Paper Title, Journal, Year

Wenzhi Wang *

September 6, 2024

^{*}This note is written in my pre-doc period at the University of Chicago Booth School of Business.

Table 1

	Mean	SD	P1	P99	N		
Panel (a): gender, age and education							
Female	0.44	0.5	0.0	1.0	10,082,081		
Share in Cohort 18-29	0.25	0.4	0.0	1.0	10,083,638		
Share in Cohort 30-39	0.39	0.5	0.0	1.0	10,083,638		
Share in Cohort 40-49	0.23	0.4	0.0	1.0	10,083,638		
Share in Cohort 50+	0.13	0.3	0.0	1.0	10,083,638		
Econ, Business, and Admin	0.48	0.5	0.0	1.0	1,016,269		
Sci, Engin, Math, and Stat	0.31	0.5	0.0	1.0	1,016,269		
Social Sciences and Humanities	0.15	0.4	0.0	1.0	1,016,269		
Other Educ	0.07	0.3	0.0	1.0	1,016,269		
Panel (b): tenure, hierarchy and team size							
Tenure (years)	8.50	8.8	0.0	35.0	10,083,638		
Share in Work-level 1	0.80	0.4	0.0	1.0	10,083,638		
Share in Work-level 2	0.16	0.4	0.0	1.0	10,083,638		
Share in Work-level 3+	0.04	0.2	0.0	1.0	10,083,638		
No. of months per worker	44.99	41.4	1.0	132.0	224,117		
No. of supervisors per worker	2.49	3.0	0.0	12.0	224,117		
No. of workers per supervisor	5.02	7.8	1.0	33.0	47,816		
Panel (c): outcome variables							
Number of salary grade increases	0.60	1.0	0.0	4.0	224,117		
Number of lateral job transfers	0.90	1.4	0.0	6.0	224,117		
Number of promotions (work-level)	0.06	0.3	0.0	1.0	224,117		
Monthly Exit	0.01	0.1	0.0	1.0	10,083,638		
Pay + bonus (logs)	10.27	0.9	8.2	12.5	4,977,935		
Bonus over Pay	0.20	116.2	0.0	0.6	4,977,935		
Perf. appraisals	98.22	26.0	0.0	142.0	3,538,611		
Productivity (sales in logs)	8.63	2.2	0.0	9.9	87,491		

Notes. An observation is a worker-month-year. The data contain personnel records for the entire white-collar employee base from January 2011 until December 2021. In Panel (a) cohort refers to the age group and education data is only available for a subset of workers. In Panel (b) work level denotes the hierarchical tier (from level 1 at the bottom to level 6). In Panel (c) salary information is only available since January 2015 and the data on performance ratings start in January 2017.

Table 2

	(1)	(2)	(3)				
Variable	Not High Flyer	High Flyer	Difference				
Panel (a): performance after high-flyer status is determined							
Monthly salary growth	0.006	0.011	0.005***				
	(0.029)	(0.034)	(0.000)				
Promotion work-level 3	0.049	0.135	0.086***				
	(0.204)	(0.331)	(0.000)				
Perf. rating (1-150)	100.932	104.042	3.110***				
	(18.236)	(15.963)	(0.000)				
Effective leader (survey)	4.025	4.119	0.095***				
	(0.691)	(0.681)	(0.000)				
_ ,							
Panel	(b): demographics						
Female	0.493	0.576	0.083***				
	(0.500)	(0.494)	(0.000)				
MBA	0.001	0.000	-0.001*				
	(0.032)	(0.000)	(0.083)				
Econ, Business, and Admin	0.505	0.549	0.044**				
	(0.500)	(0.498)	(0.019)				
Sci, Tech, Engin, and Math	0.279	0.253	-0.026				
	(0.449)	(0.435)	(0.112)				
Social Sciences and Humanities	0.156	0.178	0.022				
	(0.363)	(0.383)	(0.124)				
Other Educ	0.065	0.030	-0.035***				
	(0.247)	(0.172)	(0.000)				
MidCareerHire	0.310	0.144	-0.166***				
	(0.463)	(0.351)	(0.000)				
Observations	13,925	5,690	19,615				

Notes. Showing mean and standard deviations (in parentheses) and p-values for the difference in means. The difference in means is computed using standard errors clustered by manager. *Perf. rating* refers to the performance assessment given annually to each employee; *Effective leader (survey)* refers to the workers' anonymous upward feedback on the managers' leadership; and *Mid-career recruit* refers to managers who have been hired directly as managers by the firm (at work-level 2 instead of work-level 1).

Table 3

	Leave 1 yr	Leave 2 yrs	Leave 3 yrs	Leave 4 yrs	Leave 5 yrs	Leave 6 yrs	Leave 7 yrs	Leave 8 yrs	Leave 9 yrs	Leave 10 yrs
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
Panel A: Wit	hout event tin	ne constraints								
L to H	0.020	0.003	0.003	0.023	0.024	0.027	0.044***	0.045***	0.039**	0.037**
	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)
R-squared	0.351	0.362	0.372	0.382	0.394	0.402	0.412	0.420	0.428	0.434
Obs	16415	16415	16415	16415	16415	16415	16415	16415	16415	16415
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
Panel B: Wit	h event time c	onstraints								
L to H	0.025	0.003	0.004	0.029	0.031	0.028	0.059***	0.061***	0.047	-0.015
	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.03)	(0.06)
R-squared	0.347	0.354	0.359	0.364	0.371	0.371	0.373	0.372	0.370	0.344
Obs	15583	15117	14427	13582	12736	11687	10538	9057	6489	2159

Notes. Sample includes only LtoL and LtoH groups. I report the regression coefficient on the dummy indicating the LtoH treatment group. The outcome variable indicates whether the worker left the firm within a given period after the manager change event. Control variables include the fixed effects of the interaction of office, function, and event time, as well as the interaction between age band and gender. Standard errors are clustered at manager level. Even time constraint means whether to keep only those workers whose outcome variable can be measured given the dataset period.