Some non-minority hospitals welcomed minority candidates at least verbally.

Again in this third study, black respondents indicated that minority managers are more often role models in their communities than whites. The majority of Hispanics (and Native American women) agreed with the blacks' views but Asians (and Native American men), like the whites expressed ambivalence.

Although minorities said that the quality of their relationships with whites and other minorities could be improved, when asked if they would recommend a career in healthcare management to a young person today, about 90 percent of all race/ethnic group members said yes--a similar proportion said this in the 1992 and 1997 studies.

Managers' role in fostering positive race/ethnic relations. Should managers influence their staff's views on race/ethnicity issues? A majority of respondents, stated managers should, in their view, influence the attitudes of employees in race/ethnic relations. Except for Hispanic and Native American women, approximately two thirds or more of all race/ethnic groups agreed--even higher proportions of blacks concurred this was part of the healthcare manager's role (Table 37).

Just as we are mounting a campaign against racial and ethnic disparities in the delivery of healthcare so too must a battle be waged to ensure opportunities exist for minorities to advance to senior-level positions in healthcare management. The issue is commitment to the profession as evidenced first by minorities seeking to enter it, then by senior leadership (some of the best and most highly trained minds in the country) doing everything they can to facilitate knowledge sharing, mentoring and appropriate/timely promotion of those who demonstrate the capacity and skill for advancement—at the same time as or ahead of their peers.

A majority of all race/ethnic groups thought that managers should take public positions on equal employment opportunities. There are no important differences between the race/ethnic groups in 2002 whereas in 1997, a time when there was a general societal backlash against affirmative action policies, there appeared to be a growing segment of whites who opposed policies promoting equal employment opportunities. This pattern, while still discernible seems to have abated somewhat.

Indeed, three new questions help shed additional light on respondents' views of management's role in race/ethnic relations. First, a majority of all race/ethnic groups (except for Native American women) do not agree with the idea that white executives who promote diversity initiatives in their organizations expose themselves to risks. However, about a third of black respondents did agree with the statement, as did the following white healthcare managers:

In my current environment, colleagues are mostly whites from fairly affluent backgrounds. They appear to have been successful without expanding their views of those unlike themselves. Their relationships, and therefore the organization's relationships, with minority physicians is strained and plagued with distrust. I came from a more middle class background in a racially diverse mid-size city in the South. My accent has drawn negative attention. My efforts to recruit minority managers and staff (nurse/rad. techs) from other countries has been met, on each occasion, with exclusion from group activities and intense scrutiny on just about any project or effort I was representing.

Senior executives are evaluated based on their effectiveness, rather than whether they are very liked by their staff, peers, or whether they have a diversified staff. I believe senior executives are risk averse when it comes to promotions since they perceive that they're taking a chance on minority candidates. A wrong decision would impact their own performance. Overcoming this risk aversion comes from having well-prepared candidates from management programs, who are given opportunities within the organization to demonstrate competence, business acumen, and decision-making skills. Subsequent promotions are based on performance only.

I believe there remains a double standard in regard to consideration of minority candidates. This is particularly the case when the person is African-American. While white incumbents have the luxury of "failing" in a position, African-American "candidates" must be a "sure thing." There seems to be no room for a less than "perfect" fit. Thus African-American candidates are often excluded from receiving an offer in a situation where a white candidate (similarly situated) would receive an offer and a "chance."

Second, about 80 percent of all respondent groups agreed that building a diverse management team would enhance the morale of minority staff in healthcare organizations. A minority of white women and men as well as Asian men—perhaps 20 percent were neutral or opposed to this idea.

I see more diversity in the workplace and that is validation for me that the percentages are changing. Over the years I have personally seen that there has been significant movement to a more diverse management team. My perception is that in organizations where diversity is present, encouraged, and fostered, better relationships result among departments, staff overall and management.

Finally, when asked if efforts should be made to increase the percentage of race/ethnic minorities in senior healthcare management positions, great variation was evidenced. Nearly 100 percent of blacks, 90 percent of Native Americans, about 86 percent of Hispanics and 72 percent of Asians agreed with the idea. But only 53 percent of whites supported such efforts. For example one white respondent stated:

My experience with any group is they can achieve whatever heights they desire if they pursue education, have the right work ethic and have the initiative necessary to excel and achieve their goal. Whether man/woman, white/black etc, if the individual prefers to achieve goals based on race, sex, ethnic group, then they will never be as successful as the person who is driven based on individual merit!

Another white male wrote:

It is important to focus on talent and ability to add value to the organization rather than other unimportant/irrelevant attributes such as race or sex. The question presupposes that a quota system is in place. Quotas are not compatible with a focus on talent and ability. I will not hire or promote anyone because they are a minority; nor will I fail to do because they are a minority...talent is the sole criterion. Focusing elsewhere does a disservice to the position.

Yet another white male wrote:

There are, and will always be inequalities for minorities. There are also inequalities to otherwise qualified individuals who are not minorities by organizations that promote diversity. I personally try to hire the person best prepared to do the job. Sometimes, that means a minority gets the job – most times it doesn't. Thus, the onus is on the preparation, not the recruitment. Bring me a star and perhaps they'll have a place to shine!

On the other hand black male wrote:

The position I hold today is a direct result of the organization's interest and commitment to bringing in a black senior executive. It makes good business sense for the organization to do so, as the community we serve is largely black and Hispanic. Only when organizations are able to look past the differences we share and recognize that it's good business to do so, will we begin to see more minorities in the senior ranks.

The role of government in promoting equity Two questions asked respondents about the role of government in promoting equity between racial/ethnic groups. The first, asked for opinions on having government create incentives for the healthcare industry to engage in equal employment practices. About 60 percent of the blacks, 50 percent of Hispanics and Native Americans and 40 percent of Asians thought this was a good idea. But only 11 percent of whites agreed--and indeed, 68

percent of the whites disagreed. Again these findings reflect the dissimilar attitudes held by blacks and whites uncovered five and ten years ago.

Another question concerned increasing financial support (both government and private) for minority students who want to be healthcare managers. The pattern of responses already observed was repeated again; blacks were most supportive, followed by Native Americans and Hispanics, then Asians. Whites generally disavowed such a support. The contrast between blacks and whites confirmed findings previously observed. Here's what one white woman wrote:

As I paid fully for my MBA/MHA, I worked full time while going to school full time. This career choice is achievable with drive. I think we need to educate and provide guidance to minorities regarding the field, but not give it to them on a silver platter.

Best practices that have promoted diversity in healthcare management. In an open ended question, respondents were asked to write about any best practices they knew about that promote diversity in healthcare management. Table 38 categorizes the 715 responses into 14 main categories. By far, the most cited best practice concerned diversity planning and training initiatives. Some of the 130 comments included the following: “proactively recruiting at minority educational institutions, cultural diversity training,” or “discussing diversity with employees in informal settings; providing annual diversity training, sharing articles with employees regarding diversity issues, role playing diversity situations.”

Another 77 comments stated a best practice was for the organization to be committed to diversity. For example, “When the organization makes specific efforts to market and recruit from minority populations for qualified and capable candidates,” and “ 1)When the CEO publicly promotes it and demonstrates it by hiring ethnic minorities, 2) having an EEOC diversity officer to question when ethnic minorities are not recommended to be hired even though they are qualified and 3) setting goals related to diversifying the management team.”

An additional 68 comments concerned mentoring programs as, “...Mentoring programs –linking senior managers with junior persons. Providing career enhancement courses and making them mandatory; using minorities in an organization to pull in others; providing bonuses for recruiting qualified minorities; making minority mentoring a key component of senior management evaluation.”

Sixty-four comments concerned tapping the resources of organizations like the Institute for Diversity, the National Association of Health Service Executives and the ACHE. For example, one respondent wrote, “I strongly support Rupert Evans and his work at the Institute for Diversity—this group really goes a long way to leveling the playing field for minorities in healthcare management. I, too, believe the mentoring program and networking opportunities provided by the National Association of Health Service Executives (NAHSE) also is a best practice.”

Other practices recommended were: offering and supporting minority scholarships, internships and fellowships, promoting and recognizing the value of the individual, having senior management and Board be aware of diversity issues, education, placing minorities in healthcare executive positions, networking and advocating the benefits of a diverse staff. On placement, one respondent wrote, “Placing people in positions where they can be successful, then coaching them so that when

promotions are available, they are ready to accept the challenge--exposing them to Boards and top management.”

A number of respondents wrote that the government has successful practices. For example, one respondent employed in the Air Force stated, “The Air Force’s policy of Equal Opportunity has been extremely effective in creating a bias-free working environment. As a “minority” officer, I have never felt bias against me in my 20-year career. I do feel that quotas are counter-productive. Hiring decisions should be based on ability/work/ethic/character versus racial/ethnic considerations.”

Factors impeding minorities’ career attainments. The last question asked respondents to write in their views of (1) whether they believe there are inequities in minorities’ attaining senior level executive positions today and (2) if so, what factors account for these inequities. Table 39 shows that nearly all the blacks and more than three out of four Hispanic, Asian and Native American executives agreed that inequities exist. However, fewer whites concurred—60 percent felt there are inequities in minorities’ attaining senior level executive positions.

The table also categorizes respondents’ factors that they believe give rise to inequities. Overall, the most commonly cited reasons of the 14 categories included the following: the “good ole boy” white network (n=73), racism (n=67), cultural differences (n=65), lack of education (n=60), lack of organizational initiatives such as equal employment opportunity policies (n=57), and lack of mentors (n=53).

But some race/ethnic groups cited some factors more than would be expected by chance. For example, blacks and especially black women more than other groups cited racism or prejudice. Fewer white women cited this reason. Whites—both men and women indicated that they thought a major reason impeding minorities attaining high level management positions was due to the lack of sufficient numbers of applicants and that there were too few minority executives in the pipeline.

Hispanic and Asian men disproportionately cited the fact that minorities lacked certain attributes such as assertiveness or willingness to accept responsibility for senior level positions. Asian women cited cultural differences that impeded minorities from advancing. Here is what one wrote,

There are definite inequities, differences in culture, i.e., Asians tend to view verbal people as shallow; in Western culture, being articulate is an asset. Those who are articulate in Western culture get ahead easier and faster. There are differences in management styles—in Asian culture, relationships are of utmost importance; Western culture views the task as important—people are secondary to tasks, projects etc.

Finally, Native American men cited lack of experience or lack of supervisor support for minorities as contributing to inequities.

Conclusions and Recommendations

(These will be developed with the collaborating organizations.)

Study Committee

Study team members included the following individuals.

American College of Healthcare Executives:

Thomas C. Dolan, Ph.D., FACHE, CAE

President and Chief Executive Officer

Karen L. Hackett, FACHE, CAE

Executive Vice President and COO

Peter A. Weil, Ph.D., FACHE

Vice President, Research and Development

Peter A. Kimball, M.A.

Data Analyst/Statistician

Association of Hispanic Healthcare Executives:

George A. Zeppenfeldt-Cestero

National President

Institute for Diversity in Health Management

Rupert M. Evans, Jr., FACHE

President/CEO

Yoshi Honkawa

Board Member

Leadership Development Program, Indian Health Service

Elaine Alexander

Seh Welch

National Association of Health Services Executives

Sandra Robbie Gould, Ph.D., FACHE

President

TABLE 1

POPULATION, SAMPLE, AND RESPONSE RATES

	1992		1997				2002				
	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Native American</u>
Population	795	17,775	1,623 ²	16,096	662 ³	235	2,033 ⁴	13,601	449 ⁵	240	153 ⁶
Sample	517	966	767	802	662	235	1,573	1,608	449	240	153
Responses	367	565	410	408	264	124	526	779	215	118	68
Response Rate (%)	46.2	58.5	53.5	50.9	39.9	52.8	33.4	48.4	47.9	49.2	44.4
Analyzed ¹	328	524	380	386	240	115	497	742	204	114	64
Males	165	242	177	192	154	76	222	359	125	65	37
%	50.3	46.2	46.6	49.7	64.2	66.1	44.7	48.4	61.3	57.0	57.8
Female	163	282	203	194	86	39	275	383	79	49	27
%	49.7	53.8	53.4	50.3	35.8	33.9	55.3	51.6	38.7	43.0	42.2

¹Responses were analyzed if they were from employed healthcare executives who gave their gender.

²Composed of 603 ACHE members, 375 of whom were sampled, and 224 of whom responded:

and 1020 NAHSE members, 625 of whom were sampled, and 186 of whom responded (233 having proved unlocatable).

³Composed of 296 ACHE members, 179 of whom responded, and 366 members and contacts of AHHE, 85 of whom responded.

⁴Composed if 696 ACHE members, 539 of whom were sampled and 282 of whom responded and 1,337 NAHSE members, 1034 of whom were sampled and 244 of whom responded.

⁵Composed o 281 ACHE members, 159 of whom responded and 168 AHHE members, 56 of whom responded.

⁶Composed of 51 ACHE members, 29 of whom responded and 102 EDLP members 39 of whom responded.

TABLE 2A

DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION
FEMALES

<u>Age</u>	1992		1997				2002				
	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Native American</u>
< 35	29%	16%	20%	26%	21%	43%	23%	11%	28%	48%	0%***
35 - 44	45	48	43	35	46	31	27	23	26	19	41
45 - 54	18	24	29	33	31	23	40	44	37	33	44
55 +	<u>8</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>22</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>15</u>
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
n	(161)	(280)	(189)	(184)	(72)	(35)	(271)	(375)	(78)	(48)	(27)
median	39	40.5	42	42	42	37	45	48	43	37	49
<u>Marital status</u>											
Married	40%	60%***	45%	65%	63%	55%***	53%	72%	61%	49%	59%***
Single	<u>60</u>	<u>40</u>	<u>55</u>	<u>35</u>	<u>37</u>	<u>45</u>	<u>47</u>	<u>28</u>	<u>39</u>	<u>51</u>	<u>41</u>
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
n	(163)	(280)	(206)	(194)	(81)	(38))	(275)	(383)	(79)	(49)	(27)
<u>Number of children</u>											
0	48%	42%	36%	46%	43%	61%	36%	36%	31%	76%	22%***
1	19	20	28	19	17	18	23	14	16	11	11
2	25	23	25	27	30	18	27	29	36	13	26
3 or more	<u>9</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>42</u>
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
n	(162)	(273)	(202)	(186)	(77)	(38)	(271)	(274)	(75)	(46)	(27)
median	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	2	0	2

TABLE 2A (continued)

DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION
FEMALES

	1992		1997				2002				
	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Native American</u>
<u>Highest educational level completed</u>											
Some college	2%	2%*	1%	0	5%	0%***	1%	0%	1%	0%	15%***
College graduate	9	7	11	5	6	3	8	6	14	4	31
Graduate degree	81	72	79	90	77	97	82	86	78	85	42
Postgraduate degree	9	19	9	5	12	0	9	8	6	10	12
	100% ¹	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
n	(162)	(282)	(195)	(188)	(78)	(39)	(273)	(382)	(78)	(48)	(26)

*Chi-square significant p<.05

***Chi-square significant p<.001

¹Responses may not total to 100 due to rounding.

TABLE 2B

DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

MALES

[illegible]

TABLE 2B (continued)

DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION
MALES

	1992		1997				2002				
	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Native American</u>
<u>Highest educational level completed</u>											
Some college	1%	1% **	1%	0%	1%	0% ***	1%	0%	1%	0%	6% ***
College graduate	17	7	16	8	8	3	8	7	8	0	17
Graduate degree	69	79	72	83	78	91	82	87	78	88	67
Postgraduate degree	<u>13</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>11</u>
	100%	100%	100% ¹	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
n	(165)	(242)	(173)	(192)	(144)	(74)	(220)	(354)	(120)	(64)	(36)

**Chi-square significant p<.01

***Chi-square significant p<.001

¹Responses may not total to 100 due to rounding.

TABLE 3A

POSITION BY RACE/ETHNICITY AND YEAR
FEMALES

	1992		1997				2002				
	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Native American</u>
CEO	13%	9%*	9%	10%	6%	5%*	11%	13%	9%	9%	12%***
COO/Senior Vice President	18	25	14	25	20	10	15	27	16	15	16
Vice President	17	28	22	24	25	21	19	28	24	17	8
Department Head	20	14	33	25	33	23	39	19	32	34	44
Department Staff/Other	<u>32</u>	<u>24</u>	<u>22</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>41</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>26</u>	<u>20</u>
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
n	(161)	(280)	(203)	(191)	(80)	(39)	(266)	(381)	(76)	(47)	(25)
<u>Position Level in Hierarchy</u>											
1 = CEO	12	9***	10	12	7	6**	10	14	9	10	13***
2	15	25	8	23	15	22	14	28	15	15	9
3	23	35	28	31	32	13	21	28	31	18	52
4	30	18	23	21	26	28	23	18	22	25	13
5+	<u>20</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>31</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>31</u>	<u>33</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>22</u>	<u>32</u>	<u>13</u>
	100%	100%	100%	100% ¹	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
n	(150)	(266)	(170)	(173)	(74)	(32)	(229)	(353)	(67)	(40)	(23)

* Chi-square significant p<.05

** Chi-square significant p<.01

*** Chi-square significant p<.001

¹Responses may not total to 100 due to rounding.

TABLE 3B

POSITION BY RACE/ETHNICITY AND YEAR
MALES

	1992		1997				2002				
	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Native American</u>
CEO	23	35%**	17	26	23	16	19	37	23	11	32***
COO/Senior Vice President	25	30	26	25	24	20	25	25	24	23	14
Vice President	20	16	19	23	19	21	24	19	23	20	16
Department Head	20	10	27	13	21	28	22	10	20	31	30
Department Staff/Other	<u>13</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>8</u>
	100% ¹	100% ¹	100%	100%	100% ¹	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
n	(163)	(240)	(168)	(198)	(145)	(75)	(216)	(355)	(123)	(65)	(37)
<u>Position Level in Hierarchy</u>											
1 = CEO	29	37***	17	26	24	18*	18	37	24	15	33***
2	20	24	17	26	15	13	17	26	16	22	21
3	22	26	19	22	20	29	25	20	14	20	21
4	13	8	24	14	23	26	15	13	20	18	15
5+	<u>17</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>22</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>24</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>26</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>9</u>
	100% ¹	100%	100% ¹	100% ¹	100%	100% ¹	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
n	(152)	(230)	(149)	(188)	(136)	(68)	(206)	(328)	(111)	(55)	(33)

* Chi-square significant p<.05

** Chi-square significant p<.01

*** Chi-square significant p<.001

¹Responses may not total to 100 due to rounding.

TABLE 4A

CURRENT AREA OF RESPONSIBILITY
FEMALES

	1992		1997				2002				
	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Native American</u>
General Management	44	45**	32	47	44	33	36	45	37	33	32**
Single Business Discipline (Finance, Human Resources)	27	23	14	15	16	18	17	16	20	21	16
Clinical/Ancillary	13	23	22	16	13	10	17	23	17	17	36
Sector Management (Ambulatory, Association)	<u>16</u> 100%	<u>8</u> 100% ¹	<u>32</u> 100%	<u>23</u> 100% ¹	<u>28</u> 100% ¹	<u>38</u> 100% ¹	<u>30</u> 100%	<u>16</u> 100%	<u>26</u> 100%	<u>29</u> 100%	<u>16</u> 100%
n	(161)	(278)	(204)	(191)	(80)	(39)	(269)	(377)	(76)	(48)	(25)

** Chi-square significant p<.01

¹Responses may not total to 100 due to rounding.

TABLE 4B

CURRENT AREA OF RESPONSIBILITY
MALES

	1992		1997				2002				
	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Native American</u>
General Management	54	72***	42	56	43	51	47	69	44	45	51***
Single Business Discipline (Finance, Human Resources)	30	16	18	10	15	9	19	10	19	11	11
Clinical/Ancillary	5	9	12	11	16	19	11	10	18	25	20
Sector Management (Ambulatory, Association)	<u>11</u> 100%	<u>3</u> 100%	<u>28</u> 100%	<u>23</u> 100%	<u>26</u> 100%	<u>21</u> 100%	<u>23</u> 100%	<u>12</u> 100%	<u>18</u> 100%	<u>19</u> 100%	<u>17</u> 100%
n	(164)	(240)	(165)	(197)	(145)	(74)	(212)	(354)	(120)	(64)	(35)

*** Chi-square significant p<.001

TABLE 5A

EMPLOYING ORGANIZATION
FEMALES

Setting	1992		1997				2002				
	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Native American</u>
System Hospital	36	42	31	38	31	21***	31	38	36	43	50***
Freestanding Hospital	30	35	19	27	18	23	22	34	22	24	13
Other Provider	12	9	21	17	17	31	15	11	19	9	17
Public health agencies/ military (nonhospital)	9	5	9	4	23	5	12	4	8	9	17
Non-provider (e.g., consulting; education)	<u>14</u> 100% ¹	<u>10</u> 100% ¹	<u>20</u> 100%	<u>14</u> 100%	<u>10</u> 100% ¹	<u>21</u> 100% ¹	<u>20</u> 100%	<u>14</u> 100%	<u>15</u> 100%	<u>15</u> 100%	<u>4</u> 100%
n	(163)	(281)	(197)	(190)	(77)	(39)	(260)	(376)	(78)	(46)	(24)
<u>Number of beds</u>											
< 200	11	27***	11	35	25	17	18	36	25	32	78**
201 - 400	28	31	39	30	31	25	25	28	19	27	11
401 - 600	26	24	20	17	22	25	28	19	37	18	0
601 +	<u>35</u> 100%	<u>18</u> 100%	<u>30</u> 100%	<u>18</u> 100%	<u>22</u> 100%	<u>33</u> 100%	<u>29</u> 100%	<u>18</u> 100%	<u>19</u> 100%	<u>23</u> 100%	<u>11</u> 100%
n	(92)	(190)	(83)	(104)	(36)	(12)	(109)	(216)	(32)	(22)	(9)

TABLE 5A (continued)

EMPLOYING ORGANIZATION
FEMALES

	1992		1997				2002				
	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Native American</u>
<u>Number of beds</u>											
Median	500.5	350	417	286.5	338	459	450	292	435	364	35
Current Fiscal year Budget											
Mean (\$ millions)	NA	NA	187	136	229	685 ^{cef}	326	1888	2902	1251	595
Median (\$ millions)	NA	NA	27	14	35	34	41	95	60	80	25
Ownership											
Not-for-profit church	8	28 ^{***}	15	17	15	16 ^{***}	18	22	13	11	4 ^{***}
Not-for-profit secular	50	39	44	49	28	43	45	43	52	47	15
Investor-owned	13	16	17	21	15	30	3	10	6	6	0
For-profit--other	--	--	--	--	--	--	9	10	16	9	0
Government	29	17	24	13	41	11	21	12	12	26	81
Self-employed	--	--	--	--	--	--	<u>5</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
n	(163)	(282)	(192)	(189)	(78)	(37)	(265)	(378)	(77)	(47)	(27)

^c t test is significantly different at p<.05 between Blacks and Asians^e " " " " Whites and Asians^f " " " " Hispanics and Asians^{**} Chi-square significant p<.01^{***} Chi-square significant p<.001^l Responses may not total to 100 due to rounding.

TABLE 5B

EMPLOYING ORGANIZATION
MALES

<u>Setting</u>	1992		1997				2002				
	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Native American</u>
System Hospital	23	39***	36	36	30	41**	36	41	37	47	44***
Freestanding Hospital	32	37	23	32	23	20	23	34	25	16	14
Other Provider	13	9	19	14	17	19	13	9	18	15	14
Public health agencies/ military (nonhospital)	11	7	10	4	19	13	12	3	9	10	19
Non-provider (e.g., consulting; education)	<u>21</u> 100%	<u>7</u> 100%	<u>13</u> 100%	<u>14</u> 100%	<u>11</u> 100%	<u>7</u> 100%	<u>15</u> 100%	<u>13</u> 100%	<u>11</u> 100%	<u>13</u> 100%	<u>8</u> 100%
n	(164)	(241)	(162)	(194)	(141)	(69)	(217)	(352)	(122)	(62)	(36)
(For those in hospitals)											
<u>Number of beds</u>											
< 200	8	41***	22	46	36	46***	22	45	43	26	73***
201 - 400	25	31	24	30	28	31	29	32	32	39	20
401 - 600	44	17	21	13	20	11	21	15	15	19	7
601 +	<u>23</u> 100%	<u>12</u> 100% ¹	<u>33</u> 100% ¹	<u>11</u> 100%	<u>16</u> 100%	<u>11</u> 100% ¹	<u>27</u> 100%	<u>8</u> 100%	<u>9</u> 100%	<u>16</u> 100%	<u>0</u> 100%
n	(73)	(156)	(86)	(112)	(64)	(35)	(103)	(218)	(53)	(31)	(15)

TABLE 5B (continued)

EMPLOYING ORGANIZATION
MALES

	1992		1997				2002				
	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Native American</u>
<u>Number of beds</u>											
Median	500	268	447	217	293	230	399	226	233	334	72
Current Fiscal year Budget											
Mean (\$ millions)	NA	NA	237	209	308	167	947	742	1236	2506	158 ^{ej}
Median (\$ millions)	NA	NA	70	50	50	53	150	87	70	121	19
<u>Ownership</u>											
Not-for-profit church	9	19 ^{***}	6	14	11	12 ^{***}	14	15	15	13	11 ^{***}
Not-for-profit secular	46	39	45	36	21	29	41	47	36	25	14
Investor-owned	12	20	18	24	29	19	6	9	11	8	3
For-profit--other	--	--	--	--	--	--	10	7	11	13	5
Government	33	22	31	26	39	41	27	18	24	38	65
Self-employed	--	--	--	--	--	--	3	4	2	5	3
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100% ^l	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
n	(164)	(242)	(164)	(190)	(140)	(69)	(218)	(354)	(123)	(64)	(37)

^e t test is significantly different at p<.05 between Whites and Asians^j " " " " Asians and Native Americans^{***} Chi-square significant p<.001^l Responses may not total to 100 due to rounding.

TABLE 6A

ROLE AS MENTOR
FEMALES

	1992		1997				2002				
	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Native American</u>
Serve as mentor(%)	62	58	60	58	54	44	63	58	47	37	37***
n	(159)	(280)	(205)	(191)	(81)	(39)	(271)	(376)	(79)	(49)	(27)
Number of proteges											
Black females	2.0	.4 ^a	2.5	.6	.3	.4 ^{abc}	3.7	.6	.9	.3	.1 ^{abcg}
n	(96)	(160)	(122)	(108)	(44)	(17)	(169)	(219)	(37)	(18)	(10)
Black males	.9	.3	1.2	.1	.1	.2 ^{abc}	1.6	.2	.3	.1	.1 ^{abcg}
n	(96)	(160)	(122)	(108)	(44)	(17)	(169)	(219)	(37)	(18)	(10)
White females	.8	2.7	1.1	2.5	1.4	1.3 ^{abc}	1.8	3.3	1.2	1.3	1.1 ^{ad}
n	(96)	(160)	(122)	(108)	(44)	(17)	(169)	(219)	(37)	(18)	(10)
White males	.5	1.2 ^a	.5	1.0	.8	.4 ^{abe}	.7	1.4	.5	.8	.1 ^{adh}
n	(96)	(160)	(122)	(108)	(44)	(17)	(169)	(219)	(37)	(18)	(10)
Hispanic females	NA	NA	.3	.2	1.7	.1 ^{bdf}	.3	.2	2	.5	.2 ^{bdfi}
n			(125)	(110)	(45)	(17)	(169)	(219)	(37)	(18)	(10)
Hispanic males	NA	NA	.1	.1	.7	0 ^{bdf}	.1	.1	.4	.1	.2 ^{bd}
n			(125)	(110)	(45)	(17)	(169)	(219)	(37)	(18)	(10)
Asian females	NA	NA	.2	.1	.2	.4 ^e	.2	.2	.2	1.6	.0 ^{cefj}
n			(125)	(110)	(45)	(17)	(169)	(219)	(37)	(18)	(10)
Asian males	NA	NA	.0	.1	.1	.1	.1	.1	0	.6	.0 ^{cefj}
n			(125)	(110)	(45)	(17)	(169)	(219)	(37)	(18)	(10)

TABLE 6A (continued)

ROLE AS MENTOR
FEMALES

	1992		1997				2002				
	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Native American</u>
Native American females n	NA	NA	.0 (125)	.1 (110)	.0 (45)	.0 (17)	0 (169)	0 (219)	0 (37)	0 (18)	2.2 ^{ghij} (10)
Native American males n	NA	NA	.0 (125)	.0 (110)	.0 (45)	.0 (17)	0 (169)	0 (219)	0 (37)	.1 (18)	1.3 ^{ghi} (10)

^a t test is significantly different at p<.05 between Blacks and Whites

^b “ “ “ “ Blacks and Hispanics

^c “ “ “ “ Blacks and Asians

^d “ “ “ “ Whites and Hispanics

^e “ “ “ “ Whites and Asians

^f “ “ “ “ Hispanics and Asians

^g “ “ “ “ Blacks and Native Americans

^h “ “ “ “ Whites and Native Americans

ⁱ “ “ “ “ Hispanics and Native Americans

^j “ “ “ “ Asians and Native Americans

* Chi-square significant p<.05

** Chi-square significant p<.01

TABLE 6B

ROLE AS MENTOR
MALES

	1992		1997				2002				
	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Native American</u>
Serve as mentor(%)	71	58**	70	56	64	63*	71	57	58	48	51**
n	(161)	(241)	(174)	(198)	(148)	(75)	(222)	(351)	(125)	(65)	(37)
Number of proteges											
Black females	2.0	.2 ^a	1.9	.3	.4	.4 ^{abc}	2.6	.5	.6	.6	
n	.3 ^{abcg} (113)	(138)	(119)	(106)	(93)	(45)	(155)	(195)	(70)	(31)	(18)
Black males	2.0	.3 ^a	2.2	.3	.5	.6 ^{abc}	4.6	.5	.7	.4	
n	.4 ^{abcg} (113)	(138)	(119)	(106)	(93)	(45)	(155)	(195)	(70)	(31)	(18)
White females	.7	1.8 ^a	.7	1.6	1.1	1.3 ^{acd}	1.0	2.1	1.3	1.4	1.5 ^{ad}
n	(113)	(138)	(119)	(106)	(93)	(45)	(155)	(195)	(70)	(31)	(18)
White males	.8	3.1 ^a	.8	2.3	1.4	1.6 ^{abcde}	2.6	2.9	1.5	1.6	1.9
n	(113)	(138)	(119)	(106)	(93)	(45)	(155)	(195)	(70)	(31)	(18)
Hispanic females	NA	NA	.1	.1	.2	.2 ^{bdf}	.5	.2	.7	.2	.2
n			(121)	(109)	(96)	(45)	(155)	(195)	(70)	(31)	(18)
Hispanic males	NA	NA	.1	.1	1.3	.1 ^{bdf}	.8	.3	1.2	.2	.2
n			(121)	(109)	(96)	(45)	(155)	(195)	(70)	(31)	(18)
Asian females	NA	NA	.1	.1	.1	.2 ^{ce}	.2	.1	.1	.4	.3
n			(121)	(109)	(96)	(45)	(155)	(195)	(70)	(31)	(18)
Asian males	NA	NA	.1	.1	.1	.7 ^{cef}	.2	.1	.1	.5	.3 ^{ef}
n			(121)	(109)	(96)	(45)	(155)	(195)	(70)	(31)	(18)

TABLE 6B (continued)

ROLE AS MENTOR
MALES

	1992		1997				2002				
	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Native American</u>
Native American females n	NA	NA	.0 (121)	.0 (109)	.0 (96)	.0 (45)	.1 (155)	0 (195)	0 (70)	.1 (31)	1.4 ^{ghij} (18)
Native American males n	NA	NA	.0 (121)	.0 (109)	.0 (96)	.0 (45)	.1 (155)	0 (195)	0 (70)	0 (31)	1.3 ^{ghij} (18)

^a t test is significantly different at p<.05 between Blacks and Whites

^b “ “ “ “ Blacks and Hispanics

^c “ “ “ “ Blacks and Asians

^d “ “ “ “ Whites and Hispanics

^e “ “ “ “ Whites and Asians

^f “ “ “ “ Hispanics and Asians

^g “ “ “ “ Blacks and Native Americans

^h “ “ “ “ Whites and Native Americans

ⁱ “ “ “ “ Hispanics and Native Americans

^j “ “ “ “ Asians and Native Americans

*Chi-square significant p<.05

**Chi-square significant p<.01

TABLE 7A

SALARY + BONUS
FEMALES

Median n	1992		1997				2002				
	<u>Black</u> 52,500 (163)	<u>White</u> 55,600 (272)	<u>Black</u> 61,000 (204)	<u>White</u> 72,900 (192)	<u>Hispanic</u> 59,600 (81)	<u>Asian</u> 57,500 (37)	<u>Black</u> 79,800 (271)	<u>White</u> 104,000 (374)	<u>Hispanic</u> 80,500 (78)	<u>Asian</u> 71,300 (48)	<u>Native American</u> 61,100 (27)
Less than \$30	7%	4%	2%	3%	2%	0% [*]	1%	0%	3%	0%	0% ^{***}
30-45	28	23	22	14	22	16	8	3	8	10	19
45-60	31	33	25	18	26	41	15	6	17	21	30
60-75	17	17	21	18	20	22	20	14	18	25	26
75-90	7	9	12	18	12	3	18	16	14	17	11
90-105	6	5	8	12	11	8	11	12	15	17	0
105-120	2	3	5	6	4	11	6	12	5	4	7
120-135	0	3	4	3	0	0	4	6	1	2	0
135-150	0	2	+	2	1	0	4	7	4	0	4
150-165	0	1	+	1	0	0	3	4	8	0	4
165-180	1	0	0	3	1	0	2	5	5	0	0
180-200	1	1	0	1	0	0	3	3	0	2	0
200-225	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	0	0	0
225-250	1	0	+	1	0	0	1	2	1	2	0
250-300	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	1	0	0	0
300-350							1	1	1	0	0
350-400							0	1	0	0	0
400-450							1	0	0	0	0
450-500							0	0	0	0	0
More than \$500							0	1	0	0	0
n	100% (163)	100% (272)	100% (204)	100% (192)	100% ¹ (81)	100% ¹ (37)	100% (271)	100% (374)	100% (78)	100% (48)	100% (27)
Mean n	58,178 (163)	63,066 (272)	66,814 (204)	80,469 (192)	64,963 (81)	64,324 ^{ade} (37)	95,653 (271)	120,682 (374)	91,846 (78)	77,792 (48)	68,593 ^{adeh} (27)

^a t test is significantly different at p<.05 between Blacks and Whites^d “ “ “ “ Whites and Hispanics^e “ “ “ “ Whites and Asians^g “ “ “ “ Blacks and Native Americans^h “ “ “ “ Whites and Native Americans^{*} Less than 0.5%¹ Responses may not total to 100 due to rounding.^{*} Chi-square significant p<.05^{***} Chi-square significant p<.001

TABLE 7B

SALARY + BONUS MALES											
Median n	1992		1997				2002				
	<u>Black</u> 66,800 (159)	<u>White</u> 80,400 (237)	<u>Black</u> 72,300 (171)	<u>White</u> 82,300 (190)	<u>Hispanic</u> 73,000 (143)	<u>Asian</u> 78,800 (71)	<u>Black</u> 98,800 (217)	<u>White</u> 121,400 (350)	<u>Hispanic</u> 103,700 (123)	<u>Asian</u> 86,600 (63)	<u>Native American</u> 84,800 (37)
Less than \$30	4%	1%**	1%	2%	2%	1%	1%	0%	1%	0%	0%**
30-45	13	5	11	8	10	8	1	1	1	8	5
45-60	24	19	23	14	17	15	10	5	7	8	8
60-75	20	19	18	19	24	20	16	6	11	21	14
75-90	11	17	13	16	8	20	15	15	16	17	35
90-105	8	12	9	9	10	10	13	9	15	11	19
105-120	8	5	5	9	9	3	7	13	16	3	11
120-135	3	6	5	3	5	4	9	9	6	2	5
135-150	1	4	5	4	5	3	7	6	7	10	0
150-165	4	2	2	4	3	4	4	4	3	5	3
165-180	1	3	1	2	1	1	4	6	1	3	0
180-200	0	1	1	2	0	1	1	4	5	2	0
200-225	1	2	1	2	2	3	2	4	2	8	0
225-250	1	1	1	2	1	1	2	4	3	2	0
250-300	1	3	4	5	2	4	2	5	0	0	0
300-350							1	3	2	0	0
350-400							2	1	1	2	0
400-450							1	1	1	0	0
450-500							0	0	0	0	0
More than \$500	<u>100%</u> (159)	<u>100%</u> ¹ (237)	<u>100%</u> (171)	<u>100%</u> (190)	<u>100%</u> ¹ (143)	<u>100%</u> (71)	<u>100%</u> (217)	<u>100%</u> (350)	<u>100%</u> (123)	<u>100%</u> (63)	<u>100%</u> (37)
Mean n	77,755 (159)	94,515 ^a (237)	88,421 (171)	99,916 (190)	88,867 (143)	95,690 ^e (71)	124,493 (217)	152,531 (350)	130,821 (123)	107,730 (63)	85,783 ^{adehi} (37)

^a t test is significantly different at p<.05 between Blacks and Whites

d " " " " Whites and Hispanics

e " " " " Whites and Asians

g " " " " Blacks and Native Americans

h " " " " Whites and Native Americans

i " " " " Hispanics and Native Americans

*Chi-square significant p<.05

*** Chi-square significant p<.001

¹Responses may not total to 100 due to rounding.

TABLE 8A

MEAN SALARY BY POSITION
FEMALES

	1992		1997				2002				
	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Native American</u>
CEO	\$74,762	\$92,040	\$91,579	\$122,737	\$106,000	\$82,500	151,769	176,250	134,286	151,500	87,000
n	(21)	(25)	(19)	(19)	(5)	(2)	(26)	(48)	(7)	(4)	(3)
COO Senior Vice President, Associate Administrator	82,000	76,015	81,552	98,404	63,467	60,000 ^d	135,487	147,730	95,917	95,857	112,000 ^d
n	(29)	(66)	(29)	(47)	(15)	(4)	(39)	(100)	(12)	(7)	(4)
Vice President, Assistant Administrator	54,393	59,653	75,159	82,622	77,050	82,375	109,902	118,721	123,944	87,750	82,500
n	(28)	(75)	(44)	(45)	(20)	(8)	(51)	(104)	(18)	(8)	(2)
Department Head/Staff	47,573	46,091	55,842	60,672	54,405	53,588	70,714	76,143	68,222	61,762	54,667 ^{egh}
n	(75)	(88)	(95)	(61)	(37)	(17)	(126)	(91)	(36)	(21)	(15)

^d t test is significantly different at p<.05 between Whites and Hispanics

e “ “ “ “ Whites and Asians
g “ “ “ “ Blacks and Native Americans
h “ “ “ “ Whites and Native Americans

TABLE 8B

MEAN SALARY BY POSITION
MALES

	1992		1997				2002				
	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Native American</u>
CEO	\$114,657	\$118,072	\$112,214	\$127,708	\$129,059	\$161,917 ^c	176,026	196,438	202,556	139,143	94,500 ^{ghi}
n	(35)	(83)	(28)	(48)	(34)	(12)	(39)	(128)	(27)	(7)	(12)
COO Senior Vice President, Associate Administrator	86,725	97,958	114,595	116,250	92,121	117,267	148,463	150,402	127,200	156,400	88,000
n	(40)	(72)	(42)	(48)	(33)	(15)	(54)	(87)	(30)	(15)	(5)
Vice President, Assistant Administrator	71,156	65,103	88,065	87,833	82,346	83,667	126,904	119,212	123,357	104,385	97,000
n	(32)	(39)	(31)	(42)	(26)	(15)	(52)	(66)	(28)	(13)	(6)
Department Head/Staff	48,767	61,364 ^a	59,754	55,667	61,237	62,885	75,932	78,261	83,594	71,961	74,231
n	(43)	(33)	(57)	(36)	(38)	(26)	(59)	(46)	(32)	(26)	(13)

^a t test is significantly different at p<.05 between Blacks and Whites

^c “ “ “ “ Blacks and Asians

^g “ “ “ “ Blacks and Native Americans

^h “ “ “ “ Whites and Native Americans

ⁱ “ “ “ “ Hispanics and Native Americans

TABLE 9

MEDIAN AND PREDICTED MEDIAN TOTAL COMPENSATION CONTROLLING
FOR EDUCATION AND YEARS OF EXPERIENCE

	<u>Females</u>					<u>Males</u>				
	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Native American</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Native American</u>
Median ² (\$)	79,800	104,000	80,500	71,300	61,100	98,800	121,400	103,700	86,600	84,800
n	(271)	(374)	(78)	(48)	(27)	(217)	(350)	(123)	(63)	(37)
Median controlling for education and experience ³	87,200	104,500	99,100	1	1	122,600	120,200	115,200	1	1
n	(261)	(367)	(72)			(209)	(339)	(118)		

¹Too few observations to model.

²Respondents did not state their exact income, but assigned themselves into income brackets. This 'interpolated median' estimates the median (50th percentile) from the percentiles of the brackets on either side of the median. For example, if the \$60-75,000 bracket were at the 40th percentile, and the \$75-90,000 bracket were at the 60th percentile, the 50th percentile would be estimated as midway between \$75,000 and \$90,000, and the 'interpolated median' would be \$82,500.

³To standardize the results for the other groups onto the education/experience distribution of whites, cases from the other groups were reweighted to force the education/experience distribution for the gender/ethnicity group to be equal to that of the distribution for the white female or male respondents. To do this, crosstables of education by experience were computed for men and women of each racial/ethnic group. Then, cases in each of the six minority gender/ethnic combinations were reweighted so that their education/experience cell frequencies matched the cell frequencies of white men or women respectively. Where there was a higher proportion of whites in the education/experience cell, the case weights were greater than 1; where the proportion of whites was lower, the case weights were less than 1. When cases in either the white or minority groups had no counterparts in the corresponding cell for the other group (a cell frequency of zero), they were combined with cases in nearest-neighbor cells as necessary to allow weights to be computed. Interpolated medians were then computed for the weighted cases.

TABLE 10A

JOB SATISFACTION
(percent satisfied or very satisfied)
FEMALES

	1992		1997				2002				
	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Native American</u>
Pay and fringe benefits n	36 (160)	53 ^{***} (278)	38 (201)	53 (191)	49 (81)	38 [*] (37)	42 (256)	67 (370)	59 (76)	57 (46)	56 ^{***} (27)
Security n	58 (161)	70 [*] (278)	43 (200)	69 (190)	63 (81)	82 ^{***} (38)	60 (257)	79 (370)	68 (76)	72 (46)	70 ^{***} (26)
Sanctions and treatment received when mistake made n	54 (159)	71 ^{***} (276)	45 (200)	70 (190)	59 (81)	66 ^{***} (38)	53 (255)	76 (368)	65 (36)	57 (46)	65 ^{***} (26)
Supervisor's respect n	55 (159)	76 ^{***} (278)	62 (200)	79 (190)	65 (80)	74 ^{**} (38)	65 (255)	79 (368)	74 (76)	67 (46)	70 ^{**} (27)
Subordinates' respect n	78 (156)	85 (274)	79 (179)	86 (181)	77 (77)	69 [*] (35)	77 (244)	89 (357)	84 (70)	69 (39)	76 ^{***} (25)
Autonomy n	75 (159)	84 [*] (278)	72 (201)	84 (190)	70 (81)	92 ^{**} (38)	79 (257)	86 (370)	78 (76)	80 (46)	78 (27)

*Chi-square significant p<.05

**Chi-square significant p<.05

***Chi-square significant p<.001

TABLE 10B

JOB SATISFACTION
(percent satisfied or very satisfied)
MALES

	1992		1997				2002				
	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Native American</u>
Pay and fringe benefits n	52 (162)	60 (239)	47 (166)	67 (195)	60 (142)	49 ^{***} (71)	48 (211)	68 (339)	60 (118)	62 (60)	67 ^{***} (36)
Security n	63 (163)	68 (241)	59 (167)	68 (195)	70 (142)	71 (72)	69 (211)	76 (339)	71 (118)	75 (60)	69 (36)
Sanctions and treatment received when mistake made n	58 (160)	69 [*] (240)	57 (166)	71 (195)	63 (141)	63 (71)	58 (210)	73 (338)	66 (116)	60 (60)	51 ^{***} (35)
Supervisor's respect n	65 (158)	74 (240)	69 (166)	81 (195)	80 (141)	81 [*] (70)	71 (206)	83 (336)	77 (118)	73 (59)	69 [*] (36)
Subordinates' respect n	84 (157)	91 [*] (240)	87 (159)	89 (189)	88 (138)	87 (67)	82 (206)	92 (335)	91 (115)	84 (56)	69 ^{***} (35)
Autonomy n	83 (162)	80 (241)	77 (167)	86 (195)	83 (142)	83 (71)	83 (212)	89 (338)	86 (117)	90 (60)	89 (35)

*Chi-square significant p<.05

***Chi-square significant p<.001

TABLE 11A

JOB COMMITMENT
FEMALES
(percent agree)

	1997				2002				
	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Native American</u>
A strong feeling of belonging to organization n	54% (199)	79% (190)	66% (80)	82%*** (38)	58% (257)	82% (370)	71% (77)	70% (46)	74%*** (27)
Feels emotionally attached n	57% (200)	77% (189)	71% (79)	74%*** (38)	61 (257)	81 (371)	77 (77)	67 (46)	78*** (27)
Organization has great personal meaning for respondent n	58% (200)	70% (189)	80% (80)	68%** (38)	60 (257)	79 (370)	69 (77)	67 (46)	81*** (26)
Feels like “part of the family” at organization n	53% (198)	75% (189)	62% (78)	76%*** (37)	51 (257)	79 (371)	65 (77)	67 (46)	63*** (27)
Happy to spend remainder of career at organization n	41% (200)	57% (190)	53% (80)	50%* (38)	43 (256)	72 (370)	58 (77)	46 (46)	67*** (27)
Enjoy discussing organization with outsiders n	63% (199)	86% (190)	81% (79)	79%*** (38)	70	85	74	76	81***
Feels organizations problems are his/her own n	45% (200)	64% (190)	59% (79)	55%*** (38)	51 (257)	76 (370)	64 (76)	57 (46)	69*** (26)
Could easily become as attached to another organization as this one n	22% (198)	22% (189)	27% (78)	24% (38)	21 (256)	27 (371)	26 (77)	27 (45)	35 (26)

*Chi-square significant p<.05

**Chi-square significant p<.01

***Chi-square significant p<.001

TABLE 11B

JOB COMMITMENT
MALES
(percent agree)

	1997				2002				
	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Native American</u>
A strong feeling of belonging to organization n	68% (170)	85% (195)	74% (144)	73% ^{**} (73)	72% (212)	85% (341)	79% (118)	72% (61)	76% ^{**} (33)
Feels emotionally attached n	68% (169)	85% (195)	75% (144)	70% ^{***} (73)	69% (213)	87% (341)	72% (117)	70% (61)	74% ^{***} (34)
Organization has great personal meaning for respondent n	71% (169)	73% (195)	76% (143)	76% (71)	70% (213)	83% (341)	74% (118)	72% (61)	88% ^{**} (34)
Feels like “part of the family” at organization n	64% (170)	82% (195)	65% (144)	74% ^{***} (73)	62% (213)	85% (341)	74% (118)	61% (61)	76% ^{***} (34)
Happy to spend remainder of career at organization n	51% (170)	62% (195)	61% (144)	57% (73)	59% (213)	74% (341)	58% (118)	57% (61)	71% ^{***} (34)
Enjoy discussing organization with outsiders n	78% (167)	88% (195)	92% (144)	79% ^{**} (73)	84% (213)	90% (341)	80% (118)	75% (61)	91% ^{**} (34)
Feels organizations problems are his/her own n	58% (166)	76% (195)	71% (144)	67% ^{**} (73)	62 (213)	81 (241)	76 (118)	75 (61)	74 ^{***} (34)
Could easily become as attached to another organization as this one n	15% (170)	19% (195)	12% (144)	18% (73)	20 (213)	26 (341)	14 (118)	11 (61)	26 [*] (34)

*Chi-square significant p<.05

**Chi-square significant p<.01

***Chi-square significant p<.001

TABLE 12A

UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION
FEMALES

	1992		1997				2002				
	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Native American</u>
<u>Percent completing college</u>	98% (162)	98% (282)	99% (195)	100% (188)	95% (78)	100% (39)**	99% (273)	100% (382)	99% (78)	100% (48)	85% (26)***
<u>Ownership of undergraduate Institution</u>											
Private	43	48	52	58	59	54	57	61	57	62	77
Public	<u>57</u>	<u>52</u>	<u>48</u>	<u>42</u>	<u>41</u>	<u>46</u>	<u>43</u>	<u>39</u>	<u>43</u>	<u>38</u>	<u>23</u>
n	100% (159)	100% (274)	100% (194)	100% (186)	100% (74)	100% (39)	100% (269)	100% (378)	100% (77)	100% (47)	100% (22)
<u>Percent from historical black college</u>	30% (160)	1% (274)***	23% (195)	1% (189)	0% (75)	0% (39)***	24% (270)	1% (380)	3% (77)	0% (48)	0% (22)***
n											
<u>Year of graduation</u>											
Prior to 1962	8	9	3	2	1	0	1	1	0	0	5***
1962 - 1971	13	22	8	10	12	5	8	13	5	4	0
1972 - 1981	60	51	49	40	40	33	38	41	32	30	27
1982 - 1991	19	18	37	40	38	54	31	30	32	23	45
1992-1996	0	0	4	8	8	8	17	9	18	30	9
1997 – 2001	<u>==</u>	<u>==</u>	<u>==</u>	<u>==</u>	<u>==</u>	<u>==</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>14</u>
n	100% (158)	100% (274)	100% ¹ (190)	100% (187)	100% ¹ (73)	100% (39)	100% (269)	100% (379)	100% (74)	100% (47)	100% (22)

TABLE 12A (continued)

UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION
FEMALES

	1992		1997				2002				
	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Native American</u>
<u>Major²</u>											
Health Administration	10	6	10	14	9	8	13	11	9	4	9
Biological Science	18	25	13	15	31	31 ^{***}	20	18	25	32	9
Physical Science	2	2	2	1	0	5	4	3	5	9	9
Social Science	35	19 ^{***}	26	15	15	13 [*]	23	16	20	19	24
Humanities/Fine Arts	9	9	6	8	12	13	3	6	8	6	5
General Business	14	12	16	17	13	15	16	16	13	13	24
Nursing	19	29 [*]	23	33	20	13 [*]	22	34	17	13	32 ^{***}
Social Work	3	0 ^{**}	3	0	5	3 [*]	1	1	3	4	0
n	(162)	(282)	(191)	(75)	(189)	(39)	(270)	(379)	(75)	(47)	(22)
<u>Received 50 + percent of tuition from grants, scholarships, etc.</u>											
Yes	50	20 ^{***}	50	22	40	38 ^{***}	47	28	49	33	64 ^{***}
No	<u>50</u>	<u>80</u>	<u>50</u>	<u>78</u>	<u>60</u>	<u>62</u>	<u>53</u>	<u>72</u>	<u>51</u>	<u>67</u>	<u>36</u>
n	100% (160)	100% (276)	100% (195)	100% (189)	100% (75)	100% (39)	100% (268)	100% (379)	100% (76)	100% (48)	100% (22)

TABLE 12A (continued)

UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION
FEMALES

	1992		1997				2002				
	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Native American</u>
<u>Financial support was a determinant in decision to complete college</u>											
Yes	71	65	71	61	70	27*	68	58	68	31	93**
No	<u>29</u>	<u>35</u>	<u>29</u>	<u>39</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>73</u>	<u>32</u>	<u>42</u>	<u>32</u>	<u>69</u>	<u>7</u>
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
n	(80)	(54)	(96)	(41)	(30)	(15)	(127)	(105)	(37)	(16)	(14)

*Chi-square significant p<.05

**Chi-square significant p<.01

***Chi-square significant p<.001

¹Responses may not total to 100 due to rounding.²Responses may not total to 100 percent since respondents could indicate up to two major subject areas.

TABLE 12B

UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION
MALES

	1992		1997				2002				
	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Native American</u>
<u>Percent completing college</u>	99% (165)	99% (242)	99% (173)	100% (192)	99% (144)	100% (74)	99% (220)	100% (354)	99% (120)	100% (64)	94%** (36)
<u>Ownership of undergraduate Institution</u>											
Private	55	51	55	58	73	59**	61	62	63	48	82*
Public	<u>45</u>	<u>49</u>	<u>45</u>	<u>42</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>41</u>	<u>39</u>	<u>38</u>	<u>37</u>	<u>52</u>	<u>18</u>
n	100% (163)	100% (236)	100% (173)	100% (192)	100% (142)	100% (74)	100% (218)	100% (351)	100% (120)	100% (65)	100% (34)
<u>Percent from historical black college</u>	37% (164)	0%*** (238)	29% (173)	0% (194)	1% (143)	3%*** (74)	28% (218)	1% (354)	3% (120)	0% (64)	0% (34)
<u>Year of graduation</u>											
Prior to 1962	16	14	3	3	5	3	1	2	1	2	0***
1962 - 1971	34	41	24	25	16	20	18	28	13	14	12
1972 - 1981	41	38	40	35	41	43	36	42	37	31	35
1982 - 1991	9	6	29	35	31	30	30	20	37	34	32
1992-1996	0	0	3	2	7	4	14	7	13	13	18
1997 – 2001	<u>—</u>	<u>—</u>	<u>—</u>	<u>—</u>	<u>—</u>	<u>—</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>3</u>
n	100% (163)	100% ¹ (239)	100% ¹ (173)	100% (192)	100% (143)	100% (74)	100% (217)	100% (350)	100% (119)	100% (64)	100% (34)

TABLE 12B (continued)

UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION
MALES

	1992		1997				2002				
	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Native American</u>
<u>Major²</u>											
Health Administration	10	5*	15	9	15	14	13	10	11	13	12
Biological Science	21	23	15	18	23	34**	18	18	21	41	15***
Physical Science	7	6	8	6	4	11	6	7	5	6	9
Social Science	33	20**	25	24	21	14	26	17	23	23	32*
Humanities/Fine Arts	7	10	8	7	6	8	6	4	7	8	12
General Business	27	35	23	34	27	21	31	38	29	14	15***
Nursing	0	2	2	2	4	3	2	3	8	3	3
Social Work	1	1	1	3	3	3	0	1	1	2	3
n	(164)	(241)	(172)	(194)	(142)	(73)	(217)	(353)	(116)	(64)	(34)
<u>Received 50 + percent of tuition from grants, scholarships, etc.</u>											
Yes	44	20***	47	19	36	22***	43	18	34	34	44***
No	<u>56</u>	<u>80</u>	<u>53</u>	<u>81</u>	<u>64</u>	<u>78</u>	<u>57</u>	<u>82</u>	<u>66</u>	<u>66</u>	<u>56</u>
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
n	(163)	(239)	(173)	(194)	(143)	(74)	(217)	(354)	(119)	(64)	(34)

TABLE 12B (continued)

UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION
MALES

	1992		1997				2002				
	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Native American</u>
<u>Financial support was a determinant in decision to complete college</u>											
Yes	82	62*	62	54	75	56***	67	58	76	64	87
No	<u>18</u>	<u>38</u>	<u>38</u>	<u>46</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>44</u>	<u>33</u>	<u>42</u>	<u>24</u>	<u>36</u>	<u>13</u>
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
n	(72)	(47)	(81)	(37)	(52)	(16)	(94)	(65)	(42)	(22)	(15)

*Chi-square significant p<.05

**Chi-square significant p<.01

***Chi-square significant p<.001

¹Responses may not total to 100 due to rounding.²Responses may not total to 100 percent since respondents could indicate up to two major subject areas.

TABLE 13A

GRADUATE EDUCATION⁺
FEMALES

	1992		1997				2002				
	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Native American</u>
<u>Percent completing graduate degree</u>	90%	91%	88%	95%	88%	97%	91%	93%	85%	96	54***
n	(162)	(282)	(195)	(188)	(78)	(39)	(273)	(382)	(78)	(48)	(26)
<u>Ownership of graduate institution</u>											
Private	41	56**	46	54	63	50	45	54	41	56	50
Public	59	44	54	46	37	50	55	46	59	44	50
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
n	(146)	(255)	(179)	(180)	(70)	(36)	(241)	(332)	(61)	(45)	(12)
<u>Year of graduation</u>											
Prior to 1967	3	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1967 - 1971	2	2	1	2	3	0	1	1	0	0	0
1972 - 1976	13	13	8	1	3	0	7	5	2	4	0
1977 - 1981	32	25	18	9	10	16	13	10	13	11	25
1982 - 1986	28	32	18	22	17	16	14	20	11	11	17
1987 - 1991	22	24	25	30	33	18	18	21	16	15	8
1992 - 1996	—	—	30	36	33	50	21	22	21	11	17
1997 – 2002	--	--	--	--	--	--	26	20	36	47	33
	100%	100%	100%	100% ¹	100% ¹	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
n	(146)	(250)	(178)	(183)	(69)	(38)	(238)	(335)	(61)	(46)	(12)

TABLE 13A (continued)

GRADUATE EDUCATION⁺
FEMALES

	1992		1997				2002				
	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Native American</u>
<u>Field of graduate degree</u>											
Health Administration	68	52**	56	52	43	68***	60	55	41	63	33*
Public Health	5	3	4	7	20	11	6	4	10	11	0
Business Administration	9	24	8	28	13	16	12	22	18	13	17
Public Administration/Policy	3	4	11	4	16	0	7	4	10	2	17
Other	15	18	21	9	9	5	15	15	21	11	33
	100%	100% ¹	100%	100%	100% ¹	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
n	(146)	(256)	(181)	(183)	(70)	(37)	(240)	(338)	(61)	(46)	(12)
<u>Received 50 + percent of tuition from grants, scholarships, or fellowships</u>											
Yes	52	30***	46	31	27	26**	38	36	34	26	58
No	48	70	54	69	73	74	62	64	66	74	42
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
n	(146)	(256)	(182)	(183)	(70)	(38)	(243)	(338)	(62)	(46)	(12)

⁺Note: Respondents who completed more than one graduate degree were asked to respond with reference to the degree that most directly prepared them for their work.¹Responses may not total to 100 due to rounding.

TABLE 13A (continued)

GRADUATE EDUCATION⁺
FEMALES

	1992		1997				2002				
	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Native American</u>
<u>Financial support was a determinant in decision to pursue healthcare management career?</u>											
Yes	59	47	49	34	47	40	57	51	52	75	57
No	41	53	51	66	53	60	43	49	48	25	43
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
n	(75)	(76)	(83)	(56)	(19)	(10)	(95)	(125)	(23)	(12)	(7)

**Chi-square significant p<.01

***Chi-square significant p<.001

TABLE 13B

GRADUATE EDUCATION⁺
MALES

	1992		1997				2002				
	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Native American</u>
<u>Percent completing graduate degree</u>	82%	92%**	84%	92%	90%	97%**	91%	93%	91%	100%	78%***
n	(165)	(242)	(173)	(192)	(144)	(74)	(220)	(354)	(120)	(64)	(36)
<u>Ownership of graduate institution</u>											
Private	43	52	50	53	55	40	56	53	45	38	77**
Public	57	48	50	47	45	60	44	47	55	62	23
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
n	(136)	(220)	(149)	(182)	(128)	(72)	(188)	(318)	(106)	(63)	(26)
<u>Year of graduation</u>											
Prior to 1967	6	11	1	3	2	3	0	1	0	2	0***
1967 - 1971	12	13	6	5	4	6	3	5	2	3	0
1972 - 1976	38	24	16	12	16	13	13	15	7	6	12
1977 - 1981	23	26	20	19	16	22	15	21	15	11	15
1982 - 1986	11	17	13	19	15	14	14	19	15	14	12
1987 - 1991	11	10	22	22	16	18	11	16	13	18	27
1992 - 1997	—	—	22	20	32	25	20	15	22	22	12
1998 - 2002	--	--	--	--	--	--	25	9	25	25	23
	100% ¹	100% ¹	100%	100%	100% ¹	100% ¹	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
n	(133)	(219)	(143)	(178)	(128)	(72)	(190)	(322)	(107)	(65)	(26)

TABLE 13B (continued)

GRADUATE EDUCATION⁺
MALES

	1992		1997				2002				
	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Native American</u>
<u>Field of graduate degree</u>											
Health Administration	65	64**	55	64	60	53**	53	61	60	60	42***
Public Health	5	2	7	2	7	3	5	3	2	3	8
Business Administration	16	26	17	25	18	33	23	27	18	22	19
Public Administration/Policy	7	1	9	3	7	1	9	5	7	2	15
Other	6	7	12	6	8	10	9	4	13	14	15
	100% ¹	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
n	(135)	(219)	(145)	(182)	(130)	(72)	(193)	(323)	(109)	(65)	(26)
<u>Received 50 + percent of tuition from grants, scholarships, or fellowships</u>											
Yes	58	33***	50	25	48	34***	45	27	34	29	46***
No	42	67	50	75	52	66	55	73	66	71	54
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
n	(135)	(221)	(148)	(183)	(130)	(74)	(194)	(323)	(109)	(65)	(26)

⁺Note: Respondents who completed more than one graduate degree were asked to respond with reference to the degree that most directly prepared them for their work.

¹Responses may not total to 100 due to rounding.

TABLE 13B (continued)

GRADUATE EDUCATION⁺
MALES

	1992		1997				2002				
	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Native American</u>
<u>Financial support was a</u> <u>Determinant in decision</u> <u>to pursue healthcare</u> <u>management career?</u>											
Yes	64	36***	61	48	60	52	50	40	62	53	50
No	36	64	39	52	40	48	50	60	38	47	50
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
n	(77)	(70)	(74)	(46)	(62)	(25)	(90)	(88)	(37)	(19)	(12)

**Chi-square significant p<.01

***Chi-square significant p<.001

TABLE 14A

EARLY SOCIALIZATION EXPERIENCES
IN HEALTHCARE MANAGEMENT
FEMALES

	1992		1997				2002				
	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Native American</u>
<u>Percent with:</u>											
Internship	49	30***	37	33	38	45	41	27	32	61	14***
n	(138)	(253)	(177)	(183)	(71)	(38)	(246)	(351)	(65)	(46)	(14)
Residency	27	23	20	28	24	34	23	18	23	26	21
n	(134)	(252)	(179)	(184)	(71)	(38)	(245)	(353)	(66)	(47)	(14)
Fellowship	17	13	21	11	16	27*	21	9	4	28	0***
n	(135)	(250)	(174)	(183)	(70)	(37)	(245)	(349)	(67)	(47)	(15)
Any Mentors	81	81	64	75	71	69	77	76	68	73	59
n	(160)	(281)	(203)	(193)	(82)	(39)	(274)	(383)	(79)	(49)	(27)
<u>Percent Subsequently Hired by</u>											
Organization of Residency	NA	NA	42	59	53	69	49	71	50	33	100*
n			(36)	(51)	(17)	(13)	(57)	(63)	(16)	(12)	(4)
Organization of Fellowship	NA	NA	67	50	73	60	69	81	67	54	0
n			(36)	(11)	(20)	(10)	(52)	(31)	(3)	(11)	(0)
Percent who stated they would have liked to have had a mentor											
	--	--	--	--	--	--	78	69	88	77	82
							(60)	(89)	(25)	(13)	(11)
Reasons for no mentor:											
Time constraints							4	8	9	44	33**
Mentors uncommon then							47	75	41	44	56**
No way to link							58	36	41	56	33
No one compatible							36	20	50	33	11*
n							(45)	(61)	(22)	(9)	(9)

TABLE 14A (continued)

EARLY SOCIALIZATION EXPERIENCES
IN HEALTHCARE MANAGEMENT
FEMALES

	1992		1997				2002				
	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Native American</u>
<u>Mean Number of Mentors</u>											
Black females n	0.6 (129)	0.1 ^a (228)	0.8 (130)	0.1 (144)	0.1 (58)	0.1 ^{abc} (27)	1.0 (210)	.1 (290)	.2 (53)	.1 (36)	0.0 ^{abcg} (16)
Black males n	1.1 (129)	0.1 ^a (228)	0.9 (130)	0.1 (144)	0.1 (58)	0.2 ^{abc} (27)	.8 (210)	.1 (290)	.1 (53)	.3 (36)	0.0 ^{abcg} (16)
White females n	0.6 (129)	0.7 (228)	0.6 (130)	1.0 (144)	0.6 (58)	1.0 ^{acd} (27)	.8 (210)	1.0 (290)	.8 (53)	.8 (36)	.6 ^{abg} (16)
White males n	1.0 (129)	1.6 ^a (228)	1.0 (130)	1.7 (144)	1.0 (58)	1.7 ^{acdf} (27)	1.1 (210)	1.6 (290)	.9 (53)	1.7 (36)	1.1 (16)
Hispanic females n			0.0 (134)	0.0 (145)	0.5 (58)	0.0 ^{bdf} (27)	.1 (210)	0.0 (290)	.3 (53)	.1 (36)	0.0 ^{adfj} (16)
Hispanic males n			0.0 (134)	0.0 (145)	0.5 (58)	0.0 ^{bdf} (27)	0.0 (210)	0.0 (290)	.6 (53)	.1 (36)	0.0 ^{abdfi} (16)
Asian females n	NA	NA	0.0 (134)	0.0 (145)	0.0 (58)	0.0 (27)	0.0 (210)	0.0 (290)	0.0 (53)	.1 (36)	0.0 ^{cej} (16)
Asian males n	NA	NA	0.0 (134)	0.0 (145)	0.1 (58)	0.0 ^d (27)	0.0 (210)	0.0 (290)	0.0 (53)	.3 (36)	0.0 ^{cefj} (16)

TABLE 14A (continued)

EARLY SOCIALIZATION EXPERIENCES
IN HEALTHCARE MANAGEMENT
FEMALES

		1992		1997				2002				
		<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Native American</u>
<u>Mean Number of Mentors</u>												
Native American females	n	NA	NA	--	--	--	--	0.0 (210)	0.0 (290)	0.0 (53)	0.0 (36)	1 ^{ghij} (16)
Native American males	n			--	--	--	--	0.0 (210)	0.0 (290)	0.0 (53)	0.0 (36)	.8 ^{ghij} (16)

^a t test is significantly different at p<.05 between Blacks and Whites

^b “ “ “ “ Blacks and Hispanics

^c “ “ “ “ Blacks and Asians

^d “ “ “ “ Whites and Hispanics

^e “ “ “ “ Whites and Asians

^f “ “ “ “ Hispanics and Asians

^g “ “ “ “ Blacks and Native Americans

^h “ “ “ “ Whites and Native Americans

ⁱ “ “ “ “ Hispanics and Native Americans

^j “ “ “ “ Asians and Native Americans

*Chi-square significant p<.05

***Chi-square significant p<.001

TABLE 14B

EARLY SOCIALIZATION EXPERIENCES
IN HEALTHCARE MANAGEMENT
MALES

	1992		1997				2002				
	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Native American</u>
<u>Percent with:</u>											
Internship n	40 (129)	28* (219)	38 (147)	32 (184)	40 (129)	35 (74)	37 (197)	34 (329)	36 (110)	35 (65)	36 (28)
Residency n	37 (129)	44 (222)	30 (147)	44 (181)	39 (130)	38 (74)	26 (198)	31 (328)	34 (110)	27 (64)	18 (28)
Fellowship n	11 (126)	8 (217)	9 (148)	14 (184)	11 (130)	12 (74)	14 (190)	12 (330)	5 (114)	13 (64)	7 (28)
Any Mentors n	68 (164)	72 (241)	69 (171)	77 (199)	73 (145)	72 (74)	72 (219)	69 (356)	69 (124)	68 (65)	57 (37)
<u>Percent Subsequently Hired by</u>											
Organization of Residency n	NA	NA	51 (45)	65 (81)	59 (51)	46 (28)	66 (53)	54 (106)	50 (40)	69 (16)	50 (6)
Organization of Fellowship n	NA	NA	46 (13)	62 (26)	57 (14)	56 (9)	72 (25)	64 (36)	83 (6)	78 (9)	100 (2)
Percent who stated they would have liked to have had a mentor n											
	--	--	--	--	--	--	75 (60)	61 (109)	65 (37)	74 (19)	79 (14)
Reasons for no mentor:											
Time constraints							9	14	12	15	9
Mentors uncommon then							54	89	56	46	45*
No way to link							41	24	52	62	27*
No one compatible n							41 (46)	19 (72)	32 (25)	38 (13)	18 (11)

TABLE 14B (continued)

EARLY SOCIALIZATION EXPERIENCES
IN HEALTHCARE MANAGEMENT
MALES

	1992		1997				2002				
	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Native American</u>
<u>Mean Number of Mentors</u>											
Black females	0.3	0.0 ^a	0.4	0.0	0.1	0.0 ^{abc}	.5	.1	.1	.1	.2 ^{abcg}
n	(112)	(168)	(118)	(153)	(106)	(52)	(156)	(242)	(85)	(43)	(21)
Black males	1.0	0.1 ^a	1.2	0.1	0.2	0.2 ^{abc}	1.3	.2	.3	.2	.2 ^{abcg}
n	(112)	(168)	(118)	(153)	(106)	(52)	(156)	(242)	(85)	(43)	(21)
White females	0.3	0.3	0.4	0.5	0.5	0.5	.4	.5	.5	.6	.6
n	(112)	(168)	(118)	(153)	(106)	(52)	(156)	(242)	(85)	(43)	(21)
White males	1.2	2.0 ^a	1.2	2.1	1.5	1.8 ^{acd}	1.4	2.2	1.8	1.7	1.3 ^{abdeh}
n	(112)	(167)	(118)	(153)	(106)	(52)	(156)	(242)	(85)	(43)	(21)
Hispanic females			0.0	0.0	0.2	0.0 ^{bdf}	0.0	0.0	.1	0.0	0.0 ^{bdfi}
n			(122)	(155)	(108)	(52)	(156)	(242)	(85)	(43)	(21)
Hispanic males			0.0	0.0	0.7	0.0 ^{bdf}	0.0	0.0	.5	0.0	0.0 ^{bdfi}
n			(122)	(155)	(108)	(52)	(156)	(242)	(85)	(43)	(21)
Asian females	NA	NA	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0 ^b	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0 ^{bdfi}
n			(122)	(155)	(108)	(52)	(156)	(242)	(85)	(43)	(21)
Asian males	NA	NA	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.2 ^{cef}	0.0	0.0	0.0	.2	.1 ^{cef}
n			(122)	(155)	(106)	(52)	(156)	(242)	(85)	(43)	(21)

TABLE 14B (continued)

EARLY SOCIALIZATION EXPERIENCES
IN HEALTHCARE MANAGEMENT
MALES

	1992		1997				2002				
	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Native American</u>
<u>Mean Number of Mentors</u>											
Native American females	NA	NA	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	.4 ^{ghij}
n			(122)	(155)	(108)	(52)	(156)	(242)	(85)	(43)	(21)
Native American males			0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0 ^{cef}	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	.9 ^{ghij}
n			(122)	(155)	(108)	(52)	(156)	(242)	(85)	(43)	(21)

^a t test is significantly different at p<.05 between Blacks and Whites

^b “ “ “ “ Blacks and Hispanics

^c “ “ “ “ Blacks and Asians

^d “ “ “ “ Whites and Hispanics

^e “ “ “ “ Whites and Asians

^f “ “ “ “ Hispanics and Asians

^g “ “ “ “ Blacks and Native Americans

^h “ “ “ “ Whites and Native Americans

ⁱ “ “ “ “ Hispanics and Native Americans

^j “ “ “ “ Asians and Native Americans

*Chi-square significant p<.05

TABLE 15A

MOST INFLUENTIAL MENTOR
FEMALES

	1992		1997				2002				
	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Native American</u>
Black female	19%	1%***	19%	1%	7%	0%***	27%	1%	15%	6%	0%***
Black male	37	1	28	1	3	7	22	3	0	11	0
White female	15	26	20	30	14	26	22	35	20	25	13
White male	29	72	31	67	44	63	29	59	30	39	31
Hispanic female	NA	NA	2	0	19	0	0	0	11	8	0
Hispanic male	NA	NA	0	1	14	0	0	1	20	3	0
Asian female	NA	NA	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	0	0
Asian male	NA	NA	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	8	0
Native American female	NA	NA	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
Native American male	<u>NA</u> 100%	<u>NA</u> 100%	<u>0</u> 100%	<u>0</u> 100%	<u>0</u> 100% ¹	<u>0</u> 100%	<u>0</u> 100%	<u>0</u> 100%	<u>0</u> 100%	<u>0</u> 100%	<u>19</u> 100%
n	(130)	(226)	(129)	(147)	(59)	(27)	(203)	(291)	(54)	(36)	(16)

TABLE 15A (continued)

MOST INFLUENTIAL MENTOR

FEMALES

(Data for 2002 only)

	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Native American</u>
Position of mentor at time of being protégé					
Immediate supervisor	51	73	63	61	44 ^{***}
In same organization	33	21	15	19	44
In another healthcare organization	9	4	11	17	6
In non-healthcare organization	3	1	7	0	6
Other	<u>4</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>0</u>
	100% (207)	100% (291)	100% (54)	100% (36)	100% (16)
Percent satisfied with features of mentor/protégé relationship					
Career advice	92 (206)	94 (285)	91 (53)	100 (36)	87 (15)
Networking opportunities	80 (199)	81 (282)	88 (50)	77 (35)	100 (100)
New ideas about work	89 (202)	92 (285)	90 (52)	94 (36)	100 (16)
Obtaining promotion(s)/salary raises	73 (177)	75 (266)	67 (46)	63 (32)	86 (14)
Personal problems	62 (157)	51 (219)	73 (44)	77 (26)	71 ^{***} (14)
Initiating dialog about race/ethnic issues	74 (185)	40 (200)	62 (45)	42 (24)	54 ^{***} (13)

TABLE 15A (continued)

MOST INFLUENTIAL MENTOR
FEMALES
(Data for 2002 only)

Sufficient time allocated for the mentorship	81 (201)	79 (283)	81 (52)	74 (34)	56 (16)
Opportunities to improve my interpersonal skills	88 (200)	89 (286)	90 (51)	91 (35)	88 (16)
Overall evaluation of relationship	95 (203)	97 (289)	100 (53)	97 (36)	94 (16)

*** Chi-square significant $p < .001$

¹Responses may not total to 100 due to rounding.

TABLE 15B

MOST INFLUENTIAL MENTOR
MALES

	1992		1997				2002				
	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Native American</u>
Black female	3%	1%***	8%	0%	1%	2***	6%	1%	4%	0%	0%***
Black male	44	1	39	2	2	4	45	1	9	9	0
White female	5	11	8	10	10	13	5	10	9	16	5
White male	48	87	43	87	56	74	42	86	61	70	60
Hispanic female	NA	NA	0	0	7	0	0	0	1	0	0
Hispanic male	NA	NA	1	1	24	2	1	1	15	0	0
Asian female	NA	NA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Asian male	NA	NA	0	0	0	5	1	1	0	5	0
Native American female	NA	NA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Native American male	<u>NA</u> 100%	<u>NA</u> 100%	<u>0</u> 100% ¹	<u>0</u> 100%	<u>0</u> 100%	<u>0</u> 100%	<u>0</u> 100%	<u>0</u> 100%	<u>0</u> 100%	<u>0</u> 100%	<u>20</u> 100%
n	(112)	(168)	(118)	(154)	(107)	(54)	(154)	(239)	(85)	(43)	(20)

TABLE 15B (continued)

MOST INFLUENTIAL MENTOR
MALES
(Data for 2002 only)

	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Native American</u>
Position of mentor at time of being protégé					
Immediate supervisor	61	71	71	61	57
In same organization	20	17	16	32	24
In another healthcare organization	12	8	11	5	19
In non-healthcare organization	4	2	1	0	0
Other	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>
	100% (155)	100% (242)	100% (85)	100% (44)	100% (21)
Percent satisfied with features of mentor/protégé relationship					
Career advice	95 (155)	92 (239)	92 (86)	98 (44)	100 (19)
Networking opportunities	86 (153)	80 (234)	86 (84)	84 (43)	89 (19)
New ideas about work	87 (153)	92 (238)	91 (86)	88 (40)	90 (20)
Obtaining promotion(s)/salary raises	70 (139)	76 (221)	75 (76)	58 (38)	42*** (19)
Personal problems	63 (135)	49 (199)	56 (73)	57 (35)	59 (17)
Initiating dialog about race/ethnic issues	69 (146)	31 (191)	46 (68)	48 (33)	56*** (16)

TABLE 15B (continued)

MOST INFLUENTIAL MENTOR
 MALES
 (Data for 2002 only)

	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Native American</u>
Sufficient time allocated for the mentorship	86 (153)	85 (237)	87 (86)	76 (41)	80 (20)
Opportunities to improve my interpersonal skills	87 (153)	88 (236)	85 (85)	85 (40)	75 (20)
Overall evaluation of relationship	95 (156)	96 (239)	92 (86)	98 (43)	95 (20)

*** Chi-square significant $p < .001$

¹Responses may not total to 100 due to rounding.

TABLE 16A

CAREER ORIGINS
FEMALES

	1992		1997				2002				
	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Native American</u>
First Position											
Senior Executive	3%	3%	5%	3%	0%	3%	3%	3%	5%	6%	4%
Assistant Administrator	7	10	10	9	13	15	6	9	4	6	4
Department Head+	61	66	25	29	26	24	35	29	35	18	21
Staff and other+	<u>29</u>	<u>21</u>	<u>60</u>	<u>59</u>	<u>61</u>	<u>59</u>	<u>55</u>	<u>59</u>	<u>56</u>	<u>69</u>	<u>71</u>
n	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100% ¹	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
	(158)	(274)	(193)	(185)	(80)	(34)	(266)	(376)	(75)	(49)	(24)
First Area of Responsibility											
General management	27%	20% ^{***}	14%	12%	15%	21% [*]	19%	12%	14%	13%	12% ^{***}
Single business discipline											
(e.g., finance, human resources)	29	26	16	17	13	21	18	15	19	19	24
Clinical/ancillary	29	49	41	55	43	38	39	59	43	32	48
Sector management											
(e.g., ambulatory, association)	<u>16</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>21</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>24</u>	<u>36</u>	<u>16</u>
n	100% ¹	100%	100% ¹	100% ¹	100% ¹	100% ¹	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
	(157)	(273)	(195)	(190)	(80)	(39)	(270)	(377)	(74)	(47)	(25)
First employing organization											
System hospital	32%	32% ^{**}	24%	22%	27%	28% ^{**}	21%	18%	28%	28%	36% ^{***}
Freestanding hospital	35	49	41	55	31	39	45	59	37	45	28
Other provider	9	6	13	11	12	15	14	10	19	19	16
Public health agencies/military	11	6	11	3	21	8	13	5	10	2	8
Non-provider (e.g., consulting, education, association)	<u>13</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>12</u>
n	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
	(161)	(275)	(194)	(191)	(77)	(39)	(264)	(375)	(79)	(47)	(25)

TABLE 16A (continued)

CAREER ORIGINS
FEMALES

	1992		1997				2002				
	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Native American</u>
Ownership of first organization											
Not for profit - church	11%	29%***	10%	23%	10%	22%***	14%	25%	17%	23%	8%***
Not for profit - secular	46	41	50	50	35	35	51	45	51	31	19
Investor-owned	13	10	16	15	18	19	2	5	8	13	0
For profit - other	--	--	--	--	--	--	15	12	8	10	8
Government	30	21	24	11	37	24	18	13	16	23	65
Self-employed	--	--	--	--	--	--	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
	100%	100% ¹	100%	100% ¹	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
n	(161)	(277)	(191)	(188)	(78)	(37)	(267)	(377)	(76)	(48)	(26)
Picked first firm expecting to build career in that organization	--	--	--	--	--	--	67	67	71	60	50
							(263)	(371)	(77)	(48)	(26)

TABLE 16A (continued)

CAREER ORIGINS
FEMALES

	1992		1997				2002				
	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Native American</u>
How respondent learned about first position in current organization											
<u>From a person</u>											
Executive Recruiter	--	--	--	--	--	--	2	2	4	2	8
Professional network	--	--	--	--	--	--	16	18	26	21	8
Friend	--	--	--	--	--	--	21	21	22	21	28
Self employed or started firm	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	0	0	0	0
<u>From an organization</u>											
Recruited by official of organization	--	--	--	--	--	--	10	14	8	2	8
Internal transfer	--	--	--	--	--	--	3	3	3	2	0
Promotion	--	--	--	--	--	--	3	5	5	2	4
University program (including internship/residency)	--	--	--	--	--	--	17	13	16	17	8
State hospital association	--	--	--	--	--	--	0	0	0	0	0
Military	--	--	--	--	--	--	4	3	1	6	4
<u>From a publication</u>											
Internet	--	--	--	--	--	--	2	0	0	0	4
Print advertisement	--	--	--	--	--	--	18	18	11	21	20
<u>Other</u>	--	--	--	--	--	--	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>8</u>
n	--	--	--	--	--	--	100% (261)	100% (371)	100% (76)	100% (47)	100% (25)

⁺ Note: The response categories varied in the questionnaires between 1992 and 1997. In 1992 "staff and other" included administrative staff only while "department head" could include supervisors. In 1997, "staff and other" also included a new category, "department staff."

*Chi-square significant p<.05

**Chi-square significant p<.01

***Chi-square significant p<.001

¹Percentages may not total to 100 due to rounding.

TABLE 16B

CAREER ORIGINS
MALES

	1992		1997				2002				
	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Native American</u>
First Position											
Senior Executive	11%	11%	11%	11%	10%	10%	12%	13%	12%	10%	11%
Assistant Administrator	15	25	22	21	19	10	17	21	16	10	6
Department Head ⁺	45	42	21	33	29	26	24	27	29	21	22
Staff and other ⁺	<u>29</u>	<u>22</u>	<u>46</u>	<u>36</u>	<u>42</u>	<u>54</u>	<u>47</u>	<u>39</u>	<u>42</u>	<u>60</u>	<u>61</u>
n	100%	100%	100%	100% ¹	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
	(162)	(238)	(159)	(184)	(143)	(72)	(215)	(353)	(123)	(63)	(36)
First Area of Responsibility											
General management	34%	41% [*]	23%	27%	26%	31%	28%	33%	24%	27%	22%
Single business discipline											
(e.g., finance, human resources)	40	30	24	19	17	22	20	20	17	17	22
Clinical/ancillary	14	21	27	31	34	36	28	34	36	40	33
Sector management											
(e.g., ambulatory, association)	<u>12</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>22</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>24</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>22</u>
n	100%	100%	100% ¹	100% ¹	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
	(162)	(240)	(164)	(191)	(141)	(74)	(213)	(355)	(120)	(63)	(36)
First employing organization											
System hospital	26%	33% ^{**}	27%	25%	27%	38% [*]	31%	28%	29%	40%	30% ^{***}
Freestanding hospital	33	47	36	50	37	39	37	56	40	32	30
Other provider	14	3	13	7	13	8	9	5	11	6	14
Public health agencies/military	17	10	13	8	17	10	11	5	12	10	22
Non-provider (e.g., consulting, education, association)	<u>11</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>5</u>
n	100% ¹	100%	100%	100% ¹	100%	100% ¹	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
	(163)	(240)	(170)	(191)	(142)	(74)	(218)	(355)	(124)	(62)	(37)

TABLE 16B (continued)

CAREER ORIGINS
MALES

	1992		1997				2002				
	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Native American</u>
Ownership of first organization											
Not for profit - church	7%	25%***	7%	18%	16%	14%*	12%	21%	15%	14%	5%***
Not for profit - secular	47	36	41	38	24	29	36	39	30	30	22
Investor-owned	8	9	16	15	17	14	5	8	7	6	0
For profit - other	--	--	--	--	--	--	11	6	10	13	3
Government	38	30	36	29	42	43	35	25	35	35	70
Self-employed	--	--	--	--	--	--	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>
n	100%	100%	100%	100%	100% ¹	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
	(163)	(239)	(166)	(191)	(139)	(70)	(219)	(354)	(124)	(63)	(37)
Picked first firm expecting to build career in that organization	--	--	--	--	--	--	68	73	69	66	83
							(213)	(347)	(122)	(62)	(35)

TABLE 16B (continued)

CAREER ORIGINS
MALES

	1992		1997				2002				
	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Native American</u>
How respondent learned about first position in current organization											
<u>From a person</u>											
Executive Recruiter	--	--	--	--	--	--	5	5	2	7	6
Professional network	--	--	--	--	--	--	16	14	11	11	11
Friend	--	--	--	--	--	--	22	23	29	16	42
Self employed or started firm	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	1	2	7	0
<u>From an organization</u>											
Recruited by official of organization	--	--	--	--	--	--	9	14	8	10	8
Internal transfer	--	--	--	--	--	--	2	1	3	2	3
Promotion	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	3	2	2	0
University program (including internship/residency)	--	--	--	--	--	--	10	11	14	11	0
State hospital association	--	--	--	--	--	--	0	0	0	0	0
Military	--	--	--	--	--	--	16	9	14	18	14
<u>From a publication</u>											
Internet	--	--	--	--	--	--	0	1	1	0	0
Print advertisement	--	--	--	--	--	--	15	15	13	16	17
<u>Other</u>	--	--	--	--	--	--	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
	--	--	--	--	--	--	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
	--	--	--	--	--	--	(213)	(351)	(124)	(61)	(36)

⁺ Note: The response categories varied in the questionnaires between 1992 and 1997. In 1992 "staff and other" included administrative staff only while "department head" could include supervisors. In 1997, "staff and other" also included a new category, "department staff."

* Chi-square significant p<.05

** Chi-square significant p<.01

*** Chi-square significant p<.001

¹ Percentages may not total to 100 due to rounding.

TABLE 17A

CAREER EXPERIENCE OVERVIEW
FEMALES

	1992		1997				2002				
	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Native American</u>
Years of experience in <u>any</u> healthcare position											
Mean	16	18 ^a	17	18	16	14 ^{ce}	19	24	17	14	21 ^{acdhj}
n	(160)	(279)	(205)	(193)	(80)	(39)	(272)	(381)	(79)	(48)	(24)
Median	14	17	18	19	16	12	20	25	18	12	22
In healthcare management											
Mean	11	12	12	13	11	9 ^{de}	14	18	13	11	12 ^{acdhj}
n	(159)	(277)	(196)	(190)	(78)	(37)	(266)	(377)	(74)	(41)	(24)
Median	11	11	12	13	9	7	14	18	13	11	9
Number of <u>organizations</u> worked for as a healthcare manager	2.5	2.8	2.5	2.9	2.3	2.6 ^{ad}	3.0	3.2	3.1	2.7	2.3 ^h
n							(272)	(376)	(77)	(47)	(27)
Number of healthcare management <u>positions</u>	3.5	3.7	3.5	4.0	3.3	3.3 ^{ad}	3.9	4.7	3.8	3.5	2.8 ^{aehg}
n							(272)	(374)	(78)	(48)	(26)
Number of lateral moves made since beginning career as healthcare manager	--	--	--	--	--	--	1.0	1.1	1.3	1.0	1.3
							(270)	(374)	(75)	(46)	(26)

^a t test is significantly different at p<.05 between Blacks and Whites

^c “ “ “ “ Blacks and Asians

^d “ “ “ “ Whites and Hispanics

^e “ “ “ “ Whites and Asians

^g “ “ “ “ Blacks and Native Americans

^h “ “ “ “ Whites and Native Americans

^j “ “ “ “ Asians and Native Americans

TABLE 17B

CAREER EXPERIENCE OVERVIEW
MALES

	1992		1997				2002				
	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Native American</u>
Years of experience in <u>any</u> healthcare position											
Mean	18	20	18	19	19	19	20	24	21	19	19 ^{adeh}
n	(165)	(242)	(172)	(197)	(146)	(75)	(219)	(355)	(125)	(65)	(37)
Median	18	19	17	19	19	19	19	26	22	19	17
In healthcare management											
Mean	15	17	14	15	15	15	16	21	17	15	15 ^{adeh}
n	(162)	(240)	(166)	(195)	(145)	(74)	(216)	(353)	(125)	(63)	(37)
Median	15	17	17	14	14	14	14	22	16	16	14
Number of <u>organizations</u> worked for as a healthcare manager	3.1	3.1	2.9	2.9	3.2	3.3	3.2	3.7	4.0	3.7	2.9 ^{abhi}
n							(219)	(353)	(123)	(64)	(37)
Number of healthcare management <u>positions</u>	4.2	4.6	4.2	4.5	4.7	4.7	4.3	5.6	5.6	4.8	3.8 ^{abehi}
n							(219)	(353)	(123)	(65)	(37)
Number of lateral moves made since beginning career as healthcare manager	--	--	--	--	--	--	1.2	1.4	1.5	1.6	1.4
n							(217)	(351)	(121)	(63)	(36)

^a t test is significantly different at p<.05 between Blacks and White
^d “ “ “ “ Whites and Hispanics
^e “ “ “ “ Whites and Asians

h “ “ “ “ Whites and Native Americans
i “ “ “ “ Hispanics and Native Americans

TABLE 18A

WITHDRAWAL FROM THE WORKFORCE
(percentages)
FEMALES

	1992		1997				2002				
	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Native American</u>
Took a less desirable job because of:											
Family needs	17	30**	20	20	19	18	22	26	21	21	38
n	(161)	(281)	(196)	(191)	(79)	(38)	(269)	(372)	(72)	(43)	(26)
Financial needs			25	11	23	16**	24	9	25	14	28***
n			(196)	(191)	(78)	(38)	(268)	(363)	(72)	(42)	(25)
Lack of opportunity	11	3***	40	22	31	18***	41	20	33	32	28***
n	(161)	(281)	(196)	(191)	(78)	(38)	(268)	(367)	(73)	(44)	(25)
Lack of education			4	4	10	3	3	4	4	2	20***
n			(193)	(191)	(77)	(38)	(265)	(363)	(71)	(42)	(25)
Took a part-time job because of:											
Family demands	12	19*	11	12	17	8	15	14	10	9	23
n	(161)	(281)	(193)	(189)	(76)	(36)	(265)	(266)	(73)	(44)	(26)
Financial needs			35	12	20	6***	30	6	22	16	31***
n			(197)	(190)	(75)	(36)	(269)	(361)	(73)	(45)	(26)
Lack of opportunity	9	1***	10	4	9	0*	8	2	10	5	4*
n	(161)	(281)	(189)	(189)	(75)	(36)	(264)	(361)	(72)	(44)	(25)
Lack of education			1	1	1	0	2	1	0	0	4
n			(188)	(189)	(75)	(36)	(264)	(360)	(72)	(44)	(25)

TABLE 18A (continued)

WITHDRAWAL FROM THE WORKFORCE
(percentages)
FEMALES

	1992		1997				2002				
	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Native American</u>
Voluntarily withdrew from the workforce for three months or more because of:											
Family demands	22	27	21	13	19	16	20	22	19	5	8
n	(161)	(281)	(197)	(187)	(74)	(37)	(267)	(364)	(73)	(41)	(25)
Disliked position			5	5	11	3	9	6	9	12	0
n			(193)	(189)	(73)	(37)	(265)	(358)	(70)	(43)	(25)
Disability illness	4	2	4	1	4	3	5	3	1	5	8
n	(161)	(281)	(192)	(186)	(73)	(37)	(267)	(360)	(72)	(41)	(25)
To pursue education			11	16	15	6	14	12	10	15	8
n			(193)	(188)	(75)	(36)	(267)	(360)	(72)	(41)	(25)
Other			16	6	9	20	2	2	3	2	0
n			(32)	(48)	(11)	(5)	(272)	(374)	(75)	(45)	(26)
Experienced the following (percent yes)											
Unemployment for three months or more due to lack of opportunity	NA	NA	21	12	16	8*	18	11	15	23	8
n			(198)	(187)	(77)	(38)	(270)	(369)	(74)	(44)	(26)
Involuntary termination			18	14	13	13	19	14	15	17	4
n			(194)	(190)	(76)	(38)	(268)	(369)	(73)	(42)	(25)

* Chi-square significant p<.05

** Chi-square significant p<.01

*** Chi-square significant p<.001

TABLE 18B

WITHDRAWAL FROM THE WORKFORCE
(percentages)
MALES

	1992		1997				2002				
	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Native American</u>
Took a less desirable job because of:											
Family needs	6	8	17	16	18	18	15	17	20	23	25
n	(162)	(239)	(166)	(195)	(146)	(72)	(215)	(352)	(124)	(64)	(36)
Financial needs			23	18	15	19	16	14	19	14	25
n			(167)	(195)	(145)	(74)	(213)	(355)	(121)	(64)	(36)
Lack of opportunity	14	6*	46	21	24	28***	33	17	34	34	22***
n	(162)	(239)	(169)	(195)	(146)	(72)	(215)	(353)	(122)	(65)	(36)
Lack of education			4	2	7	4	1	4	5	2	3
n			(164)	(195)	(145)	(72)	(212)	(352)	(120)	(63)	(36)
Took a part-time job because of:											
Family demands	4	3	14	4	10	4**	13	5	9	8	9*
n	(162)	(239)	(164)	(195)	(144)	(72)	(214)	(353)	(122)	(62)	(35)
Financial needs			28	14	22	15**	25	10	16	15	17***
n			(170)	(195)	(145)	(72)	(210)	(352)	(122)	(62)	(35)
Lack of opportunity	9	3**	13	2	8	1***	13	2	7	3	6***
n	(162)	(239)	(166)	(195)	(144)	(71)	(212)	(350)	(121)	(62)	(34)
Lack of education			2	1	2	0	1	0	2	0	3
n			(163)	(195)	(144)	(71)	(210)	(350)	(122)	(62)	(34)

TABLE 18B (continued)

WITHDRAWAL FROM THE WORKFORCE
(percentages)
MALES

	1992		1997				2002				
	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Native American</u>
Voluntarily withdrew from the workforce for three months or more because of:											
Family demands	1	1	1	1	2	3	2	1	0	6	0*
n	(162)	(239)	(165)	(194)	(145)	(73)	(211)	(351)	(122)	(62)	(36)
Disliked position			5	3	4	3	5	5	2	2	3
n			(165)	(194)	(146)	(72)	(210)	(350)	(122)	(62)	(36)
Disability illness	6	2*	1	1	1	1	2	1	0	2	0
n	(162)	(239)	(165)	(195)	(145)	(73)	(209)	(350)	(122)	(62)	(36)
To pursue education			7	8	11	8	9	4	9	6	14*
n			(167)	(194)	(144)	(72)	(212)	(351)	(123)	(62)	(37)
Other			12	3	5	0	2	2	3	2	0
n			(33)	(38)	(40)	(15)	(220)	(357)	(125)	(65)	(37)
Experienced the following (percent yes)											
Unemployment for three months or more due to lack of opportunity	NA	NA	23	10	11	14**	19	16	16	18	14
n			(167)	(194)	(145)	(73)	(212)	(355)	(121)	(65)	(37)
Involuntary termination			19	20	12	13	21	20	20	14	11
n			(166)	(193)	(145)	(72)	(212)	(346)	(122)	(64)	(36)

* Chi-square significant p<.05

** Chi-square significant p<.01

*** Chi-square significant p<.001

TABLE 19A

ATTITUDES AFFECTING CAREER PROGRESSION
(percent agreeing and strongly agreeing)
FEMALES

	1992		1997				2002				
	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Native American</u>
I feel that my education adequately prepared me for the challenges that I faced in my first management position n	--	--	--	--	--	--	72 (268)	75 (376)	69 (77)	71 (48)	65 (26)
In my career, I have been willing to relocate to obtain a better position n	79 (149)	67* (262)	59 (193)	58 (182)	61 (76)	63 (35)	63 (255)	53 (348)	44 (71)	60 (43)	54* (26)
In my career, family obligations presented an obstacle to my accepting more responsibility n	18 (119)	22 (243)	17 (186)	23 (175)	22 (79)	24 (34)	23 (241)	27 (341)	26 (73)	11 (38)	19 (26)
If an attractive career opportunity came along in a different city, I would willingly relocate n	60 (160)	46** (277)	56 (196)	49 (191)	47 (79)	53 (38)	63 (267)	46 (368)	47 (75)	54 (48)	42*** (26)
If an attractive career opportunity came along in a rural or semi-rural location, I would relocate n	25 (158)	33 (276)	25 (197)	37 (190)	35 (79)	21* (38)	26 (266)	32 (363)	27 (74)	15 (48)	42* (26)

TABLE 19A (continued)

ATTITUDES AFFECTING CAREER PROGRESSION
(percent agreeing and strongly agreeing)
FEMALES

	1992		1997				2002				
	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Native American</u>
In my career, I have been negatively affected by racial/ethnic discrimination n	60 (159)	5*** (281)	64 (200)	10 (174)	27 (79)	26*** (38)	55 (269)	6 (327)	32 (76)	29 (48)	19*** (26)
I am satisfied with the progress I have made toward meeting my overall career goals n	NA	NA	56 (198)	76 (191)	73 (79)	76*** (38)	58 (272)	78 (370)	69 (77)	65 (48)	65*** (26)

* Chi-square significant p<.05

** Chi-square significant p<.01

*** Chi-square significant p<.001

TABLE 19B

ATTITUDES AFFECTING CAREER PROGRESSION
(percent agreeing and strongly agreeing)
MALES

	1992		1997				2002				
	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Native American</u>
I feel that my education adequately prepared me for the challenges that I faced in my first management position n	--	--	--	--	--	-- 81	74 (219)	81 (355)	86 (124)	75 (64)	(36)
In my career, I have been willing to relocate to obtain a better position n	78 (151)	77 (235)	82 (168)	78 (188)	82 (145)	81 (70)	77 (211)	79 (351)	77 (121)	67 (63)	78 (36)
In my career, family obligations presented an obstacle to my accepting more responsibility n	11 (135)	16 (227)	13 (164)	23 (190)	19 (140)	26* (70)	13 (206)	21 (345)	20 (119)	28 (61)	36** (36)
If an attractive career opportunity came along in a different city, I would willingly relocate n	67 (160)	54** (237)	75 (169)	66 (191)	73 (145)	74 (72)	71 (210)	59 (353)	72 (124)	55 (65)	62** (37)
If an attractive career opportunity came along in a rural or semi-rural location, I would relocate n	32 (161)	48*** (236)	38 (167)	54 (186)	63 (144)	43*** (72)	38 (210)	44 (349)	48 (123)	31 (64)	49 (37)

TABLE 19B (continued)

ATTITUDES AFFECTING CAREER PROGRESSION
(percent agreeing and strongly agreeing)
MALES

	1992		1997				2002				
	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Native American</u>
In my career, I have been negatively affected by racial/ethnic discrimination n	65 (162)	4*** (239)	60 (172)	11 (183)	34 (145)	41*** (73)	56 (216)	7 (328)	33 (124)	33 (64)	20*** (35)
I am satisfied with the progress I have made toward meeting my overall career goals n	NA	NA	68 (170)	82 (194)	80 (146)	78** (74)	62 (219)	85 (356)	76 (124)	69 (65)	86*** (37)

* Chi-square significant p<.05

** Chi-square significant p<.01

*** Chi-square significant p<.001

TABLE 20A

FIRST AND CURRENT POSITION WITHIN CURRENT FIRM
FEMALES
2002

	<u>First</u>					<u>Current</u>				
	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Native American</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Native American</u>
CEO	6%	6%	4%	6%	0%*	11%	13%	9%	9%	12%***
COO	3	7	5	2	0	5	13	5	4	4
Regional										
Vice President	0	2	0	2	4	2	3	4	4	4
Senior Vice President										
/Associate										
/Medical Director	5	6	5	6	0	9	11	7	6	8
Vice President										
/Assistant Administrator	14	22	15	10	4	19	28	24	17	8
Program Manager										
/Department Head	35	29	37	38	44	39	19	32	34	44
Executive Staff	5	3	4	0	8	3	4	5	0	12
Department Staff	20	15	23	17	32	5	2	12	13	4
Consultant	32	56	5	5	2	3	5	1	4	4
Other	7	5	4	15	4	5	3	1	9	0
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
n	(262)	(377)	(75)	(48)	(25)	(266)	(381)	(76)	(47)	(25)
Years of experience in current <u>firm</u> :										
Mean						6.9	9.5	6.2	5.5	15.4 ^{adeghij}
Median						4.2	5.8	3.8	2.1	11.9
n						(272)	(381)	(77)	(48)	(25)
Years in a current <u>position</u> :										
Mean						4.2	5.0	4.2	2.8	5.7 ^{cej}
Median						2.8	3.3	2.2	1.3	3.4
n						(263)	(374)	(70)	(46)	(25)

TABLE 20A (continued)

FIRST AND CURRENT POSITION WITHIN CURRENT FIRM
FEMALES
2002

	<u>First</u>					<u>Current</u>				
	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Native American</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Native American</u>
Source of information for first and current positions in current firm										
<u>From a person</u>										
Executive Recruiter	11%	10%	8%	2%	8%	8%	7%	7%	2%	4%
Professional network	18	23	20	28	24	15	16	14	20	16
Friend	13	16	25	13	24	4	6	12	9	16
Self employed or started firm	4	2	0	2	0	5	2	0	2	0
<u>From an organization</u>										
Recruited by official of organization	15	20	12	15	4	20	18	12	13	8
Internal transfer	3	2	1	2	12	12	14	14	11	20
Promotion	3	3	5	2	0	21	23	24	22	24
University program (including internship/residency)	7	4	7	7	4	3	2	5	4	0
State hospital association	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Military	3	3	1	7	0	3	3	1	7	0
<u>From a publication</u>										
Internet	3	2	3	2	0	3	2	3	2	0
Print advertisement	18	15	15	17	20	6	7	7	9	12
<u>Other</u>										
	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
	(263)	(372)	(75)	(46)	(25)	(266)	(375)	(74)	(46)	(25)

TABLE 20A (continued)

FIRST AND CURRENT POSITION WITHIN CURRENT FIRM
FEMALES
2002

^a t test is significantly different at $p < .05$ between Blacks and Whites

c	“	“	“	“	Blacks and Asians
d	“	“	“	“	Whites and Hispanics
e	“	“	“	“	Whites and Asians
g	“	“	“	“	Blacks and Native Americans
h	“	“	“	“	Whites and Native Americans
i	“	“	“	“	Hispanics and Native Americans
j	“	“	“	“	Asians and Native Americans

* Chi-square significant $p < .05$

¹ Responses may not total to 100 due to rounding.

TABLE 20B

FIRST AND CURRENT POSITION WITHIN CURRENT FIRM
MALES
2002

	<u>First</u>					<u>Current</u>				
	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Native American</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Native American</u>
CEO	13%	31%	16%	8%	24%***	19%	37%	23%	11%	32%***
COO	7	9	7	6	3	10	13	8	12	5
Regional Vice President	2	1	4	5	5	3	2	5	5	3
Senior Vice President										
/Associate										
/Medical Director	10	6	6	3	3	12	10	11	6	5
Vice President										
/Assistant Administrator	15	18	18	17	8	24	19	23	20	16
Program Manager										
/Department Head	25	19	30	28	16	22	10	20	31	30
Executive Staff	2	3	4	5	3	4	3	3	5	3
Department Staff	18	5	9	17	32	2	0	3	8	3
Consultant	6	3	2	5	5	3	3	2	3	3
Other	4	4	4	6	0	2	3	1	0	0
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
n	(215)	(353)	(122)	(64)	(37)	(216)	(355)	(123)	(65)	(37)
Years of experience in current firm:										
Mean						8.2	9.5	6.3	6.3	9.6 ^{bdeij}
Median						5.8	6.4	3.4	3.7	6.1
n						(219)	(356)	(124)	(63)	(37)
Years in a current position:										
Mean						5.2	6.6	4.3	4.3	5.0 ^{ade}
Median						3.5	4.2	2.2	2.0	3.3
n						(210)	(351)	(123)	(61)	(37)

TABLE 20B (continued)

FIRST AND CURRENT POSITION WITHIN CURRENT FIRM
MALES
2002

	<u>First</u>					<u>Current</u>				
	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Native American</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Native American</u>
Source of information for first and current positions										
<u>From a person</u>										
Executive Recruiter	15	15	11	5	5**	11	11	11	3	5
Professional network	20	20	19	21	24	16	18	13	20	19
Friend	15	15	17	2	30	10	8	9	0	19
Self employed or started firm	3	5	3	5	3	3	5	3	7	5
<u>From an organization</u>										
Recruited by official of organization	17	16	12	18	14	13	11	12	15	5
Internal transfer	1	2	6	2	5	7	11	11	7	16
Promotion	2	3	3	0	5	23	19	20	20	19
University Program (including internship/residency)	2	4	2	8	0	1	0	0	2	0
State hospital association	0	1	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0
Military	10	5	11	18	5	10	5	11	18	5
<u>From a publication</u>										
Internet	1	3	6	7	0	1	3	5	5	0
Print advertisement	12	12	11	15	5	5	8	4	5	5
<u>Other</u>										
	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
	(212)	(348)	(121)	(61)	(37)	(213)	(349)	(121)	(61)	(37)

TABLE 20B (continued)

FIRST AND CURRENT POSITION WITHIN CURRENT FIRM
MALES
2002

^a	t test is significantly different at p<.05 between Blacks and White			
b	“	“	“	“
d	“	“	“	“
e	“	“	“	“
i	“	“	“	“
j	“	“	“	“

Blacks and Hispanics
Whites and Hispanics
Whites and Asians
Hispanics and Native Americans
Asians and Native Americans

¹Responses may not total to 100 due to rounding.

TABLE 21A

PROMOTION WITHIN CURRENT FIRM BY FIRST POSITION
(1997 and 2002)
(percent)
FEMALES

		1997				2002				
		<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Native American</u>
First position	Current position									
CEO	CEO	98%	90%	100%	100%	91%	92%	87%	83%	100%
	COO/ Senior Vice President	2	3	0	0	5	5	9	8	0
	Vice President	0	2	0	0	2	1	0	0	0
	/Assistant Administrator	<u>0</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>0</u>
	Department Head/Staff	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
	n	(42)	(19)	(41)	(9)	(64)	(110)	(23)	(12)	(3)
COO/Senior Vice President	CEO	23	56	43	17*	33	39	13	14	18
/Associate Administrator	COO/ Senior Vice President	65	38	50	83	63	53	75	86	64
	Vice President	8	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
	/Assistant Administrator	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>9</u>
	Department Head/Staff	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
	n	(48)	(61)	(14)	(6)	(49)	(132)	(16)	(7)	(11)

TABLE 21A (continued)

PROMOTION WITHIN CURRENT FIRM BY FIRST POSITION
(1997 and 2002)
(percent)
FEMALES

		1997				2002				
		<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Native American</u>
Vice President /Assistant Administrator	CEO	20%	25%	+	+	13%	63%	+	+	+
	COO	0	0	+	+	0	0	+	+	+
	Vice President	80	75	+	+	87	37	+	+	+
	Department Head/Staff	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	+	+	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	+	+	+
	n	100% (10)	100% (8)			100% (16)	100% (8)			
Department Head/Staff	CEO	10	30	24	+	27	11	22	22	+
	COO	16	0	5	+	3	11	0	11	+
	Vice President	0	0	5	+	0	0	0	0	+
	Department Head/Staff	<u>74</u>	<u>70</u>	<u>66</u>	+	<u>70</u>	<u>78</u>	<u>78</u>	<u>67</u>	+
	n	100% (19)	100% (21)	100% (10)		100% (33)	100% (47)	100% (9)	100% (9)	

⁺ Too few observations to analyze

* Chi-square significant p<.05

*** Chi-square significant p<.001

TABLE 21B

PROMOTION WITHIN CURRENT FIRM BY FIRST POSITION
(1997 and 2002)
(percent)
MALES

		1997				2002				
		<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Native American</u>
First position	Current position									
CEO	CEO	94%	97%	86%	97%	96%	95%	95%	100%	93%
	COO/ Senior Vice President	4	0	10	3	1	2	5	0	7
	Vice President	0	0	2	0	3	1	0	0	0
	/Assistant Administrator	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
	Department Head/Staff	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
	n	100% (51)	100% (76)	100% (52)	100% (31)	100% (68)	100% (200)	100% (43)	100% (19)	100% (14)
COO/Senior Vice President	CEO	33	45	31	12	33	52	19	18	38
/Associate Administrator	COO/ Senior Vice President	64	45	57	82	61	43	71	76	38
	Vice President	0	8	8	0	2	0	0	6	13
	/Assistant Administrator	<u>0</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>13</u>
	Department Head/Staff	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>12</u>
	n	100% (39)	100% (38)	100% (26)	100% (17)	100% (51)	100% (65)	100% (31)	100% (17)	100% (8)

TABLE 21B (continued)

PROMOTION WITHIN CURRENT FIRM BY FIRST POSITION
(1997 and 2002)
(percent)
MALES

		1997				2002				
		<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Native American</u>
Vice President /Assistant Administrator	CEO	+	+	+	+	+	42%	+	+	+
	COO	+	+	+	+	+	0	+	+	+
	Vice President	+	+	+	+	+	50	+	+	+
	Department Head/Staff	+	+	+	+	+	<u>8</u>	+	+	+
	n						100% (12)			
Department Head/Staff	CEO	+	50	15	+	13	30	10	+	+
	COO	+	6	0	+	6	15	10	+	+
	Vice President	+	0	8	+	0	0	0	+	+
	Department Head/Staff	+	<u>44</u>	<u>77</u>	+	<u>81</u>	<u>55</u>	<u>80</u>	+	+
	n		100% (18)	100% (13)		100% (16)	100% (20)	100% (10)		

⁺Too few observations to analyze

TABLE 22A

LIKELIHOOD OF RESPONDENT'S
PROMOTION IN NEXT YEAR
FEMALES

	1992		1997				2002				
	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Native American</u>
Will definitely be promoted	3%	4%	4%	3%	4%	11%	5%	3%	3%	2%	7%
Good chance will be promoted	17	14	10	9	11	26	13	12	17	17	15
Situation is uncertain	30	23	24	28	33	13	18	15	21	22	22
Chances for promotion are slight	32	32	32	31	32	21	29	32	30	26	26
Definitely will not be promoted	18	27	21	17	11	18	24	21	19	15	22
Not applicable (e.g., you are the CEO)	<u>—</u>	<u>—</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>7</u>
n	100% (139)	100% (249)	100% (200)	100% (190)	100% (81)	100% (38)	100% (255)	100% (369)	100% (77)	100% (46)	100% (27)

TABLE 22B

LIKELIHOOD OF RESPONDENT'S
PROMOTION IN NEXT YEAR
MALES
(percentages)

	1992		1997				2002				
	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Native American</u>
Will definitely be promoted	3	3*	4	7	7	6	1	3	2	7	3***
Good chance will be promoted	13	9	14	14	15	18	14	9	17	15	22
Situation is uncertain	32	22	21	18	22	21	20	15	27	24	17
Chances for promotion are slight	38	35	29	24	17	18	30	24	22	27	25
Definitely will not be promoted	14	31	15	13	17	21	17	16	14	19	11
Not applicable (e.g., you are the CEO)	<u>—</u>	<u>—</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>22</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>33</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>22</u>
n	100% (119)	100% (154)	100% (168)	100% ¹ (195)	100% (143)	100% ¹ (72)	100% (213)	100% (338)	100% (116)	100% (59)	100% (36)

* Chi-square significant p<.05

¹Percentage may not total to 100 due to rounding.

TABLE 23A

CURRENT ORGANIZATION
RACIAL COMPOSITION
FEMALES

	1992		1997				2002				
	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Native American</u>
Race/ethnicity of predecessor											
Black	19	1 ^{***}	22	2	5	0 ^{***}	21	3	11	10	0 ^{***}
White	56	68	48	70	51	70	57	77	50	57	28
Hispanic	0	1	2	1	15	0	1	0	10	2	0
Asian/							3	0	0	5	0
Native American	—	—	0	1	4	5	0	0	0	0	56
New Position	24	28	27	26	22	22	18	17	21	24	16
Don't know	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>
n	100% (156)	100% (269)	100% (191)	100% ¹ (188)	100% ¹ (78)	100% (37)	100% (227)	100% (327)	100% (70)	100% (42)	100% (25)
Race/ethnicity of all employees											
Majority Black	31	1 ^{***}	25	3	3	0 ^{***}	22	3	9	0	0 ^{***}
Majority White	51	80	64	78	41	76	64	72	42	68	17
Majority Hispanic	1	0	1	2	22	0	1	1	21	0	0
Majority Asian/							0	0	1	5	0
Majority Native American	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	83
No racial majority	<u>17</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>34</u>	<u>24</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>0</u>
n	100% (153)	100% (258)	100% (193)	100% (183)	100% ¹ (76)	100% (38)	100% (215)	100% (285)	100% (67)	100% (41)	100% (23)

TABLE 23A (continued)

CURRENT ORGANIZATION
RACIAL COMPOSITION
FEMALES

	1992		1997				2002				
	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Native American</u>
Race/ethnicity composition of service area											
Black	50	4 ^{***}	36	4	4	6 ^{***}	36	5	10	8	0 ^{***}
White	32	73	43	72	26	50	45	68	35	54	30
Hispanic	2	2	4	3	47	0	6	3	25	0	0
Asian/ Native American	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	70
No racial/ethnic majority	<u>16</u>	<u>19</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>44</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>24</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>0</u>
n	100%	100%	100%	100%	100% ¹	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
	(107)	(155)	(128)	(132)	(47)	(18)	(157)	(229)	(40)	(24)	(20)
Race ethnic composition of employees in department											
Majority Black	55	5 ^{***}	29	1	7	13 ^{***}	35	5	10	0	0 ^{**}
Majority White	32	70	48	83	33	63	43	79	33	80	11
Majority Hispanic	—	—	1	1	26	0	2	1	29	0	0
Majority Asian/ Majority Native American	—	—	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	8	0
No racial/ethnic majority	<u>13</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>22</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>33</u>	<u>19</u>	<u>19</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>29</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>6</u>
n	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100% ¹	100% ¹	100%	100%	100%	100%
	(31)	(40)	(128)	(106)	(54)	(16)	(159)	(177)	(52)	(25)	(18)

¹Percentage may not total to 100 due to rounding.

TABLE 23A (continued)

CURRENT ORGANIZATION
RACIAL COMPOSITION
FEMALES

	1992		1997				2002				
	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Native American</u>
Race/ethnic identity of your immediate supervisor											
Black	--	--	--	--	--	--	21	3	9	9	0
White	--	--	--	--	--	--	75	96	70	82	27
Hispanic	--	--	--	--	--	--	2	1	18	2	0
Asian	--	--	--	--	--	--	2	1	3	7	0
Native American	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	0	0	0	73
n							100% ¹	100% ¹	100%	100%	100%
							(253)	(358)	(77)	(45)	(26)
Race/ethnicity of direct reports (means)											
Black	2.8	0.4 ^a	3.0	0.9	0.9	2.0 ^{ab}	2.1	0.7	1.0	0.7	0.1 ^{abcg}
n	(136)	(241)	(149)	(154)	(70)	(22)	(191)	(293)	(60)	(28)	(22)
White	3.0	5.7 ^a	4.8	9.9	4.5	5.6 ^{ad}	3.3	6.5	3.1	4.2	1.6 ^{abehj}
n	(136)	(234)	(149)	(154)	(70)	(22)	(191)	(293)	(60)	(28)	(22)
Hispanic	0.2	0.2	0.4	0.4	3.9	1.6 ^{bd}	0.4	0.3	1.6	0.5	0.1 ^{bdfi}
n	(136)	(241)	(149)	(154)	(70)	(22)	(191)	(293)	(60)	(28)	(22)
Asian	}	0.2	0.3	0.1	0.4	1.6 ^{cef}	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.7	0.1 ^{cefj}
n			(149)	(154)	(70)	(22)	(191)	(293)	(60)	(28)	(22)
Native American			0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0	0	0.1	4.5 ^{ghij}
n	(136)	(242)	(149)	(154)	(70)	(22)	(190)	(293)	(60)	(28)	(22)

^a t test is significantly different at p<.05 between Blacks and Whites

^b " " " " Blacks and Hispanics

^c " " " " Blacks and Asians

^d " " " " Whites and Hispanics

^e " " " " Whites and Asians

^f " " " " Hispanics and Asians

^g " " " " Blacks and Native Americans

^h " " " " Whites and Native Americans

ⁱ " " " " Hispanics and Native Americans

^j " " " " Asians and Native Americans

*** Chi-square significant p<.001

¹ Percentage may not total to 100 due to rounding.

TABLE 23B

CURRENT ORGANIZATION
RACIAL COMPOSITION
MALES

	1992		1997				2002				
	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Native American</u>
Race/ethnicity of predecessor											
Black	26	1***	18	4	4	7***	18	2	1	4	0***
White	51	83	53	72	59	60	64	78	62	69	44
Hispanic	0	1	1	2	13	2	1	0	16	2	0
Asian/ Native American	—	—	0	1	4	7	0	0	0	0	38
New Position	22	14	26	21	19	21	15	16	17	13	15
Don't Know	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>3</u>
n	100% (151)	100% (226)	100% (167)	100% ¹ (186)	100% (136)	100% (68)	100% (192)	100% (302)	100% (102)	100% (54)	100% (34)
Race/ethnicity of all employees											
Majority Black	37	2***	21	2	3	2***	20	3	5	4	0***
Majority White	54	85	67	83	61	67	63	82	51	58	33
Majority Hispanic	0	1	1	2	20	3	3	1	17	2	3
Majority Asian/ Majority Native American	0	1	1	0	1	6	0	0	0	0	61
No racial majority	<u>9</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>29</u>	<u>3</u>
n	100% (148)	100% (221)	100% (162)	100% (182)	100% (138)	100% ¹ (66)	100% (191)	100% (238)	100% (99)	100% (55)	100% (33)

TABLE 23B (continued)

CURRENT ORGANIZATION
RACIAL COMPOSITION
MALES

	1992		1997				2002				
	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Native American</u>
Race/ethnicity composition of service area											
Black	42	3***	30	3	4	5***	25	6	7	11	0***
White	41	80	50	74	45	59	50	79	42	47	37
Hispanic	1	3	2	3	36	2	8	3	25	3	4
Asian/							0	1	0	3	0
Native American	0	0	0	0	2	10	0	0	1	3	52
No racial/ethnic majority	<u>16</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>24</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>34</u>	<u>7</u>
n	100% (88)	100% (125)	100% (115)	100% (119)	100% (95)	100% (41)	100% (118)	100% (203)	100% (69)	100% (38)	100% (27)
Race/ethnic composition of employees in department											
Majority Black	+	+	34	1	2	5***	30	3	3	8	0***
Majority White	+	+	56	83	46	61	55	82	47	58	25
Majority Hispanic	+	+	0	1	33	2	1	0	31	3	0
Majority Asian/							2	1	0	5	0
Majority Native American	+	+	0	0	1	2	1	0	0	0	61
No racial/ethnic majority	+	+	<u>10</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>19</u>	<u>28</u>	<u>14</u>
n			100% (107)	100% ¹ (78)	100% (83)	100% (43)	100% (128)	100% (103)	100% (62)	100% (40)	100% (28)

TABLE 23B (continued)

CURRENT ORGANIZATION
RACIAL COMPOSITION
MALES

	1992		1997				2002				
	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Native American</u>
Race/ethnic identity of your immediate supervisor											
Black	--	--	--	--	--	--	23	3	4	12	3***
White	--	--	--	--	--	--	74	94	81	77	56
Hispanic	--	--	--	--	--	--	2	2	13	5	0
Asian	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	1	2	7	3
Native American	--	--	--	--	--	--	0	0	0	0	38
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
	(208)	(330)	(115)	(60)	(34)						
Race/ethnicity of direct reports (means)											
Black	2.4	0.4 ^a	2.2	0.7	0.8	1.3 ^{abc}	2.1	0.6	0.8	0.8	0.3 ^{abcg}
n	(135)	(219)	(147)	(167)	(125)	(61)	(183)	(290)	(92)	(43)	(27)
White	2.9	6.3 ^a	5.1	7.0	6.7	10.3 ^{cf}	4.1	6.5	4.2	4.4	3.8 ^{adeh}
n	(135)	(219)	(147)	(167)	(125)	(61)	(182)	(290)	(92)	(43)	(27)
Hispanic	0.2	0.2	0.5	0.2	3.7	0.5 ^{bdf}	0.4	0.3	1.9	0.4	0.3 ^{bdfi}
n	(135)	(219)	(147)	(167)	(125)	(61)	(182)	(290)	(92)	(43)	(27)
Asian	0.3	0.1 ^a	0.2	0.2	1.0	1.6 ^{bcde}	0.2	0.2	0.3	1.0	0.2 ^{cefj}
n	(135)	(219)	(147)	(167)	(125)	(61)	(183)	(290)	(92)	(43)	(27)
Native American			0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	0	0	0	0.1	2.9 ^{ghij}
n	(135)	(219)	(147)	(167)	(125)	(61)	(183)	(290)	(92)	(43)	(27)

† Too few observations to analyze

^a t test is significantly different at p<.05 between Blacks and Whites

b " " " " Blacks and Hispanics

c " " " " Blacks and Asians

d " " " " Whites and Hispanics

e " " " " Whites and Asians

f " " " " Hispanics and Asians

g " " " " Blacks and Native Americans

h " " " " Whites and Native Americans

i " " " " Hispanics and Native Americans

j " " " " Asians and Native Americans

*** Chi-square significant p<.001

^l Percentage may not total to 100 due to rounding.

TABLE 24A

CURRENT ORGANIZATION'S POLICIES
(percent yes)
FEMALES

	1992		1997				2002				
	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Native American</u>
Recruiting events targeted toward minorities n	38% (162)	33% (277)	29% (196)	30% (182)	24% (76)	27% (37)	32% (254)	36% (362)	29% (77)	27% (48)	54% (24)
Educational support programs n	78 (161)	91*** (278)	75 (198)	84 (178)	69 (77)	76* (37)	83 (253)	88 (364)	81 (77)	83 (48)	63* (24)
Job sharing n	15 (155)	33*** (277)	17 (194)	28 (180)	20 (76)	14* (35)	17 (252)	37 (364)	12 (75)	19 (48)	21*** (24)
Childcare services n	26 (159)	40** (277)	30 (197)	35 (181)	29 (75)	27 (37)	34 (253)	36 (362)	27 (77)	38 (48)	8 (24)
Target set for hiring minorities n	NA		17 (194)	11 (180)	26 (74)	22* (37)	17 (255)	13 (364)	16 (77)	10 (48)	71*** (24)
Target set for promoting minorities n	NA		10 (193)	9 (180)	15 (74)	5 (37)	12 (256)	11 (364)	13 (77)	8 (48)	54*** (24)
Rotations provided for minorities n	NA		12 (191)	10 (179)	5 (74)	8 (37)	8 (254)	5 (361)	8 (77)	6 (48)	29*** (24)
Minority candidate required to be on the short list for senior-level executive positions n	NA		4 (190)	3 (179)	8 (74)	5 (37)	6 (253)	7 (361)	4 (76)	8 (48)	24* (25)

TABLE 24A (continued)

CURRENT ORGANIZATION'S POLICIES
(percent yes)
FEMALES

	1992		1997				2002				
	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Native American</u>
Formal mentoring program n	--	--	--	--	--	--	21 (254)	27 (362)	22 (76)	21 (48)	12 (25)
Senior executives encouraged to mentor minorities n	NA		15 (190)	19 (180)	28 (76)	14 (37)	16 (253)	14 (361)	16 (77)	10 (48)	16 (25)
Senior executive evaluated in part on mentoring minorities n	--	--	--	--	--	--	5 (252)	6 (363)	3 (76)	2 (48)	4 (25)
Diversity goals tied to business objectives n	NA		20 (191)	18 (178)	25 (75)	32 (37)	22 (255)	15 (363)	14 (77)	15 (48)	24 (25)
Fluency in Spanish rewarded: with additional pay n	NA		5 (191)	7 (171)	22 (74)	14*** (36)	8 (247)	6 (355)	12 (76)	17 (46)	0* (23)
by providing greater visibility n	NA		9 (191)	8 (171)	9 (74)	22 (36)	15 (247)	16 (355)	14 (76)	11 (46)	9 (23)
by offering more promotional opportunities n	NA		3 (191)	4 (171)	8 (74)	6 (36)	6 (247)	5 (355)	13 (76)	0 (46)	4* (23)
not rewarded n	NA		84 (191)	84 (171)	66 (74)	64*** (36)	75 (247)	77 (355)	68 (76)	74 (46)	91 (23)

TABLE 24A (continued)

CURRENT ORGANIZATION'S POLICIES
(percent yes)
FEMALES

	1992		1997				2002				
	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Native American</u>
Organization's Internal Promotions of Healthcare Managers											
Always filled within	0	2	4	1	4	8	2	1	3	0	4
Usually filled from within	29	31	30	36	32	42	36	34	27	42	52
About half the time filled from within	40	41	34	36	37	24	36	43	47	42	37
Usually filled from the outside	25	22	25	21	19	21	21	17	16	13	7
Do not know	<u>6</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>
n	100% (161)	100% (276)	100% (200)	100% (189)	100% ¹ (81)	100% (38)	100% (255)	100% (368)	100% (77)	100% (45)	100% (27)
Preference for filling senior management positions with internal candidates	--	--	--	--	--	--	32 (255)	40 (359)	34 (77)	40 (48)	17* (24)
n											
Formal succession planning	--	--	--	--	--	--	16 (255)	25 (359)	13 (77)	25 (48)	13 (23)
n											

* Chi-square significant p<.05

** Chi-square significant p<.01

*** Chi-square significant p<.001

¹Percentage may not total to 100 due to rounding.

TABLE 24B

CURRENT ORGANIZATION'S POLICIES
(percent yes)
MALES

	1992		1997				2002				
	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Native American</u>
Recruiting events targeted toward minorities n	56% (158)	33%*** (242)	35% (159)	36% (192)	37% (137)	24% (71)	37% (206)	35% (337)	32% (117)	30% (60)	56% (34)
Educational support programs n	81 (160)	89* (242)	86 (159)	89 (194)	79 (135)	79 (73)	86 (208)	92 (340)	81 (115)	87 (60)	81* (32)
Job sharing n	24 (156)	26 (242)	16 (155)	29 (190)	28 (135)	23* (73)	25 (201)	42 (333)	22 (114)	33 (60)	27*** (33)
Childcare services n	31 (160)	39 (244)	39 (155)	42 (192)	28 (138)	38 (73)	36 (201)	34 (337)	28 (114)	43 (60)	24 (33)
Target set for hiring minorities n	NA		17 (157)	14 (190)	20 (137)	18 (73)	13 (208)	14 (340)	20 (117)	17 (59)	38** (34)
Target set for promoting minorities n	NA		6 (155)	9 (190)	15 (137)	10 (72)	7 (207)	9 (340)	16 (117)	15 (59)	35*** (34)
Rotations provided for minorities n	NA		12 (155)	8 (190)	13 (135)	7 (72)	6 (207)	8 (338)	14 (116)	10 (59)	12 (34)
Minority candidate required to be on the short list for senior-level executive positions n	NA		11 (157)	7 (190)	9 (135)	7 (73)	7 (209)	6 (339)	6 (115)	5 (58)	24** (34)

TABLE 24B (continued)

CURRENT ORGANIZATION'S POLICIES
(percent yes)
MALES

	1992		1997				2002				
	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Native American</u>
Formal mentoring program n	--	--	--	--	--	--	15 (209)	21 (339)	23 (118)	34 (59)	24* (34)
Senior executives encouraged to mentor minorities n	NA		25 (154)	19 (191)	26 (136)	18 (73)	17 (209)	17 (339)	18 (117)	17 (59)	21 (33)
Senior executive evaluated in part on mentoring minorities n	--	--	--	--	--	--	5 (209)	6 (336)	7 (117)	7 (59)	15 (34)
Diversity goals tied to business objectives n	NA		22 (159)	22 (190)	30 (137)	19 (72)	16 (207)	15 (338)	16 (117)	17 (59)	18 (34)
Fluency in Spanish rewarded: with additional pay n	NA		6 (159)	7 (188)	16 (138)	5** (73)	13 (202)	8 (337)	14 (116)	13 (60)	9 (34)
by providing greater visibility n	NA		10 (159)	17 (188)	11 (138)	10 (73)	9 (202)	12 (337)	17 (116)	12 (60)	6 (34)
by offering more promotional opportunities n	NA		3 (159)	3 (188)	9 (138)	1** (73)	7 (202)	7 (337)	8 (116)	2 (60)	3 (34)
not rewarded n	NA		82 (159)	76 (188)	70 (138)	84 (73)	75 (202)	77 (337)	66 (116)	75 (60)	82 (34)

TABLE 24B (continued)

CURRENT ORGANIZATION'S POLICIES
(percent yes)
MALES

	1992		1997				2002				
	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Native American</u>
Organization's Internal Promotions of Healthcare Managers											
Always filled within	2	5	7	6	10	8*	1	2	7	3	6***
Usually filled from within	25	32	27	38	41	31	30	34	34	31	56
About half the time filled from within	41	42	37	38	27	29	37	44	41	36	31
Usually filled from the outside	28	18	24	16	16	22	27	18	11	26	8
Do not know	4	3	5	2	6	10	5	3	6	3	0
n	100% (159)	100% (240)	100% (166)	100% (191)	100% (142)	100% (72)	100% (210)	100% (337)	100% (116)	100% (58)	100% (36)
Preference for filling senior management positions with internal candidates	--	--	--	--	--	--	35 (205)	42 (338)	43 (117)	32 (60)	45 (33)
n											
Formal succession planning	--	--	--	--	--	--	20 (202)	25 (338)	19 (116)	28 (60)	32 (34)
n											

* Chi-square significant p<.05

** Chi-square significant p<.01

*** Chi-square significant p<.001

TABLE 25A

PROFESSIONAL HOURS WORKED PER WEEK
FEMALES

	1992		1997				2002				
	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Native American</u>
At the office	46.3	46.9	46.5	48.9	47.8	44.5 ^{ae}	46.5	48.9	46.3	47.9	44.2 ^{adh}
n	(160)	(277)	(196)	(181)	(77)	(37)	(255)	(366)	(77)	(47)	(24)
Outside the office	4.6	5.0	5.6	4.3	4.8	6.1	5.0	3.7	4.2	2.6	5.3 ^{acj}
n	(160)	(273)	(196)	(181)	(77)	(37)	(255)	(366)	(77)	(47)	(24)
At home	5.9	5.4	6.7	5.0	6.2	7.1 ^a	5.6	5.5	5.2	4.4	3.9
n	(160)	(272)	(196)	(181)	(77)	(37)	(255)	(365)	(76)	(47)	(24)

^a t test is significantly different at p<.05 between Blacks and Whites

c “ “ “ “ Blacks and Asians

d “ “ “ “ Whites and Hispanics

e “ “ “ “ Whites and Asians

h “ “ “ “ Whites and Native Americans

j “ “ “ “ Asians and Native Americans

TABLE 25B

PROFESSIONAL HOURS WORKED PER WEEK
MALES

	1992		1997				2002				
	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Native American</u>
At the office	47.6	47.6	48.7	48.5	46.0	48.9 ^{bdf}	47.7	48.0	46.5	47.9	45.0
n	(163)	(241)	(162)	(194)	(141)	(73)	(210)	(341)	(118)	(60)	(35)
Outside the office	5.7	6.1	6.0	5.7	7.6	5.4 ^{df}	6.4	4.8	6.1	3.7	5.1 ^{acf}
n	(162)	(238)	(162)	(194)	(141)	(73)	(210)	(340)	(118)	(60)	(35)
At home	5.5	4.5 ^a	5.6	5.0	6.1	6.3	5.6	4.3	5.4	3.5	5.4 ^{acdej}
n	(162)	(236)	(162)	(194)	(141)	(72)	(209)	(340)	(118)	(60)	(35)

^a t test is significantly different at p<.05 between Blacks and Whites

^b “ “ “ “ Blacks and Hispanics

^c “ “ “ “ Blacks and Asians

^d “ “ “ “ Whites and Hispanics

^e “ “ “ “ Whites and Asians

^f “ “ “ “ Hispanics and Asians

^j “ “ “ “ Asians and Native Americans

* Chi-square significant p<.05

TABLE 26A

INVOLVEMENT IN RECRUITING
FEMALES
(percent yes)

	1992		1997				2002				
	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Native American</u>
Any involvement n	56	61	49	59	49	51	49 (256)	60 (366)	52 (77)	47 (47)	54 (24)
Physicians n	22 (161)	32* (280)	17 (198)	36 (180)	20 (75)	11*** (37)	15 (254)	28 (365)	23 (77)	15 (47)	38*** (24)
Nurses n	24 (161)	27 (280)	17 (198)	29 (180)	19 (75)	11* (37)	20 (254)	33 (365)	25 (77)	17 (47)	38** (24)
Auxiliary professionals n	30 (161)	32 (280)	26 (198)	37 (180)	27 (75)	24 (37)	28 (254)	35 (365)	27 (77)	32 (47)	38 (24)
Administrators n	22 (161)	25 (280)	26 (198)	39 (180)	23 (75)	27* (37)	27 (254)	41 (365)	27 (77)	26 (47)	25** (24)
Nonprofessional staff n	23 (161)	21 (280)	21 (198)	27 (180)	24 (75)	14 (37)	20 (254)	21 (365)	19 (77)	13 (47)	17 (24)
Other n	NA		5 (198)	3 (180)	7 (75)	8 (37)	5 (254)	4 (365)	5 (77)	4 (47)	0 (24)

* Chi-square significant p<.05

*** Chi-square significant p<.001

TABLE 26B

INVOLVEMENT IN RECRUITING
MALES
(percent yes)

	1992		1997				2002				
	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Native American</u>
Any involvement n	56	75***	56	64	71	53*	57 (209)	70 (339)	64 (118)	66 (59)	63* (35)
Physicians n	29 (165)	52*** (242)	29 (160)	42 (193)	42 (139)	28* (72)	26 (208)	48 (340)	33 (117)	31 (59)	34*** (35)
Nurses n	19 (165)	14 (242)	18 (160)	10 (193)	24 (139)	18** (72)	19 (208)	20 (340)	24 (117)	22 (59)	31 (35)
Auxiliary professionals n	25 (165)	31 (242)	31 (160)	28 (193)	43 (139)	21** (72)	32 (208)	36 (340)	37 (117)	42 (59)	54 (35)
Administrators n	41 (165)	43 (242)	36 (160)	49 (193)	43 (139)	42 (72)	34 (208)	58 (340)	45 (117)	41 (59)	49*** (35)
Nonprofessional staff n	24 (165)	18 (242)	21 (160)	14 (193)	27 (139)	15* (72)	19 (208)	19 (340)	26 (117)	29 (59)	26 (35)
Other n	NA		6 (160)	4 (193)	5 (139)	1 (72)	5 (208)	4 (340)	10 (117)	0 (59)	9* (35)

* Chi-square significant p<.05

** Chi-square significant p<.01

*** Chi-square significant p<.001

TABLE 27A

INTERRACIAL/ETHNIC SOCIALIZING WITH OTHER EXECUTIVES
AT LEAST MONTHLY
(percent affirming)
FEMALES

	1992		1997				2002				
	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Native American</u>
Informal lunches n	38 (160)	42 (274)	29 (196)	43 (174)	48 (73)	49** (35)	27 (255)	29 (354)	26 (76)	42 (45)	46 (24)
Dinners n	10 (158)	8 (273)	9 (192)	13 (173)	10 (72)	11 (35)	6 (254)	10 (350)	11 (76)	18 (45)	9 (23)
Socializing after work n	6 (160)	8 (272)	8 (195)	13 (174)	15 (75)	20 (35)	7 (254)	9 (352)	9 (75)	18 (45)	21 (24)
Attending cultural events n	2 (159)	3 (271)	5 (194)	7 (175)	6 (72)	6 (35)	7 (252)	6 (348)	3 (76)	4 (43)	8 (24)
Attending sporting events n	1 (158)	2 (272)	3 (193)	2 (175)	3 (71)	0 (35)	4 (255)	5 (350)	0 (76)	2 (43)	4 (25)
Participating in sports n	1 (158)	4 (275)	3 (193)	5 (173)	1 (71)	9 (35)	2 (254)	3 (349)	3 (76)	5 (43)	4 (25)

** Chi-square significant $p < .01$

TABLE 27B

INTERRACIAL/ETHNIC SOCIALIZING WITH OTHER EXECUTIVES
AT LEAST MONTHLY
(percent affirming)
MALES

	1992		1997				2002				
	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Native American</u>
Informal lunches n	39 (155)	46 (240)	42 (160)	46 (193)	46 (138)	44 (73)	37 (204)	38 (328)	44 (116)	41 (59)	35 (34)
Dinners n	13 (153)	11 (236)	8 (160)	14 (190)	20 (138)	14* (72)	11 (202)	11 (328)	15 (112)	10 (58)	3 (34)
Socializing after work n	10 (149)	11 (236)	11 (159)	14 (191)	20 (138)	18 (71)	10 (203)	12 (328)	17 (115)	24 (59)	12* (34)
Attending cultural events n	3 (151)	4 (234)	4 (160)	5 (189)	12 (137)	4* (71)	8 (202)	6 (331)	8 (112)	7 (59)	15 (34)
Attending sporting events n	3 (151)	8 (238)	5 (160)	5 (191)	8 (137)	6 (71)	4 (201)	5 (330)	6 (111)	7 (59)	21** (34)
Participating in sports n	2 (152)	13*** (239)	9 (160)	6 (191)	8 (138)	16 (73)	8 (203)	7 (330)	8 (112)	14 (59)	18 (34)

* Chi-square significant p<.05

*** Chi-square significant p<.001

TABLE 28A

FAIRNESS OF CURRENT ORGANIZATION
(percent who think feature is fair or very fair)
FEMALES

	1992		1997				2002				
	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Native American</u>
Executive employment contract	77	88	68	74	78	87	69	89	89	62	82 ^{***}
n	(57)	(67)	(62)	(61)	(37)	(15)	(98)	(152)	(36)	(13)	(11)
Length of severance pay	66	71	66	81	74	62	69	75	79	67	89
n	(59)	(77)	(80)	(88)	(35)	(13)	(114)	(190)	(33)	(18)	(9)
Salary	60	76 ^{***}	59	74	65	70 ^{**}	62	82	76	76	81 ^{***}
n	(155)	(270)	(198)	(189)	(77)	(37)	(250)	(368)	(75)	(45)	(27)
Paid professional membership dues	79	87*	72	90	69	80 ^{***}	78	82	71	73	56
n	(137)	(243)	(173)	(175)	(61)	(35)	(219)	(343)	(62)	(37)	(16)
Continuing education tuition /support	83	86	77	84	78	94 [*]	82	88	68	72	80 ^{***}
n	(140)	(262)	(186)	(182)	(67)	(36)	(237)	(357)	(72)	(43)	(25)
Promotions	59	75 ^{**}	56	75	64	76 ^{***}	59	81	78	71	77 ^{***}
n	(121)	(225)	(162)	(168)	(70)	(33)	(212)	(313)	(68)	(38)	(26)
Recognition	64	80 ^{***}	63	72	62	73	66	82	74	72	81 ^{***}
n	(153)	(267)	(192)	(189)	(78)	(37)	(241)	(364)	(72)	(46)	(27)
Physical facilities	82	87	85	87	75	85	85	91	77	78	73 ^{**}
n	(139)	(261)	(193)	(188)	(72)	(34)	(237)	(360)	(69)	(46)	(26)

*

Chi-square significant p<.01

**

Chi-square significant p<.01

Chi-square significant p<.001

TABLE 28B

FAIRNESS OF CURRENT ORGANIZATION
MALES
(percent who think feature is fair or very fair)

	1992		1997				2002				
	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Native American</u>
Executive employment contract	77	84	78	90	86	73	81	89	90	72	92
n	(57)	(102)	(68)	(89)	(77)	(26)	(93)	(171)	(49)	(25)	(13)
Length of severance pay	71	80	81	83	77	81	75	79	69	71	71
n	(62)	(118)	(85)	(113)	(86)	(32)	(107)	(208)	(62)	(31)	(14)
Salary	71	83**	70	80	78	79	70	84	83	85	74**
n	(154)	(235)	(155)	(193)	(134)	(67)	(207)	(332)	(116)	(59)	(35)
Paid professional membership dues	78	89*	77	87	68	82**	76	88	76	67	59***
n	(135)	(210)	(138)	(176)	(114)	(55)	(187)	(307)	(101)	(46)	(29)
Continuing education tuition /support	82	92**	84	93	80	89**	83	93	83	81	70***
n	(143)	(218)	(155)	(183)	(127)	(65)	(205)	(323)	(113)	(53)	(33)
Promotions	60	85***	65	89	69	70***	71	88	73	82	68***
n	(121)	(179)	(139)	(168)	(121)	(61)	(172)	(266)	(99)	(57)	(31)
Recognition	69	82**	72	86	77	72**	71	88	78	78	68***
n	(148)	(233)	(161)	(190)	(137)	(67)	(207)	(334)	(116)	(59)	(34)
Physical facilities	86	90	86	92	90	86	87	90	85	86	83
n	(141)	(223)	(159)	(188)	(135)	(66)	(196)	(328)	(113)	(56)	(35)

* Chi-square significant p<.05

** Chi-square significant p<.01

*** Chi-square significant p<.001

TABLE 29A

OPINIONS ON RACIAL/ETHNICITY ISSUES IN CURRENT ORGANIZATION
(percent agreeing or strongly agreeing)
FEMALES

	1992		1997				2002				
	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Native American</u>
Minority managers usually have to be more qualified than others to get ahead in my organization n	74 (163)	13*** (272)	75 (202)	11 (188)	49 (80)	22*** (36)	75 (252)	6 (342)	47 (72)	29 (48)	30*** (27)
Race relations within my organization are good n	36 (163)	72*** (277)	24 (203)	62 (188)	54 (80)	68*** (37)	41 (255)	79 (359)	55 (77)	60 (48)	70*** (27)

*** Chi-square significant p<.001

TABLE 29B

OPINIONS ON RACIAL/ETHNICITY ISSUES IN CURRENT ORGANIZATION
(percent agreeing or strongly agreeing)
MALES

	1992		1997				2002				
	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Native American</u>
Minority managers usually have to be more qualified than others to get ahead in my organization n	64 (160)	6*** (237)	67 (165)	5 (194)	31 (140)	36*** (74)	66 (212)	3 (323)	35 (120)	33 (60)	20*** (35)
Race relations within my organization are good n	52 (161)	87*** (214)	45 (168)	81 (196)	70 (140)	62*** (74)	53 (212)	90 (337)	73 (122)	70 (61)	80*** (35)

*** Chi-square significant $p < .001$

TABLE 30A

WORK ENVIRONMENT FIVE YEAR REVIEW
(percent affirming)
FEMALES

	1997				2002				
	Black	White	Hispanic	Asian	Black	White	Hispanic	Asian	Native American
In the past 5 years I have:									
Failed to be <u>hired</u> because of race/ethnicity	43	5	10	24 ^{***}	32	2	13	19	12 ^{***}
n	(195)	(190)	(81)	(37)	(270)	(373)	(77)	(48)	(26)
Failed to be promoted because of race/ethnicity	44	4	21	22 ^{***}	45	3	26	21	8 ^{***}
n	(200)	(190)	(81)	(36)	(267)	(373)	(77)	(48)	(26)
Failed to receive fair compensation because of race/ethnicity	53	5	19	22 ^{***}	49	4	29	23	12 ^{***}
n	(200)	(188)	(79)	(37)	(265)	(372)	(77)	(47)	(26)
Were evaluated with standards believed to be inappropriate	49	17	23	17 ^{***}	33	11	22	20	25 ^{***}
n	(197)	(189)	(81)	(36)	(254)	(357)	(72)	(45)	(24)
Were discriminated against in career advancement because of having an accent or speaking in a dialect	4	2	10	14 ^{***}	4	1	14	13	0 ^{***}
n	(193)	(188)	(80)	(37)	(271)	(372)	(77)	(47)	(26)
Received preferential treatment because of race/ethnicity:									
in hiring	11	1	9	16 ^{***}	15	1	6	19	38 ^{***}
n	(200)	(191)	(81)	(37)	(269)	(372)	(77)	(48)	(26)
in promotion	6	0	7	5 ^{**}	7	1	4	10	28 ^{***}
n	(200)	(191)	(81)	(37)	(268)	(372)	(77)	(48)	(25)
in compensation	4	0	2	5 [*]	3	1	1	10	12 ^{***}
n	(201)	(191)	(81)	(37)	(268)	(370)	(77)	(48)	(25)

* Chi-square significant p<.05

** Chi-square significant p<.01

*** Chi-square significant p<.001

TABLE 30B

WORK ENVIRONMENT FIVE YEAR REVIEW
(percent affirming)
MALES

	1997				2002				
	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Native American</u>
In the past 5 years I have:									
Failed to be hired because of race/ethnicity n	44 (165)	6 (196)	16 (139)	26*** (74)	33 (217)	5 (358)	21 (125)	29 (65)	19*** (37)
Failed to be promoted because of race/ethnicity n	39 (162)	4 (196)	22 (137)	28*** (74)	33 (218)	3 (357)	28 (125)	34 (65)	8*** (36)
Failed to receive fair compensation because of race/ethnicity n	37 (166)	2 (196)	18 (137)	22*** (74)	35 (217)	1 (355)	23 (124)	17 (65)	11*** (36)
Were evaluated with standards believed to be inappropriate n	42 (164)	9 (196)	21 (137)	26**** (72)	28 (211)	7 (340)	18 (120)	15 (59)	15*** (33)
Were discriminated against in career advancement because of having an accent or speaking in a dialect n	7 (161)	1 (191)	10 (136)	21*** (73)	5 (221)	1 (356)	11 (123)	9 (64)	3*** (36)
Received preferential treatment because of race/ethnicity:									
in hiring n	19 (165)	2 (195)	12 (138)	8*** (74)	9 (218)	1 (355)	7 (123)	9 (64)	46*** (35)
in promotion n	9 (164)	1 (195)	7 (137)	3*** (72)	2 (218)	0 (355)	2 (124)	9 (65)	20*** (35)
in compensation n	4 (165)	1 (195)	2 (137)	3 (72)	3 (216)	1 (354)	2 (124)	8 (65)	3** (35)

*** Chi-square significant p<.001

TABLE 31A

INTENT TO LEAVE CURRENT EMPLOYER IN NEXT YEAR
FEMALES

	1992		1997				2002				
	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Native American</u>
Definitely will	10%	8**	14%	3%	9%	13%**	8%	4%	3%	13%	11%***
Good chance	21	10	16	13	10	18	19	9	16	20	7
Situation is uncertain	23	19	27	25	26	21	23	19	14	22	15
Very slight	31	36	21	37	26	24	25	32	36	28	48
Definitely will not leave	<u>15</u> 100%	<u>27</u> 100%	<u>22</u> 100%	<u>21</u> 100% ¹	<u>30</u> 100% ¹	<u>24</u> 100%	<u>25</u> 100%	<u>36</u> 100%	<u>31</u> 100%	<u>17</u> 100%	<u>19</u> 100%
n	(159)	(277)	(201)	(187)	(81)	(38)	(259)	(367)	(77)	(46)	(27)

** Chi-square significant p<.01

¹Percentage may not total to 100 due to rounding.

TABLE 31B

INTENT TO LEAVE CURRENT EMPLOYER IN NEXT YEAR
MALES

	1992		1997				2002				
	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Native American</u>
Definitely will	5%	5%	5%	6%	7%	10%*	9%	5%	6%	5%	6%
Good chance	12	9	16	10	15	7	14	8	16	8	9
Situation is uncertain	25	19	29	20	18	23	20	12	22	21	37
Very slight	37	35	34	37	27	31	31	38	32	39	17
Definitely will not leave	<u>21</u> 100%	<u>32</u> 100%	<u>16</u> 100%	<u>27</u> 100%	<u>34</u> 100% ¹	<u>29</u> 100%	<u>26</u> 100%	<u>37</u> 100%	<u>25</u> 100%	<u>26</u> 100%	<u>31</u> 100%
n	(163)	(241)	(164)	(196)	(143)	(73)	(212)	(337)	(120)	(61)	(35)

* Chi-square significant p<.05

¹Percentage may not total to 100 due to rounding.

TABLE 32A

CERTAINTY OF CAREER PLANS
FEMALES

	1992		1997				2002				
	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Native American</u>
Overall do you have a career plan in place											
Yes, definitely	--	--	--	--	--	--	45	43	44	27	27
More or less	--	--	--	--	--	--	43	47	42	56	54
No, plans are pretty indefinite	--	--	--	--	--	--	<u>12</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>19</u>
	--	--	--	--	--	--	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
n	--	--	--	--	--	--	(273)	(375)	(77)	(48)	(26)

TABLE 32B

CERTAINTY OF CAREER PLANS
MALES

	1992		1997				2002				
	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Native American</u>
Overall do you have a career plan in place											
Yes, definitely	--	--	--	--	--	--	53	49	50	49	61
More or less	--	--	--	--	--	--	36	42	41	34	36
No, plans are pretty indefinite	--	--	--	--	--	--	$\frac{11}{100\%}$	$\frac{9}{100\%}$	$\frac{9}{100\%}$	$\frac{17}{100\%}$	$\frac{3}{100\%}$
n	--	--	--	--	--	--	(219)	(351)	(124)	(65)	(36)

TABLE 33A

PREFERRED SETTING FOR FUTURE EMPLOYMENT IN 5 YEARS
FEMALES
(percent affirming)

	1992		1997				2002				
	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Native American</u>
Hospital	45	70 ^{***}	45	58	51	41	50	62	63	80	54 ^{***}
Other provider	22	9	28	20	29	36	21	10	23	9	27
Consulting	13	9	8	8	4	8	4	6	4	4	0
Other (public health agency, association, supplier, nonhealthcare)	17	7	16	12	13	13	22	15	10	7	15
Retirement	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>4</u>
	100%	100% ¹	100%	100% ¹	100%	100% ¹	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
n	(151)	(272)	(193)	(181)	(76)	(39)	(260)	(364)	(72)	(46)	(26)

*** Chi-square significant p<.001

¹Percentage may not total to 100 due to rounding.

TABLE 33B

PREFERRED SETTING FOR FUTURE EMPLOYMENT IN 5 YEARS
 MALES
 (percent affirming)

	1992		1997				2002				
	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Native American</u>
Hospital	51	75 ^{***}	50	65	57	51	57	71	67	65	68 ^{**}
Other provider	17	6	21	14	25	25	12	7	17	13	12
Consulting	12	5	8	9	6	7	9	5	6	8	6
Other (public health agency, association, supplier, nonhealthcare)	13	8	17	10	9	15	17	10	8	14	12
Retirement	<u>6</u> 100% ¹	<u>6</u> 100%	<u>4</u> 100%	<u>2</u> 100%	<u>4</u> 100% ¹	<u>1</u> 100% ¹	<u>6</u> 100%	<u>8</u> 100%	<u>2</u> 100%	<u>0</u> 100%	<u>3</u> 100%
n	(146)	(236)	(167)	(197)	(140)	(72)	(210)	(345)	(122)	(63)	(34)

*** Chi-square significant p<.001

¹Percentage may not total to 100 due to rounding.

TABLE 34A

CAREER ASPIRATIONS TO BE A CEO
FEMALES
(percent affirming)

		1992		1997				2002				
		<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Native American</u>
In 5 years	n	13 (150)	16 (273)	12 (190)	15 (178)	10 (72)	17 (36)	14 (257)	17 (364)	16 (74)	13 (46)	15 (26)
In 10 years	n	25 (145)	21 (265)	14 (183)	19 (178)	19 (67)	13 (38)	16 (241)	17 (349)	11 (72)	9 (46)	8 (24)
In 15 years	n	28 (133)	25 (258)	17 (186)	14 (170)	20 (65)	14 (35)	15 (227)	14 (338)	13 (69)	13 (45)	14 (22)

TABLE 34B

CAREER ASPIRATIONS TO BE A CEO
(percent affirming)
MALES

		1992		1997				2002				
		<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Native American</u>
In 5 years		39	48	28	26	24	22	26	45	32	23	30***
	n	(149)	(232)	(166)	(193)	(140)	(73)	(211)	(344)	(121)	(65)	(33)
In 10 years		40	52	31	29	31	20	27	44	34	25	32***
	n	(136)	(227)	(156)	(193)	(133)	(71)	(207)	(328)	(119)	(63)	(34)
In 15 years		43	45	30	32	32	27	27	33	36	37	16
	n	(135)	(221)	(152)	(182)	(131)	(67)	(189)	(312)	(117)	(59)	(32)

*** Chi-square significant $p < .001$

TABLE 35A

RANKING OF RESOURCES THAT WOULD BE CALLED UPON IF JOB CHANGE WAS PLANNED
FEMALES

CHOICES ⁺	PERCENT RANKING EACH SOURCE AS "1"					PERCENT RANKING TOP 3				
	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Native American</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Native American</u>
Personal network	51	60	58	56	50	82	85	78	87	85
Professional Society	9	6	12	2	5	53	38	48	24	25 ^{***}
Electronic job listing (e.g., ACHE's Job Bank)	9	9	12	18	10	46	37	56	50	
Local healthcare executive group or women's healthcare executive network	2	1	4	4	5	11	21	24	16	25 [*]
Undergraduate or graduate program in healthcare management	2	0	1	0	10 ^{**}	8	7	9	20	20 [*]
Executive search firm	17	18	6	13	5	54	56	52	44	15 ^{**}
State or metro hospital association	0	1	0	0	5	4	7	0	4	10
Other healthcare association	1	1	0	0	0	6	8	13	4	15
Published advertisement	<u>9</u> 100%	<u>3</u> 100%	<u>6</u> 100%	<u>7</u> 100%	<u>10</u> [*] 100%	30	24	27	36	35
n	(253)	(355)	(67)	(45)	(20)	(253)	(355)	(67)	(45)	(20)

⁺Totals will not add to 100 since top three choices were included

^{*}Chi-square significant p<.05

^{**}Chi-square significant p<.01

^{***}Chi-square significant p<.001

TABLE 35B

RANKING OF RESOURCES THAT WOULD BE CALLED UPON
IF JOB CHANGE WAS PLANNED
MALES

	PERCENT RANKING EACH SOURCE AS "1"					PERCENT RANKING TOP 3 CHOICES ⁺				
	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Native American</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Native American</u>
Personal network	62	66	63	55	53	85	87	83	83	81
Professional Society	12	7	8	6	17	61	46	47	33	31 ^{***}
Electronic job listing (e.g., ACHE's Job Bank)	5	6	8	16	14 [*]	32	38	38	59	44 ^{**}
Local healthcare executive group or women's healthcare executive network	0	0	2	0	0 [*]	10	8	13	13	14
Undergraduate or graduate program in healthcare management	0	1	0	2	0	5	8	4	8	17
Executive search firm	16	17	17	9	3	64	67	65	47	28 ^{***}
State or metro hospital association	0	1	1	0	3	3	16	8	9	11 ^{***}
Other healthcare association	1	0	1	3	3	8	5	8	8	19 [*]
Published advertisements	<u>3</u> 100%	<u>2</u> 100%	<u>1</u> 100%	<u>9</u> 100%	<u>8</u> 100%	20	20	27	31	22

⁺Totals will not add to 100 since top three choices were included

^{*} Chi-square significant p<.05

^{**} Chi-square significant p<.01

^{***} Chi-square significant p<.001

TABLE 36A

ATTITUDES CONCERNING RACIAL INTERACTIONS
IN HEALTHCARE MANAGEMENT
FEMALES
(percent)

		1992		1997				2002					
		<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Native American</u>	
<u>Support</u>													
Minority managers generally receive more support from the employees they supervise than do white managers.	n	Agree	7	2**	10	4	15	5*	10	4	14	2	33***
		Neutral	34	48	36	48	38	46	32	42	46	51	48
		Disagree	<u>59</u>	<u>50</u>	<u>54</u>	<u>48</u>	<u>47</u>	<u>49</u>	<u>58</u>	<u>54</u>	<u>40</u>	<u>47</u>	<u>19</u>
			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
		(162)	(273)	(203)	(188)	(81)	(37)	(268)	(368)	(77)	(49)	(27)	
Minority managers generally receive more support from their supervisors than do white managers.	n	Agree	3	6***	6	9	1	0***	5	8	6	10	4***
		Neutral	14	40	11	30	22	38	15	32	23	23	48
		Disagree	<u>83</u>	<u>54</u>	<u>83</u>	<u>61</u>	<u>77</u>	<u>62</u>	<u>80</u>	<u>60</u>	<u>71</u>	<u>67</u>	<u>48</u>
			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
		(163)	(273)	(200)	(188)	(81)	(37)	(267)	(375)	(79)	(49)	(27)	
The evaluation of both Whites and minorities are equally thorough and carefully evaluated.	n	Agree	11	61***	14	58	43	46***	18	69	33	51	44***
		Neutral	23	32	25	31	31	32	22	24	36	22	22
		Disagree	<u>66</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>61</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>26</u>	<u>22</u>	<u>60</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>31</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>33</u>
			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
		(163)	(273)	(202)	(188)	(80)	(37)	(268)	(373)	(78)	(49)	(27)	
White managers share vital growth and career related information with minority managers.	n	Agree	7	47***	8	41	20	38***	10	57	18	29	30***
		Neutral	28	44	18	47	44	43	28	36	42	43	44
		Disagree	<u>65</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>73</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>36</u>	<u>19</u>	<u>62</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>40</u>	<u>29</u>	<u>26</u>
			100%	100%	100% ¹	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
		(162)	(272)	(203)	(188)	(81)	(37)	(267)	(371)	(76)	(49)	(27)	

TABLE 36A (continued)

ATTITUDES CONCERNING RACIAL INTERACTIONS
IN HEALTHCARE MANAGEMENT
FEMALES
(percent)

		1992		1997				2002				
		<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Native American</u>
The quality of relationships between minority and white managers could be improved.	Agree	92	40***	84	43	63	57***	85	28	58	53	59***
	Neutral	7	41	12	38	26	22	10	43	33	27	22
	Disagree	1	19	3	20	11	22	5	29	9	20	19
		100%	100%	100% ¹	100% ¹	100%	100% ¹	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
		(163)	(273)	(203)	(188)	(81)	(37)	(268)	(372)	(79)	(49)	(27)
The quality of relationships between minorities from different racial/ethnic groups could be improved.	Agree	NA	NA	87	53	66	78***	87	48	71	68	65***
	Neutral			11	35	26	5	10	34	23	15	23
	Disagree			2	12	8	16	2	19	6	17	12
				100%	100%	100%	100% ¹	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
				(203)	(187)	(80)	(37)	(270)	(372)	(79)	(47)	(26)
In the healthcare industry White managers have greater opportunities to advance than minority managers.	Agree	95	42***	93	34	68	51***	89	31	70	59	58
	Neutral	2	24	4	23	16	19	6	24	15	24	19
	Disagree	2	34	3	43	16	30	5	45	15	16	23
		100% ¹	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
		(163)	(274)	(203)	(188)	(81)	(37)	(269)	(376)	(79)	(49)	(26)

TABLE 36A (continued)

ATTITUDES CONCERNING RACIAL INTERACTIONS
IN HEALTHCARE MANAGEMENT
FEMALES
(percent)

		1992		1997				2002				
		<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Native American</u>
There are limited opportunities for minority managers to advance in their careers.	Agree	73	16***	70	14	42	30***	63	11	43	35	26***
	Neutral	14	23	12	22	23	13	14	20	15	12	19
	Disagree	13	61	18	64	35	57	23	69	42	53	55
		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
		(163)	(272)	(202)	(187)	(81)	(37)	(269)	(374)	(79)	(49)	(27)
Minority managers are more often role models in their communities than are White managers.	Agree	65	37***	56	37	60	43***	57	35	65	45	56***
	Neutral	28	36	34	35	20	38	31	33	24	30	19
	Disagree	7	28	10	27	20	19	13	33	11	26	26
		100%	100% ¹	100%	100% ¹	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
		(162)	(272)	(202)	(186)	(81)	(37)	(268)	(371)	(79)	(47)	(27)
Would recommend a career in healthcare management to a young person.	Yes	86%	88%	88%	85%	91%	89%	90%	93%	91%	90%	93%
		(161)	(281)	(203)	(192)	(82)	(38)	(273)	(381)	(79)	(46)	(27)

*Chi-square significant p<.05

**Chi-square significant p<.01

***Chi-square significant p<.001

¹Percentage may not total to 100 due to rounding.

TABLE 36B

ATTITUDES CONCERNING RACIAL INTERACTIONS
IN HEALTHCARE MANAGEMENT
MALES
(percent)

		1992		1997				2002					
		<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Native American</u>	
<u>Support</u>													
Minority managers generally receive more support from the employees they supervise than do white managers.	n	Agree	12	2 ^{***}	11	4	10	4	11	4	12	2	3 ^{**}
		Neutral	37	42	40	49	40	47	37	37	41	44	50
		Disagree	<u>51</u>	<u>56</u>	<u>49</u>	<u>47</u>	<u>50</u>	<u>49</u>	<u>52</u>	<u>59</u>	<u>47</u>	<u>54</u>	<u>47</u>
		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	
		(163)	(237)	(167)	(195)	(138)	(73)	(218)	(349)	(121)	(63)	(36)	
Minority managers generally receive more support from their supervisors than do whites managers.	n	Agree	4	6 ^{***}	6	8	5	4 ^{***}	5	11	8	5	8 ^{**}
		Neutral	14	44	20	45	27	27	17	30	25	33	33
		Disagree	<u>82</u>	<u>50</u>	<u>74</u>	<u>47</u>	<u>68</u>	<u>69</u>	<u>78</u>	<u>59</u>	<u>67</u>	<u>63</u>	<u>58</u>
		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	
		(163)	(240)	(168)	(196)	(139)	(74)	(216)	(351)	(123)	(64)	(36)	
The evaluation of both Whites and minorities are equally thorough and carefully evaluated.	n	Agree	16	69 ^{***}	22	68	45	48 ^{***}	22	75	43	50	42 ^{***}
		Neutral	20	25	30	23	34	36	31	17	31	33	33
		Disagree	<u>64</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>48</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>21</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>47</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>25</u>
		100%	100%	100%	100% ¹	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	
		(163)	(240)	(168)	(195)	(139)	(73)	(217)	(351)	(122)	(64)	(36)	
White managers share vital growth and career related information with minority managers.	n	Agree	10	50 ^{***}	15	52	32	36 ^{***}	12	55	30	37	28 ^{***}
		Neutral	18	43	30	42	37	38	34	40	38	33	46
		Disagree	<u>72</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>55</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>32</u>	<u>26</u>	<u>54</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>32</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>26</u>
		100%	100% ¹	100%	100%	100% ¹	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	
		(163)	(240)	(168)	(194)	(139)	(73)	(217)	(346)	(120)	(63)	(35)	

TABLE 36B (continued)

ATTITUDES CONCERNING RACIAL INTERACTIONS
IN HEALTHCARE MANAGEMENT
MALES
(percent)

		1992		1997				2002					
		<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Native American</u>	
The quality of relationships between minority and white managers could be improved.	n	Agree	92	39***	89	46	71	66***	85	40	67	58	66***
		Neutral	7	47	9	38	20	26	12	39	22	27	23
		Disagree	<u>1</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>21</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>11</u>
		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	
		(162)	(239)	(168)	(195)	(139)	(73)	(217)	(350)	(124)	(64)	(35)	
The quality of relationships between minorities from different racial/ethnic groups could be improved.	n	Agree	NA	NA	88	55	77	69***	89	56	70	63	67***
		Neutral			8	33	18	27	8	31	20	23	31
		Disagree			<u>4</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>3</u>
		100%	100% ¹	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	
		(168)	(195)	(138)	(74)	(219)	(350)	(122)	(64)	(36)			
In the healthcare industry White managers have greater opportunities to advance than minority managers.	n	Agree	96	44***	90	30	61	69***	90	31	59	63	56***
		Neutral	1	22	8	26	16	16	5	22	24	14	19
		Disagree	<u>2</u>	<u>34</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>44</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>48</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>25</u>
		100% ¹	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	
		(162)	(240)	(168)	(194)	(138)	(74)	(218)	(355)	(123)	(64)	(36)	

TABLE 36B (continued)

ATTITUDES CONCERNING RACIAL INTERACTIONS
IN HEALTHCARE MANAGEMENT
MALES
(percent)

		1992		1997				2002				
		<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Native American</u>
There are limited opportunities for minority managers to advance in their careers.	Agree	75	22***	64	9	39	44***	68	9	50	33	39***
	Neutral	9	21	13	25	19	22	13	16	22	22	19
	Disagree	16	58	23	66	42	34	19	74	28	45	42
	n	100% (161)	100% ¹ (240)	100% (168)	100% (195)	100% (139)	100% (74)	100% (218)	100% (355)	100% (122)	100% (64)	100% (36)
Minority managers are more often role models in their communities than are White managers.	Agree	66	30***	59	26	54	39***	65	28	53	44	33***
	Neutral	24	38	29	36	22	39	24	30	30	35	42
	Disagree	10	32	12	38	24	22	11	42	17	21	25
	n	100% (163)	100% (239)	100% (167)	100% (196)	100% (139)	100% (74)	100% (217)	100% (349)	100% (122)	100% (63)	100% (36)
Would recommend a career in healthcare management to a young person.	Yes	88%	82%	93%	88%	93%	85%	94%	88%	94%	91%	94%
	n	(165)	(242)	(174)	(198)	(147)	(75)	(222)	(356)	(125)	(65)	(36)

*** Chi-square significant $p < .001$

¹Percentage may not total to 100 due to rounding.

TABLE 37A

THE ROLES OF MANAGERS AND GOVERNMENT IN
RACE/ETHNIC RELATIONS
FEMALES
(percent favoring)

		1992		1997				2002				
		<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Native American</u>
Management should not be asked to influence the attitudes of its employees concerning racial relations.	Agree	14	21**	16	22	21	23	15	15	26	24	37**
	Neutral	7	14	10	13	9	15	11	13	22	10	11
	Disagree	80	66	74	65	70	62	75	72	53	65	52
	n	100% ¹ (161)	100% ¹ (277)	100% (195)	100% (189)	100% (80)	100% (39)	100% (271)	100% (380)	100% (78)	100% (49)	100% (27)
Management's responsibility should extend to taking public positions on equal employment opportunities. ²	Agree	80	71	82	59	78	62***	74	64	72	69	70
	Neutral	11	17	10	19	15	21	16	23	16	20	15
	Disagree	9	12	8	23	8	18	10	14	11	10	15
	n	100% (162)	100% (276)	100% (194)	100% ¹ (189)	100% ¹ (80)	100% ¹ (39)	100% (270)	100% (381)	100% (79)	100% (49)	100% (27)
White executives expose themselves to risks when they promote diversity initiatives in their organization.	Agree	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	28	7	16	6	15
	Neutral							12	14	22	24	42
	Disagree							60	79	62	69	42
	n							100% (270)	100% (381)	100% (79)	100% (49)	100% (26)
Building a diverse management team will enhance the morale of minority staff in healthcare organizations.	Agree	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	94	79	94	94	77***
	Neutral							4	17	5	6	19
	Disagree							2	4	1	0	4
	n							100% (272)	100% (382)	100% (79)	100% (49)	100% (26)

TABLE 37A (continued)

THE ROLES OF MANAGERS AND GOVERNMENT IN
RACE/ETHNIC RELATIONS
FEMALES
(percent favoring)

		1992		1997				2002				
		<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Native American</u>
In general, an effort should be made to increase the percentage of race/ethnic minorities in senior healthcare management positions.	Agree	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	97	54	91	80	85***
	Neutral							1	31	8	12	12
	Disagree							1	14	1	8	4
	n							100% (272)	100% (382)	100% (79)	100% (49)	100% (26)
Government involvement is needed to create incentives for the healthcare industry to engage in equal employment practices.	Agree	70	17***	70	11	55	33***	58	13	58	39	56***
	Neutral	20	20	18	20	18	21	26	23	13	26	19
	Disagree	10	63	11	69	28	46	16	64	29	35	26
	n	100% (162)	100% (276)	100% ¹ (195)	100% (188)	100% ¹ (80)	100% (39)	100% (272)	100% (381)	100% (79)	100% (49)	100% (27)
Increased financial support (government and private) should be available for minority students who want to be healthcare managers.	Agree	89	30***	82	26	68	38***	82	28	73	39	76***
	Neutral	9	31	16	29	18	26	14	31	18	31	12
	Disagree	2	39	3	46	15	36	4	41	9	31	12
	n	100% (162)	100% (275)	100% ¹ (196)	100% ¹ (189)	100% ¹ (80)	100% (39)	100% (272)	100% (382)	100% (79)	100% (49)	100% (26)

** Chi-square significant $p < .01$ *** Chi-square significant $p < .001$ ¹Percentage may not total to 100 due to rounding.²Note: The 1992 and 1997 versions of this question was similarly stated but included the following additional phase: Management's responsibility should extend to public positions on equal employment opportunities and affirmative action.

TABLE 37B

THE ROLES OF MANAGERS AND GOVERNMENT IN
RACE/ETHNIC RELATIONS
MALES
(percent favoring)

		1992		1997				2002				
		<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Native American</u>
Management should not be asked to influence the attitudes of its employees concerning racial relations.	Agree	10	15	10	18	20	23*	10	15	24	25	25***
	Neutral	7	11	6	10	11	12	8	13	14	15	6
	Disagree	83	74	83	72	69	65	82	72	62	60	69
	n	100% (163)	100% (242)	100% ¹ (172)	100% (194)	100% (146)	100% (73)	100% (221)	100% (354)	100% (125)	100% (65)	100% (36)
Management's responsibility should extend to taking public positions on equal employment opportunities. ²	Agree	85	73*	79	57	79	75***	79	64	70	71	58*
	Neutral	9	11	12	22	11	16	14	21	18	18	31
	Disagree	7	16	9	21	10	8	7	15	11	11	11
	n	100% (164)	100% (242)	100% (171)	100% (193)	100% (146)	100% ¹ (73)	100% (221)	100% (355)	100% (125)	100% (65)	100% (36)
White executives expose themselves to risks when they promote diversity initiatives in their organization.	Agree	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	37	13	22	20	17***
	Neutral							10	17	19	20	25
	Disagree							53	71	58	60	58
	n							100% (221)	100% (356)	100% (125)	100% (65)	100% (36)
Building a diverse management team will enhance the morale of minority staff in healthcare organizations.	Agree	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	95	81	86	80	86***
	Neutral							4	13	9	15	11
	Disagree							1	6	6	5	3
	n							100% (221)	100% (356)	100% (125)	100% (65)	100% (36)

TABLE 37B (continued)

THE ROLES OF MANAGERS AND GOVERNMENT IN
RACE/ETHNIC RELATIONS
MALES
(percent favoring)

		1992		1997				2002				
		Black	White	Black	White	Hispanic	Asian	Black	White	Hispanic	Asian	Native American
In general, an effort should be made to increase the percentage of race/ethnic minorities in senior healthcare management positions.	Agree	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	97	52	82	65	94***
	Neutral							2	32	12	26	3
	Disagree							<u>1</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>3</u>
	n							100% (221)	100% (355)	100% (125)	100% (65)	100% (36)
Government involvement is needed to create incentive for the healthcare industry to engage in equal employment practices.	Agree	71	14***	65	11	52	41***	62	9	48	40	39***
	Neutral	14	19	22	18	23	25	20	19	26	31	31
	Disagree	<u>16</u>	<u>67</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>71</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>34</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>72</u>	<u>26</u>	<u>29</u>	<u>31</u>
	n	100% ¹ (163)	100% (242)	100% (171)	100% (194)	100% (147)	100% (73)	100% (221)	100% (355)	100% (124)	100% (65)	100% (36)
Increased financial support (government and private) should be available for minority students who want to be healthcare managers.	Agree	90	30***	78	24	71	48***	82	32	71	54	72***
	Neutral	8	28	14	34	17	30	14	24	19	29	19
	Disagree	<u>2</u>	<u>42</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>42</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>22</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>44</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>8</u>
	n	100% (164)	100% (241)	100% (172)	100% (194)	100% (147)	100% (73)	100% (221)	100% (356)	100% (125)	100% (65)	100% (36)

** Chi-square significant $p < .01$

*** Chi-square significant $p < .001$

¹ Percentage may not total to 100 due to rounding.

² Note: The 1992 and 1997 versions of this question was similarly stated but included the following additional phase: Management's responsibility should extend to public positions on equal employment opportunities and affirmative action

TABLE 38

BEST PRACTICES PROMOTING DIVERSITY
IN HEALTHCARE MANAGEMENT

Response	Number that Responded
Diversity, Planning and Training Programs	130
An organization's commitment to Diversity	77
Mentoring programs	68
Organizations/Associations (such as IFD, NAHSE, ACHE, etc.)	64
Minority Fellowships, Internships, and Scholarships	52
Promoting and recognizing the value of the individual	44
Board, CEO, Management awareness of diversity issues	40
"None that I can think of"	41
Education	36
Placing minorities in healthcare executive positions	36
Networking	36
Diverse staff should be present	31
Government	16
Other	44
Total	<u>715</u>

TABLE 39A

OPINIONS CONCERNING INEQUITIES
IN HEALTHCARE MANAGEMENT
FEMALES

	1997				2002				
	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Native American</u>
Are there inequities?									
Yes	97	66	78	88 ^{***}	95	60	89	83	83 ^{***}
No	1	18	8	6	0	30	11	8	0
Ambiguous	<u>2</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>17</u>
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
	ⁿ (123)	(79)	(49)	(16)	(97)	(94)	(27)	(12)	(6)
Reasons for inequities (numbers):									
“Old boy” network					18	12	4	3	0
Cultural differences					18	8	3	6	0 [*]
Racism					24	2	4	1	0 [*]
Sexism					5	4	2	0	1
Religious discrimination					0	1	1	0	0
Lack of education					14	11	6	0	1
Lack of mentors					17	7	4	1	1
Lack of experience					4	3	1	0	0
Lack of networking opportunities					15	3	4	1	0
Lack attributes needed (assertiveness/responsibility)					6	3	0	1	0
Lack motivation/competence					2	4	1	0	0 [*]
Lack of applicants/pipeline					4	10	0	1	0 [*]
Lack of organizational initiatives recruitments, incentives, promotions					11	9	3	0	0
Board composition					9	4	4	0	0
Lack of support for minorities in management positions					11	1	3	0	1 [*]

* Chi-square significant p<.05

** Chi-square significant p<.01

*** Chi-square significant p<.001

TABLE 39B

OPINIONS CONCERNING INEQUITIES
IN HEALTHCARE MANAGEMENT
MALES

	1997				2002				
	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Native American</u>
Are there inequities?									
Yes	97	51	72	71 ^{***}	95	60	76	79	80 ^{***}
No	0	25	18	14	0	35	15	16	10
Ambiguous	3	25	10	14	5	5	9	5	10
	100%	100% ¹	100%	100% ¹	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
	ⁿ (110)	(69)	(83)	(42)	(87)	(83)	(45)	(19)	(10)
Reasons for inequities (numbers):									
“Old boy” network					12	7	8	3	1
Cultural differences					14	5	6	2	0
Racism					17	6	8	2	1
Sexism					1	0	3	0	0
Religious discrimination					0	0	0	0	0
Lack of education					8	8	7	4	1
Lack of mentors					13	5	1	3	0
Lack of experience					4	1	0	1	2 [*]
Lack of networking opportunities					15	4	2	2	1
Lack attributes needed (assertiveness/responsibility)					0	1	4	2	0 [*]
Lack motivation/competence					2	0	0	1	0 [*]
Lack of applicants/pipeline					5	11	5	0	1 [*]
Lack of organizational initiatives recruitments, incentives, promotions					16	7	6	1	1
Board composition					9	1	2	0	0
Lack of support for minorities in management positions					13	6	0	2	1

**

Chi-square significant p<.01

*** Chi-square significant p<.001

¹Percentage may not total to 100 due to rounding.

TABLE 40

NON-RESPONSE ANALYSIS - CROSS-SECTIONAL STUDY
(percent)

		Females		Males	
respondents		Respondents	Non-respondents	Respondents	Non-
Age					
<35		20	17	10	9
35-44		26	30	27	29
45-54		38	40	42	45
55 +		16	13	21	18
		100%	100%	100%	100%
	n	(636)	(626)	(710)	(701)
Highest Degree					
Doctorate		7	5*	6	9
Masters		86	85	87	84
Bachelors		7	10	7	7
Other/None		0	0	0	0
		100%	100%	100%	100%
	n	(638)	(633)	(712)	(698)
Field of Highest Degree					
Healthcare Management		63	58	64	62
Business		15	20	21	21
Public Health/Public		4	4	3	3
Administration		18	18	12	14
Other		100%	100%	100%	100%
	n	(619)	(625)	(699)	(684)

TABLE 40 (continued)

NON-RESPONSE ANALYSIS - CROSS-SECTIONAL STUDY (percent)				
respondents	Females		Males	
	Respondents	Non-respondents	Respondents	Non-
Position Level				
CEO	10	10	29	26*
COO	10	9	12	15
Vice President	26	24	21	18
Department Head/Staff	30	35	21	23
Other	23	21	17	16
Unknown	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>2</u>
	100%	100%	100%	100%
n	(650)	(643)	(716)	(709)
Employing Organization				
Freestanding Hospital:	30	26	29	26
System Hospital	36	36	39	37
Other direct provider	7	8	8	9
Managed Care/HMO	5	3	3	5
Other	21	25	20	22
Unknown	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>
	100%	100%	100%	100%
n	(650)	(643)	(716)	(709)

¹Percentage may not total to 100 due to rounding.

* Chi square significant p<.05