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## THE 1999 SANS SYSTEM, NETWORK, AND SECURITY Administration Survey

The positions held by administrators, auditors, and security professionals continue to become ever more critical as businesses increase their reliance on data processing and computer networking. These professionals ensure that computer systems continue to operate, that data is not lost (either through mismanagement or malicious breakins), that users have easy and continuous access to the resources they need to perform their jobs, and that electronic commerce operates smoothly, continuously, and securely. Their skill, perseverance, patience and creativity directly impact the productivity of every computer user in organizations from the smallest, one-site company to the largest global enterprise.

As organizations added computers over the last few years for enterprise resource management, electronic commerce, electronic mail, scientific analysis, and general office productivity, the relentless law of supply and demand has pushed systems, network, and security administrator salaries higher and higher. The average increase in salaries reported by almost 11,000 respondents was $11.47 \%$ from last year. The Northeast and Southwest continue to be the technological salary hotbeds.

This Sixth Annual SANS Salary Survey reflects data from 11,064 system, network, and security administrators from the entire gamut of industries. We hope you find it useful but must ask that it not be reproduced in whole or in part, in any way without specific prior written permission.

## ABOUT THE SANS INSTITUTE

The SANS Institute is an educational organization committed to providing world-class technical education for security and systems management professionals. Its annual $N$ etwork Security and SAN S Conferences perennially rate among the world's best educational programs for technologists. SAN S relies on the highest-rated and effective practitioner/ teachers. For more information, see http:/ / www.sans.org or email [sans@sans.org](mailto:sans@sans.org).

## 1. INTRODUCTION AND HIGHLIGHTS

While most of this document consists of tables, here are a few highlights in prose to point the way.
All salaries are reported in United States dollars.
Salary averages are reported in sub-groups only when the group contains at least four members. Otherwise, when the group is too small for statistical averaging, dashes are printed in the various tables.

Many tables report separate statistics for Windows NT and Novell Netware from the many brands of UNIX and other operating system such as MVS and Cisco IOS. In the tables, NT signifies the first group while UNIX signifies the second.

1. This year's survey response grew to 11,064 valid responses from 7,189 in 1998 and 1,608 in 1997. This large response enables more accurate salary breakdowns by industry and other measures.
2. Over $50 \%$ of the administrators report 1998 salaries from $\$ 40,000$ to $\$ 69,999$; see Section 3a. The average overall reported salary is $\$ 56,441$; the median is $\$ 54,000$. The average NT salary reported is $\$ 53,598$ while the average UNIX salary is $\$ 62,907$. Median for NT is $\$ 50,000$ while the median for UNIX is $\$ 61,000$.
3. Security consultants topped the heap with an average reported income of $\$ 73,762$; security auditors were next with $\$ 66,193$; then came security administrators at $\$ 58,590$, database administrators at $\$ 55,641$, then system administrators at $\$ 54,660$, and network administrators at $\$ 51,133$. See Section 3h.
4. The average reported raise was $11.47 \%$. Men reported raises of $11.61 \%$ versus women at $10.40 \%$. Security consultants reported raises of $11.4 \%$; database admins $11.4 \%$; security administrators $10.4 \%$; security auditors $9.6 \%$; system administrators $11.4 \%$; and network administrators $12.0 \%$.

In addition, there appears to be some wage compression by age as workers with more than 10 years of administrative experience received generally smaller raises percentage-wise than those with fewer years of experience. Paradoxically at the same time, very highly paid workers received raises that were, on average, higher than those earning less than average (see Section 3m for these counterintuitive results).
5. Experience counts. Those with less than three years of experience report incomes that average at least $\$ 14,000$ less than average. Those with twenty or more years of experience average almost $\$ 20,000$ or more above average. See Section 3 b.
6. Education counts, too. Holders of Masters Degrees report salaries $\$ 9,000$ greater than average. Those without a bachelors degree report smaller than average salaries. See Section 31.
7. Management responsibility is usually rewarded. Front line managers appear to earn more money for each subordinate. See Section 3n.
8. More than $83 \%$ (down from $88 \%$ last year) of the administrators reported that they did not work in homogeneous computer environments. Instead, they managed several different operating systems. On average, those managing more than three types of computers made more money. See Section 2g and 3k.
9. Amazingly, there are significant salary differences among those who concentrate on different OSes. For example, Solaris administrators report salaries $\$ 8,000$ above average while Windows NT administrators averaged $\$ 2,000$ below average. Novell Netware admins averaged another $\$ 1,500$ lower than that. See Section $3 e$ for comparisons.
10. Women are catching up to men in experience; see Section 2f. Women's salaries continue to trail men's salaries for administrators with more than five years experience but have caught up with and pretty much equalled those of men for respondents with less than five years of experience; see Sections $3 f$ and 30 .
11. Applications, chemical, biotech, security, and pharmaceutical industries continue to pay highest on average. Education is sadly among the lowest of payers, averaging over $\$ 20 \mathrm{~K} /$ year below the higher paying industries. Money inn't everything, of course. See Section 3f.
12. The US Northeast and US Southwest are the best places to make more money. See Section 3i.
13. Just under $22 \%$ of the respondents are paid extra for overtime.

The document includes demographs (in the next section) and a host of tables in Section 3. If you are in a hurry to see how your salary stands up, check out Section 3 m to see salaries broken out by region, experience, position, and operating system.

## 2. DEMOGRAPHICS

More than 11,064 full-time administrators and auditors completed the survey this year, up over $50 \%$ from 7,189 last year. They completed a questionnaire on the world wide web with over 40 questions, including:

- Organization type and size
- Administrator Type
- Number of OS types supported
- Main operating system
- Number of users in organization
- Number of desktops and servers
- Number of subordinates
- Years of sysadmin experience
- Years of general computer experience
- Number of org's FTE sysadmins, netadmins, and security admins
- This year's and last year's salary
- Number of hours worked per week
- Whether overtime is paid
- Highest educational degree
- Gender
- Whether salaried, consultant, or contractor
- Why salary changed
- Region of world
- Favorite benefits
- Important reasons for job stability

This document summarizes some of their responses. While over 11,000 forms had responses deemed valid, many tables summarize fewer responses because not all respondents answered every question.

Throughout the document, standard security and system administration terminology will be used. Additionally, six abbreviations describe the various jobs held by respondents:

| DB_ADM | Database Administrator |
| :--- | :--- |
| NET_ADM | Network Administrator |
| SEC_ADM | Security Administrator |
| SEC_AUD | Security Auditor |
| SEC_CON | Security Consultant |
| SYS_ADM | System Administrator |

Furthermore, some tabular columns are marked with a dagger $(\dagger)$ that indicates that that column's percentages are percentages of items listed only in that column, not of the entire set.

All "years of experience" in this document refer to years of experience in administration of computers.

## 2A. Where Are They From?

SURVEY RESPONDENT LOCATION


US-N ortheas
US-Midwest
US-Southwe
US-Southeas
US-South
US-N orthwest

| Canada - O ntario | 254 | 2.3 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Eur: UK | 224 | 2.0 |


| Canada - O ther | 201 | 1.8 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Australia | 174 | 1.6 |

Eur: Scandinavia/ Benelux

| Canada - BC | 121 | 1.1 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Canada - Q uebec | 108 | 1.0 |


| Eur: Germ/ Aus/ Switz | 73 | 0.7 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| South A merica | 70 | 0.6 |
| O ther A sia | 69 | 0.6 |
| East. Eur. \& Soviet Repb's | 59 | 0.5 |
| O ther W est. Europe | 54 | 0.5 |
| Middle East | 51 | 0.5 |
| South A frica | 49 | 0.4 |


| Hawaii | 45 | 0.4 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Alaska | 37 | 0.3 |
| N ew Zealand | 34 | 0.3 |
| Asia/ India | 19 | 0.2 |
| M exico | 18 | 0.2 |
| Central America | 15 | 0.1 |
| Eur: Spain | 15 | 0.1 |
| Eur: France | 12 | 0.1 |
| Eur: Italy | 12 | 0.1 |
| O ther South Pacific | 11 | 0.1 |
| O ther A frica | 8 | 0.1 |
| All | $\mathbf{1 1 , 1 1 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

The survey asked each respondent to indicate their region of the world. Approximately 84\% were from the USA.

Here is how the states were assigned to regions.
US-MIDWEST: Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, Ohio, South Dakota, Wisconsin

US-NORTHEAST: Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Vermont, Virginia

US-NORTHWEST: Idaho, Montana, Oregon, Washington, Wyoming

US-SOUTH: Arkansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, Oklahoma, Texas

US-SOUTHEAST: Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, West Virginia

US-Southwest: Arizona, California, Colorado, Nevada, New Mexico, Utah

## 2b. What Are Their Primary Duties?

| SELF-CLASSIFIED ADMIN TYPE |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TYPE | FEMALE \% ¢ | MaLe \% ¢ | TOTAL \% |
| DB_ADM | 0.7 | 0.6 | 0.6 |
| NET_ADM | 20.1 | 24.3 | 23.8 |
| SEC_ADM | 7.8 | 4.3 | 4.7 |
| SEC_AUD | 5.3 | 3.3 | 3.5 |
| SEC_CON | 4.9 | 5.4 | 5.3 |
| SYS_ADM | 47.1 | 52.1 | 51.5 |
| OTHER | 14.0 | 10.1 | 10.6 |
| All | 12.0 | 88.0 | 100.0 |

Respondents classified themselves as database administrators, network administrators, security administrators, security auditors, security consultants, or system administrators. Alternative selections ("OTHER") were allowed. No formal job descriptions or rules were used to guide the respondents, so these demographics are informal.

## 2 C. Are Respondents SAlARIED, 2C: ARE RURACTORS, OR CONSULTANTS? CONTRA

$\dagger N$ umbers in this column are percentages of respondents in this column, not of the entire set of respondents.

SALARY TYPE VS. GENDER

| SALARY TYPE | FEMALE $\% ~ \dagger$ | MALE $\% ~ \dagger$ | TOTAL |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Contractor | 8.1 | 10.6 | 10.3 |
| Full-time consultant | 1.0 | 2.0 | 1.9 |
| Full-time employee | 89.0 | 86.4 | 86.7 |
| Part-time consultant | 0.5 | 0.3 | 0.3 |
| Part-time employee | 1.0 | 0.4 | 0.5 |
| Student/ unemployed | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.3 |
| All | $\mathbf{1 2 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{8 8 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

$\dagger N$ umbers in this column are percentages of respondents in this column, not of the entire set of respondents.

About $87 \%$ of the respondents were full-time salaried employees; $10 \%$ were contractors.

## 2D. HOW MANY PeOPLE DO They MANAGE?

| NuMber of Subordinates vs. Gender |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Subords | FEMALE \% ¢ | Male \% † | TOTAL \% |
| 0 | 60.8 | 52.1 | 53.1 |
| 1 | 10.8 | 10.7 | 10.7 |
| 2 | 7.6 | 9.8 | 9.6 |
| 3-4 | 8.4 | 11.5 | 11.1 |
| 5-6 | 4.1 | 7.4 | 7.0 |
| 7-9 | 3.0 | 3.1 | 3.1 |
| >9 | 5.3 | 5.4 | 5.4 |
| All | 11.8 | 88.2 | 100.0 |

This section details the number of subordinates reported by the respondents. This indication of supervisory responsibility is broken out by gender, experience, and admin type.

[^0]It appears that the male respondents are ahead a bit when it comes to becoming supervisors. This chart does not reflect years of experience in the field, though.
The next chart does.

| NUMBER OF SUBORDINATES VS. ADMIN EXPERIENCE, \% RESPONDENTS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| EXP. | SUBORDINATES |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $\mathbf{0}$ | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{3 - 4}$ | $\mathbf{5 - 6}$ | $>9$ | TOTAL |  |
| $<1$ | 2.1 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 2.9 |  |
| $1-2$ | 9.9 | 1.7 | 1.3 | 1.0 | 0.5 | 0.4 | 14.8 |  |
| $3-4$ | 14.2 | 3.2 | 2.4 | 2.6 | 1.6 | 1.2 | 25.1 |  |
| $5-6$ | 9.4 | 2.1 | 2.0 | 2.4 | 1.7 | 1.2 | 18.8 |  |
| $7-8$ | 5.1 | 1.1 | 1.3 | 1.5 | 0.9 | 1.0 | 10.9 |  |
| $9-10$ | 4.7 | 0.9 | 0.9 | 1.3 | 1.2 | 1.2 | 10.2 |  |
| $11-15$ | 4.9 | 1.1 | 1.1 | 1.4 | 1.3 | 1.5 | 11.3 |  |
| $16-20$ | 1.6 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.6 | 3.8 |  |
| $>20$ | 0.9 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.5 | 2.3 |  |
| All | $\mathbf{5 3 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 . 8}$ | $\mathbf{9 . 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 1 . 1}$ | $\mathbf{8 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{7 . 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |  |

In this chart, respondents with higher numbers of subordinates are clustered just above the visual center and, to a lesser extent, on the right side of the 11-15 and $9-10$ experience groups. One interpretation of this data is that more experienced managers of more people do not continue to fill out this survey.

The next chart shows supervisor responsibility by job description.

| ADMIN TYPE VS. SUBORDINATES, \% RESPON DENTS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SUBORD | DB_ADM $\dagger$ | NET_ADM $\dagger$ SEC_ADM $\dagger$ | SEC_AUD $\dagger$ | SEC_CON $\dagger$ | SYS_ADM $\dagger$ | TOTAL |  |
| 0 | 74.6 | 53.3 | 54.0 | 48.3 | 53.6 | 53.7 | 53.6 |
| 1 | 9.0 | 11.3 | 10.8 | 11.3 | 5.7 | 12.0 | 11.3 |
| 2 | 7.5 | 10.3 | 9.4 | 9.7 | 7.8 | 10.0 | 9.9 |
| $3-4$ | 4.5 | 12.1 | 10.0 | 12.5 | 10.6 | 10.8 | 11.1 |
| $5-6$ | 1.5 | 7.2 | 7.9 | 9.0 | 8.7 | 7.4 | 7.5 |
| $>9$ | 3.0 | 6.0 | 7.9 | 9.2 | 13.5 | 6.0 | 6.6 |
| All | $\mathbf{0 . 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 6 . 4}$ | $\mathbf{5 . 3}$ | $\mathbf{4 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{5 . 9}$ | $\mathbf{5 7 . 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

$\dagger N$ umbers in this column are percentages of respondents in this column, not of the entire set of respondents.
It appears that Security Auditor respondents supervise slightly more people than the other admin types, but the difference is not large.

## 2 e. What Are the Main OS Platforms?

Respondents were asked to choose a single "main" operating system, which disgruntled some who wished not to choose just one platform. However, later info examines the relationship between "main" OS platform and salary with surprising results.

| MAIN OS TYPE |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| OS | $\%$ |
| W indows/ NT | 63.5 |
| Solaris | 13.8 |
| N ovell N etware | 6.0 |
| HP-UX | 3.3 |
| Cisco IO S | 2.9 |
| Linux | 2.1 |
| AIX | 1.9 |
| MVS | 1.2 |
| Silicon G raphics IRIX | 1.0 |
| BSD UN IX (open, BSDI, etc.) | 0.8 |
| O pen VMS | 0.7 |
| Other | 0.7 |
| Digital/ Compaq Ultrix | 0.5 |
| OSF/ 1 | 0.4 |
| SCO | 0.3 |
| AS/ 400 | 0.3 |
| DG -UX | 0.1 |
| Sequent | 0.1 |
| AT\&T or NCR UNIX | 0.1 |
| Digital UN IX | 0.1 |
| OS/ 2 | 0.1 |
| Vines | 0.1 |
| Tru64 | 0.1 |
| Unicos | 0.1 |
| W indows | 0.0 |
| Compaq Unix | 0.0 |
|  |  |

The big three (Windows/NT, Solaris, and Novell Netware) cover a whopping $83.3 \%$ of the primary operating system responses.

NT and Novell, the major systems whose respondents are often reported separately as a group, are cited by $69.5 \%$ of the respondents as their major OS.

This table also reflects a potential stagnation of the "Linux Movement" trend with same $2 \%$ of the respondents claiming Linux as their main platform as last year. Of course, the absolute number of Linux systems is growing at the same rate as the total number of systems, so the movement is far from dead. The Linux salaries (later) show a strong demand for skilled Linux administrators.

## 2 f. HOW MuCh AdMIN EXperience Do They Have?

Two different charts highlight this section: experience in system administration vs. gender and system experience vs. admin type.

| EXPERIENCE VS. GEN DER |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| YEARS EXP. | FEMALE $\% ~$ | MALE $\% ~$ | TOTAL |
| $<1$ | 4.8 | 2.7 | 2.9 |
| $1-2$ | 16.0 | 14.7 | 14.9 |
| $3-4$ | 23.5 | 25.5 | 25.3 |
| $5-6$ | 16.4 | 19.1 | 18.7 |
| $7-8$ | 10.1 | 11.0 | 10.9 |
| $9-10$ | 9.8 | 10.1 | 10.1 |
| $11-15$ | 13.1 | 11.0 | 11.2 |
| $16-20$ | 4.7 | 3.6 | 3.7 |
| $>20$ | 1.6 | 2.3 | 2.2 |
| All | $\mathbf{1 2 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{8 8 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

The distributions were fairly similar in this table, though the differences that do exist (higher percentage of women respondents with high levels of computer experience) are explicable only by citing "statistical variations" inherent in surveys like this one.
$\dagger$ Numbers in this column are percentages of respondents in this column, not of the entire set of respondents.

| ADMIN EXPERIENCE VS. ADMIN TYPE, \% RESPONDENTS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | DB_ADM $\dagger$ NET_ADM $\dagger$ | OTHER $\dagger$ | SEC_ADM $\dagger$ | SEC_AUD $\dagger$ | SEC_CON $\dagger$ SYS_ADM $\dagger$ | TOTAL |  |  |
| $<1$ | 8.8 | 3.8 | 5.7 | 3.0 | 3.5 | 1.8 | 2.0 | 2.9 |
| $1-2$ | 16.2 | 18.1 | 13.6 | 15.5 | 10.8 | 7.5 | 14.6 | 14.9 |
| $3-4$ | 26.5 | 28.3 | 19.8 | 22.3 | 17.1 | 18.7 | 26.4 | 25.3 |
| $5-6$ | 13.2 | 19.3 | 15.8 | 16.0 | 18.3 | 15.2 | 19.8 | 18.8 |
| $7-8$ | 5.9 | 11.2 | 10.9 | 10.2 | 9.5 | 11.7 | 10.9 | 10.9 |
| $9-10$ | 10.3 | 8.5 | 9.8 | 10.9 | 10.8 | 12.9 | 10.4 | 10.1 |
| $11-15$ | 14.7 | 7.8 | 13.8 | 12.8 | 15.1 | 18.4 | 11.0 | 11.2 |
| $16-20$ | 4.4 | 2.0 | 5.3 | 6.0 | 8.8 | 7.4 | 3.2 | 3.7 |
| $>20$ | 0.0 | 0.9 | 5.2 | 3.2 | 6.0 | 6.4 | 1.5 | 2.3 |
| All | $\mathbf{0 . 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 3 . 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 . 6}$ | $\mathbf{4 . 7}$ | $\mathbf{3 . 5}$ | $\mathbf{5 . 3}$ | $\mathbf{5 1 . 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

$\dagger N$ umbers in this column are percentages of respondents in this column, not of the entire set of respondents.
Security auditors and security consultants seem to have an edge in experience over the others.

## 2G. HOW Mixed is the Environment?

| NUMBER OF <br> PLATFORMS AT Site <br> \# OS PlatForms |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| \% SItes |  |
| 1 | 16.8 |
| 2 | 28.2 |
| 3 | 25.0 |
| 4 | 12.8 |
| $\geq 5$ | 17.3 |

This table shows the prevalence of administrators who manage mixed environments with multiple operating system types.

One sixth of the respondents work in a single OS shop; over half have three or more platform types.

## 3. The SALARIES

## 3A. HOw MuCh Do They MaKe?

The average salary for all respondents was $\$ 56,442 /$ year. The 9,735 male respondents averaged $\$ 56,779$ while the 1,329 female respondents averaged \$53,971/year.

Breaking down by operating system, average NT salary was $\$ 53,598 /$ year with average UNIX salary at $\$ 62,907 / y e a r$. The NT male respondents averaged $\$ 53,899 /$ year; the NT female respondents averaged $\$ 51,302 /$ year. The UNIX male respondents averaged $\$ 63,434 /$ year; the UNIX female respondents averaged $\$ 59,355$. None of these averages takes experience into account.

The chart below shows how people fall into various salary ranges:

| SALARY RaNGE | NT |  |  | UNIX |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ALL \% | MALES \% ¢ | FEMALES \% ¢ | ALL \% | Males \% ¢ | FEMALES \% ¢ |
| Under 20,000 | 1.6 | 1.7 | 0.6 | 0.9 | 1.0 | 0.5 |
| 20,000-29,999 | 5.8 | 5.7 | 6.4 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 2.5 |
| 30,000-39,999 | 16.2 | 15.7 | 19.8 | 7.2 | 6.9 | 8.7 |
| 40,000-49,999 | 23.2 | 22.9 | 25.8 | 15.5 | 15.1 | 18.6 |
| 50,000-59,999 | 19.1 | 19.1 | 19.2 | 19.3 | 18.7 | 23.2 |
| 60,000-69,999 | 14.9 | 15.1 | 13.1 | 19.6 | 19.9 | 17.2 |
| 70,000-79,999 | 8.7 | 9.0 | 6.7 | 16.2 | 16.2 | 16.1 |
| 80,000-89,999 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 4.9 | 8.5 | 8.7 | 7.3 |
| 90,000-99,999 | 1.9 | 2.0 | 1.2 | 4.7 | 4.8 | 3.4 |
| 100,000 \& up | 3.6 | 3.8 | 2.2 | 5.7 | 6.2 | 2.5 |

$\dagger N$ umbers in this column are percentages of respondents in this column, not of the entire set of respondents.
The main conclusion this chart suggests is that working in computer administration in the late 1990s is surely a lucrative way to earn a living.

## 3 b. How Does Level Of EXperience Affect SAlaries?

It is an American tautology that experience should increase salary. This chart examines whether such a widely held belief holds true.

Generally, salary does appear to increase with administration experience (which can be less than computer experience). But, in a fascinating demonstration of salary compression, salaries of experienced administrators are increasing less quickly than those with less experience. This is often due to departmental budgets with fixed-percentage raises. If a department has $6 \%$ for raises, for instance, that turns into a certain number of dollars. By giving 5\% to the highend earners, the remaining dollars enable giving $7 \%, 8 \%$, or more to lower-end earners (since $7 \%$ is calculated from a smaller number).

This chart compares salary and raises for different levels of administrative experience. Furthermore, it quantifies the raises by converting the percentage to annual dollar increase.

| ADMINISTRATIVE EXPERIENCE VS. SALARY INCREASE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Exp. Range | NT |  |  |  | UNIX |  |  |  |
|  | SAL | INCR \% | \$ RaISE | RESP \% $\dagger$ | SAL | INCR \% | \$ RaISE | Resp. \% ¢ |
| <1 | 40,056 | 14.1 | 5,648 | 2.8 | 44,685 | 12.5 | 5,600 | 1.1 |
| 1-2 | 41,545 | 14.3 | 5,932 | 17.0 | 45,585 | 13.9 | 6,326 | 7.3 |
| 3-4 | 49,405 | 13.8 | 6,832 | 28.0 | 53,968 | 13.1 | 7,096 | 18.4 |
| 5-6 | 54,206 | 11.3 | 6,104 | 19.4 | 60,954 | 11.0 | 6,721 | 18.5 |
| 7-8 | 60,930 | 10.7 | 6,520 | 10.6 | 65,148 | 10.5 | 6,822 | 13.0 |
| 9-10 | 61,049 | 9.1 | 5,530 | 8.9 | 68,240 | 9.2 | 6,264 | 14.2 |
| 11-15 | 68,094 | 9.0 | 6,127 | 8.8 | 71,513 | 8.4 | 6,029 | 17.9 |
| 16-20 | 71,818 | 7.8 | 5,620 | 2.5 | 73,981 | 6.5 | 4,842 | 6.8 |
| >20 | 75,841 | 7.0 | 5,333 | 2.1 | 74,476 | 5.6 | 4,200 | 2.7 |

$\dagger \mathrm{N}$ umbers in this column are percentages of respondents in this column, not of the entire set of respondents.
It appears that percentage raises decline with experience, as does the absolute dollar value of each raise. NT administrators do better at almost every experience level, probably because their salaries are behind their UNIX counterparts, except at the highest levels of experience.

## 3 C. How FAst Are SALARIes Growing?

The average salary increase reported overall by 10,310 respondents for the last year was $11.47 \%$ (vs. $11.9 \%$ last year). The 9,067 male respondents reported a $11.6 \%$ increase (vs. $12.1 \%$ last year) while the 1,243 female respondents reported an average $10.4 \%$ increase (vs. $10.2 \%$ last year). Here's the breakdown of various increases by gender and OS:

| $\%$ SNCREASE | NT |  |  |  | UNIX |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | OVERALL | MALE $\dagger$ | FEMALE $\dagger$ | OVERALL | MALE $\dagger$ | FEMALE $\dagger$ |
|  | 13.2 | 13.5 | 10.4 | 12.2 | 11.9 | 14.7 |
| $2-3.99$ | 9.2 | 8.7 | 13.6 | 12.7 | 12.7 | 12.8 |
| $4-5.99$ | 13.1 | 12.9 | 14.6 | 17.8 | 17.5 | 19.3 |
| $6-7.99$ | 9.8 | 9.9 | 9.3 | 10.5 | 10.9 | 8.0 |
| $8-9.99$ | 8.1 | 8.0 | 8.5 | 7.8 | 7.8 | 7.7 |
| $10-11.99$ | 8.8 | 8.7 | 9.8 | 7.8 | 7.7 | 8.2 |
| $12-13.99$ | 5.1 | 5.1 | 4.7 | 5.7 | 5.7 | 5.8 |
| $14-15.99$ | 5.0 | 4.9 | 5.3 | 4.4 | 4.3 | 5.1 |
| $16-17.99$ | 4.2 | 4.2 | 4.2 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.1 |
| $18-19.99$ | 2.9 | 2.9 | 2.9 | 2.0 | 2.1 | 1.7 |
| $\geq 20$ | 20.6 | 21.2 | 16.6 | 16.0 | 16.4 | 13.7 |

$\dagger N$ umbers in this column are percentages of respondents in this column, not of the entire set of respondents.
The raises are fairly comparable between the genders, except inexplicably in the experience range of 2-6 years.

## 3D. SALARY AND RAISES

This chart shows average percent raises vs. salary.

| SALARY | NT |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | OVERALL | MALE | FEMALE | OVERALL | MALE | FEMALE |
|  | 13.30 | 12.79 | 20.62 | 14.27 | 14.27 | 14.29 |
|  | 11.27 | 11.81 | 7.35 | 10.60 | 10.79 | 9.44 |
|  | 11.45 | 11.56 | 10.75 | 10.65 | 10.88 | 9.44 |
|  | 12.04 | 12.19 | 11.02 | 10.12 | 10.03 | 10.57 |
|  | 11.93 | 12.10 | 10.65 | 9.67 | 9.82 | 8.82 |
|  | 12.31 | 12.37 | 11.80 | 10.54 | 10.50 | 10.88 |
| $70,000-79,999$ | 12.26 | 12.28 | 12.13 | 10.44 | 10.63 | 9.22 |
| $80,000-89,999$ | 11.09 | 11.10 | 11.02 | 10.24 | 10.70 | 6.66 |
| $90,000-99,999$ | 11.49 | 11.91 | 6.59 | 9.34 | 9.82 | 4.89 |
| $100,000 \&$ up | 13.70 | 13.72 | 13.35 | 12.97 | 13.11 | 10.36 |

The top line and bottom lines of the chart are interesting. Why do females in the NT world get such big raises at low salaries? Why do females in the UNIX world fare so poorly at high salaries? This survey does not have enough data to provide speculation.

## 3 e. Does Pay Level or Pay Increase Vary Across Main OSes?

This chart uses the data about "main operating system" to compare salaries.
The sample sizes are small for many of the operating systems, but they are included anyway.

| SALARY AN D INCREASE BY OS TYPE |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MAIN OS | SALARY | INCREASE \% | \% RESP |
| Sequent | 78,000 | 10.5 | 0.1 |
| AT \& T or NCR UNIX | 68,583 | 8.0 | 0.1 |
| Unicos | 68,200 | 8.6 | 0.0 |
| MVS | 66,595 | 6.8 | 1.3 |
| Solaris | 64,738 | 10.8 | 13.9 |
| Cisco IO S | 64,587 | 12.2 | 3.0 |
| Silicon Graphics IRIX | 64,059 | 8.8 | 1.0 |
| Other | 61,860 | 9.5 | 0.7 |
| HP-UX | 61,281 | 9.9 | 3.4 |
| AIX | 61,207 | 9.0 | 2.0 |
| Vines | 61,125 | 8.5 | 0.1 |
| Open VM S | 60,961 | 7.0 | 0.8 |
| Linux | 60,927 | 12.2 | 1.9 |
| DG -UX | 60,846 | 10.7 | 0.1 |
| BSD UN IX (open, BSDI, etc. | 58,986 | 10.5 | 0.7 |
| O SF/ I | 58,333 | 10.6 | 0.4 |
| Digital/ Compaq Ultrix | 56,816 | 10.7 | 0.5 |
| OS/ 2 | 54,000 | 13.8 | 0.1 |
| W indows/ NT | 53,949 | 12.2 | 62.9 |
| AS/ 400 | 53,724 | 9.3 | 0.3 |
| SCO | 52,972 | 11.7 | 0.4 |
| Novell N etware | 52,613 | 9.7 | 6.1 |
| Digital UN IX | 49,000 | 10.1 | 0.1 |
| Compaq Unix | 48,000 | 13.4 | 0.0 |
| W indows | 47,500 | 2.2 | 0.0 |
| Tru64 | 45,600 | 8.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  |  |  |

The top entries could be construed as fairly surprising, though the sample sizes are small. The bottom entries are interesting in that they are $\$ 12 \mathrm{~K}-\$ 19 \mathrm{~K}$ in salary behind the top entries.

For one of the biggest surprises of the survey, check out this table - same data (salary and increase by "main" OS type) but sorted by salary increase:

| IN CREASE AND SALARY BY OS TYPE |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MAIN OS | SALARY | INCREASE $\%$ | \% RESP |
| O S/ 2 | 54,000 | 13.8 | 0.1 |
| Compaq Unix | 48,000 | 13.4 | 0.0 |
| Cisco IO S | 64,587 | 12.2 | 3.0 |
| Linux | 60,927 | 12.2 | 1.9 |
| W indows/ NT | 53,949 | 12.2 | 62.9 |
| SCO | 52,972 | 11.7 | 0.4 |
| Solaris | 64,738 | 10.8 | 13.9 |
| DG -UX | 60,846 | 10.7 | 0.1 |
| Digital/ Compaq UItrix | 56,816 | 10.7 | 0.5 |
| O SF/ I | 58,333 | 10.6 | 0.4 |
| BSD UN IX (open, BSDI, etc.) | 58,986 | 10.5 | 0.7 |
| Sequent | 78,000 | 10.5 | 0.1 |
| Digital UN IX | 49,000 | 10.1 | 0.1 |
| HP-UX | 61,281 | 9.9 | 3.4 |
| N ovell N etware | 52,613 | 9.7 | 6.1 |
| Other | 61,860 | 9.5 | 0.7 |
| AS/ 400 | 53,724 | 9.3 | 0.3 |
| AIX | 61,207 | 9.0 | 2.0 |
| Silicon Graphics IRIX | 64,059 | 8.8 | 1.0 |
| Unicos | 68,200 | 8.6 | 0.0 |
| Vines | 61,125 | 8.5 | 0.1 |
| AT \& T or NCR UNIX | 68,583 | 8.0 | 0.1 |
| Tru64 | 45,600 | 8.0 | 0.0 |
| O pen VMS | 60,961 | 7.0 | 0.8 |
| MVS | 66,595 | 6.8 | 1.3 |
| W indows | 47,500 | 2.2 | 0.0 |
|  |  |  |  |

Both Linux and Windows/NT are very high on this chart. Many of the entries have swapped their positions (high for low and vice-versa) in this chart relative to their positions in the previous chart. This might be a function of the relative ages of the operating systems' administrators.

## 3 f: HOW DOES SALARY VARY BY INDUSTRY AND Gender?

This chart shows the salary differences by industry and gender. There are many sets of dashes here (particularly for the female respondents); they indicate that an insufficient sample of the 11,000 respondents were members of a particular class.

| AVERAGE SALARY BY GENDER AND INDUSTRY |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| INDUSTRY | OVERALL | MALE |  | FEMALE |  |
|  |  | SALARY | \% | SALARY | \% |
| Accounting | 52,230 | 53,416 | 0.1 | - | - |
| Advertising | 49,000 | 50,750 | 0.0 | - | - |
| A erospace | 61,363 | 61,629 | 1.4 | 59,720 | 0.2 |
| A griculture | 49,034 | 48,785 | 0.3 | - | - |
| Applications | 73,777 | 79,250 | 0.1 | - | - |
| A rchitecture | 42,571 | 41,333 | 0.1 | - | - |
| A utomotive | 54,619 | 54,333 | 0.4 | - | - |
| Banking/ Ins./ Secur. | 59,370 | 59,235 | 8.0 | 60,242 | 1.2 |
| Biotech | 65,320 | 69,421 | 0.2 | 52,333 | 0.1 |
| Business Services | 56,428 | 56,000 | 0.0 | - | - |
| Cable | 50,200 | 50,200 | 0.0 | - | - |
| Chemical | 71,428 | 74,166 | 0.1 | - | - |
| Const/ M ining/ Eng'g | 53,004 | 52,882 | 1.9 | 54,250 | 0.2 |
| Consulting/ Prof. Svcs | 64,309 | 64,431 | 13.8 | 62,951 | 1.2 |
| Contractor | 58,085 | 60,857 | 0.3 | 47,000 | 0.1 |
| Data Processing | 64,200 | 64,200 | 0.0 | - | - |
| Direct M ktg \& Sales | 52,750 | 57,666 | 0.1 | - | - |
| Distribution | 54,285 | 54,285 | 0.1 | - | - |
| E-Commerce | 56,500 | 56,500 | 0.1 | - | - |
| Educ. (Comm. Educ./ Trng.) | 52,884 | 51,263 | 0.5 | 60,583 | 0.1 |
| Educ. (Public/ Priv. Sch's/ Colli.) | 47,147 | 47,132 | 7.4 | 47,221 | 1.4 |
| Electronic Indust's | 56,857 | 49,200 | 0.0 | - | - |
| Energy | 54,571 | 54,571 | 0.1 | - | - |
| Engineering | 50,875 | 51,857 | 0.1 | - | - |
| Entertainment and M ktg | 60,816 | 61,975 | 0.7 | 48,932 | 0.1 |
| Environmental | 41,600 | 41,600 | 0.0 | - | - |
| Financial | 60,526 | 62,666 | 0.1 | 52,500 | 0.0 |
| Food | 50,200 | 49,500 | 0.1 | - | - |
| G aming | 49,600 | 50,000 | 0.0 | - | - |
| Govt (Fed): Civilian | 59,086 | 59,245 | 3.2 | 58,461 | 0.8 |
| G ovt (Fed): M ilitary | 51,606 | 52,216 | 2.3 | 47,447 | 0.3 |


| AVERAGE SALARY BY GENDER AND INDUSTRY |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| INDUSTRY | OVERALL | MALE |  | FEMALE |  |
|  |  | SALARY | \% | SALARY | \% |
| G ovt State/ Local | 48,397 | 48,920 | 3.5 | 46,017 | 0.8 |
| Health Care | 54,980 | 55,377 | 3.8 | 52,011 | 0.5 |
| Hospitality and Travel | 50,186 | 50,057 | 0.5 | 51,142 | 0.1 |
| ISP | 57,666 | 56,656 | 0.6 | 71,200 | 0.0 |
| IT | 56,796 | 55,612 | 0.4 | 62,600 | 0.1 |
| Insurance | 63,279 | 63,279 | 0.2 | - | - |
| Internet Indust's | 57,277 | 57,277 | 0.2 | - | - |
| Legal/ Real Estate | 57,121 | 58,466 | 1.1 | 49,050 | 0.2 |
| Mfg (computer-related) | 59,952 | 60,108 | 4.8 | 57,951 | 0.4 |
| M fg (non-computer-related) | 53,260 | 53,765 | 7.1 | 48,992 | 0.8 |
| Not-For-Profit Association | 48,905 | 49,677 | 1.4 | 45,931 | 0.4 |
| O il \& Petro Indust's | 60,820 | 60,555 | 0.3 | - | - |
| 0 ther | 52,621 | 52,784 | 1.7 | 51,500 | 0.3 |
| O utsource | 55,909 | 55,909 | 0.1 | - | - |
| Pharmaceutical | 62,904 | 65,166 | 0.2 | - | - |
| Printing | 41,000 | 41,000 | 0.1 | - | - |
| Publ'g/ Adv/ W eb | 56,777 | 57,315 | 2.0 | 53,047 | 0.3 |
| Real Estate | 42,500 | 42,500 | 0.1 | - | - |
| Research organization | 64,250 | 64,516 | 1.4 | 62,105 | 0.2 |
| Retail | 48,750 | - | - | - | - |
| Security Indust's | 66,235 | 68,400 | 0.1 | - | - |
| Software Indust's | 56,958 | 57,323 | 1.9 | 54,797 | 0.3 |
| System Integ's and VARs | 54,818 | 54,980 | 5.2 | 52,560 | 0.4 |
| Telecommunications | 58,450 | 58,785 | 5.2 | 55,507 | 0.6 |
| Transportation | 52,384 | 52,716 | 1.1 | 48,818 | 0.1 |
| Utilities: Gas/ Elec/ W ater/ San | 59,098 | 59,533 | 1.2 | 57,000 | 0.3 |
| W eb | 50,857 | 54,333 | 0.1 | - | - |
| W holesale and Retail Trade | 53,097 | 53,139 | 2.3 | 52,805 | 0.3 |

Some differences might have everything to do with experience rather than industry.

## 3g. How Does Industry Type And Size Affect Salaries?

This chart shows salaries and population in various industries (also broken out by company size). When the "Overall" numbers do not match the previous table, it is because the previous table only summarizes those participants who reported a gender while this table only summarizes participants who reported an industry.

## AVERAGE SALARY wITH \% Of RESPONDENTS BY INDUSTRY TYPE AND SIZE

| INDUSTRY OrgTYPE | Number OF Employees |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $<10$ |  | 11-100 |  | 101-1,000 |  | >1,000 |  | ALL |  |
|  | AVg SAL | \% | Avg SAL | \% | AVg SAL | \% | AVg SAL | \% | AVg SAL | \% |
| Accounting | - | - | 48,714 | 0.1 | - | - | 57,400 | 0.0 | 54,428 | 0.1 |
| A erospace | 49,500 | 0.1 | 52,593 | 0.3 | 52,333 | 0.1 | 65,770 | 1.1 | 61,534 | 1.6 |
| A griculture | 38,200 | 0.0 | 47,800 | 0.1 | 56,800 | 0.0 | 52,111 | 0.1 | 49,034 | 0.3 |
| Applications | 79,000 | 0.0 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 73,777 | 0.1 |
| A rchitecture | 44,666 | 0.1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 42,571 | 0.1 |
| Automotive | 43,400 | 0.0 | 57,125 | 0.1 | 43,888 | 0.1 | 61,250 | 0.2 | 54,619 | 0.4 |
| Banking/ Ins./ Secur | 48,679 | 1.1 | 56,479 | 2.0 | 53,030 | 0.9 | 64,262 | 5.2 | 59,645 | 9.2 |
| Biotech Indust's | 54,800 | 0.0 | 70,800 | 0.0 | - | - | 67,071 | 0.1 | 65,320 | 0.2 |
| Chemical | - | - | - | - | - | - | 81,333 | 0.1 | 71,428 | 0.1 |
| Const/ M ining/ Eng'g | 47,193 | 0.6 | 51,312 | 0.7 | 57,894 | 0.2 | 59,933 | 0.6 | 53,063 | 2.0 |
| Consult'g/ Prof. Svcs | 63,355 | 4.3 | 61,348 | 3.3 | 66,780 | 1.1 | 66,121 | 6.0 | 64,275 | 14.8 |
| Contractor | - | - | 48,454 | 0.1 | 61,727 | 0.1 | 55,454 | 0.1 | 57,750 | 0.3 |
| Direct M ktg \& Sales | - | - | 42,750 | 0.0 | - | - | - | - | 54,000 | 0.1 |
| E-Commerce | 54,250 | 0.0 | 58,750 | 0.0 | - | - | - | - | 56,500 | 0.1 |
| Educ: Commerc/ Trng | 52,375 | 0.2 | 48,300 | 0.2 | 54,000 | 0.0 | 58,842 | 0.2 | 53,102 | 0.6 |
| Educ: Sch'Is/ Coll's | 39,666 | 0.2 | 42,833 | 1.0 | 47,016 | 0.6 | 48,114 | 6.9 | 47,199 | 8.8 |
| Energy | - | - | - | - | - | - | 52,500 | 0.0 | 54,571 | 0.1 |
| Engineering | 48,500 | 0.1 | 55,000 | 0.0 | - | - | 55,714 | 0.1 | 53,000 | 0.2 |
| Entert't and M ktg | 46,600 | 0.1 | 58,608 | 0.2 | 59,250 | 0.1 | 67,336 | 0.4 | 60,859 | 0.8 |
| Financial Indust's | - | - | 44,333 | 0.1 | - | - | 68,818 | 0.1 | 60,526 | 0.2 |
| Food Indust's | - | - | - | - | - | - | 46,500 | 0.0 | 50,200 | 0.1 |
| Govt (Fed): Civilian | 49,516 | 0.3 | 54,457 | 1.0 | 60,666 | 0.4 | 62,525 | 2.4 | 59,462 | 4.1 |
| Govt (Fed): M ilitary | 49,066 | 0.3 | 47,500 | 0.6 | 50,928 | 0.3 | 53,595 | 1.5 | 51,405 | 2.7 |
| Govt State/ Local | 41,103 | 0.3 | 45,034 | 1.4 | 46,813 | 0.6 | 52,420 | 2.1 | 48,596 | 4.3 |
| Health Care | 51,492 | 0.5 | 54,193 | 0.9 | 50,355 | 0.5 | 57,310 | 2.5 | 55,201 | 4.3 |
| Hospitality and Travel | 40,857 | 0.1 | 43,090 | 0.1 | 46,818 | 0.1 | 59,225 | 0.3 | 51,850 | 0.6 |
| ISP | 52,833 | 0.1 | 63,692 | 0.1 | 78,875 | 0.1 | 53,131 | 0.4 | 57,915 | 0.7 |
| IT | 51,214 | 0.1 | 52,285 | 0.1 | 52,000 | 0.1 | 64,083 | 0.2 | 56,796 | 0.5 |
| Insurance | 42,687 | 0.0 | 71,800 | 0.0 | - | - | 69,285 | 0.1 | 63,279 | 0.2 |
| Internet Indust's | 44,000 | 0.1 | 102,750 | 0.0 | - | - | 36,250 | 0.0 | 58,294 | 0.2 |
| Legal/ Real Estate | 43,392 | 0.3 | 58,511 | 0.4 | 60,250 | 0.2 | 62,469 | 0.5 | 57,121 | 1.3 |

## AVERAGE SALARY wITH \% Of Respondents by Industry TYpe and SIze

| INDUSTRY ORGTYPE | Number of Employees |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $<10$ |  | 11-100 |  | 101-1,000 |  | >1,000 |  | ALL |  |
|  | Avg SAL | \% | Avg SAL | \% | Avg SAL | \% | Avg SAL | \% | Avg SAL | \% |
| M fg (computer-related) | 51,734 | 0.9 | 57,387 | 1.1 | 61,071 | 0.5 | 63,489 | 2.6 | 59,871 | 5.1 |
| Mfg (non-comp.-related) | 45,060 | 1.5 | 50,259 | 2.6 | 52,029 | 1.0 | 60,630 | 2.9 | 53,303 | 8.0 |
| Not-For-Profit A ssoc. | 44,161 | 0.8 | 47,463 | 0.5 | 56,607 | 0.3 | 58,379 | 0.3 | 48,945 | 1.8 |
| O il \& Petro Indust's | 56,750 | 0.0 | 51,500 | 0.0 | 47,333 | 0.1 | 66,043 | 0.2 | 60,432 | 0.3 |
| 0 ther | 48,045 | 0.4 | 48,743 | 0.6 | 52,529 | 0.2 | 57,537 | 0.9 | 52,703 | 2.0 |
| O utsource | - | - | - | - | - | - | 51,000 | 0.1 | 53,666 | 0.1 |
| Pharmaceutical | - | - | - | - | - | - | 68,428 | 0.1 | 62,904 | 0.2 |
| Printing | - | - | 45,333 | 0.1 | - | - | - | - | 41,000 | 0.1 |
| Publ/ Adv/ W eb | 51,759 | 0.7 | 55,913 | 0.8 | 69,619 | 0.2 | 60,439 | 0.6 | 56,938 | 2.3 |
| Real Estate | 33,750 | 0.0 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 42,500 | 0.1 |
| Research organization | 56,206 | 0.3 | 62,131 | 0.4 | 60,095 | 0.2 | 70,734 | 0.7 | 64,916 | 1.5 |
| Security Indust's | 85,500 | 0.0 | - | - | 60,833 | 0.1 | 63,000 | 0.0 | 66,937 | 0.1 |
| Software Indust's | 53,023 | 0.8 | 55,438 | 0.7 | 60,043 | 0.2 | 60,921 | 0.6 | 56,504 | 2.3 |
| Sys Integr's \& Vars | 52,488 | 2.0 | 52,038 | 1.5 | 53,808 | 0.3 | 61,626 | 1.7 | 55,255 | 5.5 |
| Telecommunications | 54,356 | 0.7 | 57,250 | 1.1 | 56,784 | 0.5 | 60,396 | 3.4 | 58,737 | 5.7 |
| Transportation | 46,972 | 0.2 | 46,150 | 0.3 | 52,222 | 0.1 | 58,000 | 0.6 | 53,106 | 1.2 |
| Utils: Gas/ Elec/ H20+ | 47,200 | 0.1 | 59,260 | 0.2 | 56,055 | 0.2 | 61,075 | 1.0 | 58,975 | 1.5 |
| W hisle and Retl Trade | 48,482 | 0.5 | 47,408 | 0.7 | 47,156 | 0.3 | 60,771 | 1.1 | 53,144 | 2.6 |
| All | 52,695 | 18.3 | 53,575 | 24.0 | 55,618 | 9.5 | 59,658 | 48.3 | 56,544 | 100.0 |

One pattern of note in this table is that larger employers pay higher salaries, on average.

## 3 h. How Does Job Type Affect Salaries?

One might conjecture that security professionals, those on the leading edge of administrative abilities, could command a higher salary. This table breaks out salary ranges by admin type.

| INCREASES BY SALARY AND ADMIN TYPE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SALARY | DB_ADM $\dagger$ |  | NET_ADM † |  | SEC_ADM $\dagger$ |  | SEC_AUD $\dagger$ |  | SEC_CON † |  | SYS_ADM $\dagger$ |  |
|  | UNIX | NT | UNIX | NT | UNIX | NT | UNIX | NT | UNIX | NT | UNIX | NT |
| 20,000-29,999 | - | - | 6.7 | 3.1 | 2.4 | 1.9 | 1.8 | 2.4 | 1.1 | 1.7 | 6.3 | 2.6 |
| 30,000-39,999 | 10.9 | - | 20.4 | 8.6 | 9.9 | 9.6 | 10.7 | 5.9 | 3.7 | 3.8 | 16.7 | 7.2 |
| 40,000-49,999 | 16.4 | - | 27.1 | 18.3 | 24.2 | 16.7 | 12.4 | 9.4 | 12.2 | 5.1 | 24.4 | 17.2 |
| 50,000-59,999 | 20.0 | - | 19.6 | 21.2 | 17.9 | 20.0 | 16.4 | 16.5 | 12.2 | 12.4 | 20.9 | 20.4 |
| 60,000-69,999 | 16.4 | - | 13.0 | 20.5 | 21.8 | 18.5 | 18.2 | 17.1 | 15.9 | 16.2 | 15.2 | 20.9 |
| 70,000-79,999 | 20.0 | - | 6.0 | 12.9 | 9.5 | 14.4 | 13.8 | 20.0 | 14.7 | 21.4 | 8.5 | 16.0 |
| 80,000-89,999 | - | - | 3.1 | 6.4 | 11.1 | 6.7 | 12.0 | 10.0 | 14.2 | 14.5 | 3.1 | 7.8 |
| 90,000-99,999 | - | - | 0.8 | 3.3 | - | 6.3 | 7.6 | 9.4 | 9.3 | 9.4 | 1.2 | 3.4 |
| 100,000 \& up | - | - | 2.0 | 5.0 | - | 4.1 | 6.7 | 8.8 | 15.0 | 14.1 | 2.1 | 3.9 |
| Average Salary | 56,000 | 54,000 | 49,462 | 59,995 | 56,333 | 60,696 | 64,364 | 68,614 | 73,228 | 74,568 | 51,208 | 61,140 |

$\dagger N$ umbers in this column are percentages of respondents in this column, not of the entire set of respondents.
Consultants report highest earnings (but we didn't ask about expenses; consultants usually pay their own benefits). Security auditors exceed all the other job types by over $10 \%$. Security administrators are higher than their networking and system admin counterparts. Network administrators probably report lower salaries by 10 or $15 \%$ since they entered the field from LAN world.

## 3I. HOW DOes Region Affect SAlARIes?

The cost of living varies across the world. This chart shows how compensation also varies.

| AVERAGE SALARY AND INCREASE BY REGION |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| REGION | NT |  |  | UNIX |  |  |
|  | SALARY | INCREASE \% | \% RESP $\dagger$ | SALARY | INCREASE \% | \% RESP † |
| US-N ortheast | 60,663 | 12.2 | 22.8 | 67,567 | 10.5 | 25.9 |
| US-Southwest | 58,926 | 12.1 | 16.0 | 69,930 | 10.1 | 20.1 |
| Eur: Germ/ Aus/ Swit | 59,187 | 10.9 | 0.6 | 56,500 | 6.7 | 0.6 |
| US-South | 52,975 | 11.8 | 8.2 | 64,546 | 10.7 | 8.4 |
| US-M idwest | 52,669 | 11.8 | 19.0 | 61,490 | 10.0 | 16.8 |
| US-Southeast | 52,751 | 12.0 | 11.8 | 61,562 | 11.3 | 9.7 |
| Hawaii | 50,840 | 15.2 | 0.4 | 60,214 | 8.2 | 0.4 |
| US-N orthwest | 51,398 | 11.1 | 5.7 | 61,342 | 10.3 | 4.5 |
| Eur: UK | 49,841 | 14.0 | 2.2 | 67,930 | 13.2 | 1.4 |
| O ther A sia | 47,611 | 12.4 | 0.5 | 66,400 | 13.4 | 0.5 |
| A laska | 48,576 | 9.8 | 0.4 | 57,857 | 6.5 | 0.2 |
| Eur: Scandinavia/ Benelux | 45,509 | 11.6 | 1.4 | 51,051 | 9.4 | 1.5 |
| A ustralia | 42,844 | 11.2 | 1.6 | 56,720 | 7.6 | 1.4 |
| O ther South Pacific | 45,500 | 20.5 | 0.1 | - | - | - |
| A sia/ India | - | - | - | 42,750 | 26.8 | 0.1 |
| Eur: France | 44,200 | 13.9 | 0.1 | - | - | - |
| Canada - Ontario | 42,788 | 9.8 | 2.3 | 43,055 | 9.2 | 2.3 |
| Middle East | 40,046 | 18.1 | 0.5 | 54,206 | 20.7 | 0.3 |
| Eur: Italy | 46,000 | 12.5 | 0.1 | - | - | - |
| O ther W est. Europe | 41,068 | 18.5 | 0.4 | 43,021 | 18.6 | 0.6 |
| Canada - Q uebec | 39,666 | 10.8 | 1.0 | 42,233 | 11.4 | 0.9 |
| Canada - BC | 37,527 | 9.1 | 1.0 | 42,358 | 4.5 | 1.2 |
| Canada - O ther | 37,429 | 8.3 | 2.0 | 41,976 | 8.2 | 1.4 |
| South A merica | 34,000 | 20.4 | 0.4 | 43,437 | 9.4 | 0.5 |
| 0 ther A frica | 33,750 | 16.7 | 0.1 | - | - | - |
| Central A merica | 33,250 | 14.1 | 0.1 | - | - | - |
| South A frica | 34,918 | 19.9 | 0.3 | 24,333 | 10.0 | 0.2 |
| N ew Zealand | 32,527 | 12.6 | 0.4 | 24,333 | 3.5 | 0.2 |
| M exico | 22,000 | 9.4 | 0.1 | 41,600 | 15.5 | 0.2 |
| Eur: Spain | 20,291 | 13.8 | 0.1 | 33,955 | 15.7 | 0.3 |
| East. Eur. \& Soviet Repb's | 20,416 | 15.2 | 0.2 | 21,111 | 19.4 | 0.3 |

The US-Southwest (including California) and US-Northeast have significantly better payscales than other regions. Of course, they also have higher expenses. Some of the lower-level salaried countries appear to be giving raises to increase their pay levels to match the rest of the world.

## 3J. Do Consultants Make More Than Salaried Employees?

One would imagine that consulting would be more lucrative than being a salaried employee. This chart illuminates that supposition.

| EMPLOYMENT TYPE VS. SALARY FOR NT ADMINS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TYPE |  | ALL |  | MALE |  | FEMALE |  |  |
|  | SALARY | $\%$ | SALARY | $\%$ | SALARY | $\%$ |  |  |
| Contractor | 60,807 | 9.8 | 61,672 | 10.0 | 52,630 | 8.1 |  |  |
| Fulltime consultant | 75,820 | 1.9 | 77,354 | 2.0 | 56,727 | 1.2 |  |  |
| Fulltime employee | 52,524 | 87.3 | 52,709 | 87.0 | 51,148 | 89.0 |  |  |
| Part-time consultant | 47,136 | 0.3 | 37,125 | 0.2 | 73,833 | 0.7 |  |  |
| Part-time employee | 29,000 | 0.4 | 28,892 | 0.4 | 29,600 | 0.6 |  |  |
| Student/ unemployed | 30,291 | 0.3 | 29,100 | 0.3 | 36,250 | 0.4 |  |  |

$\dagger N$ umbers in this column are percentages of respondents in this column, not of the entire set of respondents.

| EMPLOYMENT TYPE VS. SALARY FOR UNIX ADMINS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
| TYPE |  | ALL |  | MALE |  | FEMALE |  |
|  | SALARY | $\%$ | SALARY | $\%$ | SALARY | $\%$ |  |
| Contractor | 70,894 | 11.6 | 71,216 | 12.1 | 67,628 | 8.0 |  |
| Fulltime consultant | 90,526 | 1.7 | 89,629 | 1.8 | 106,666 | 0.7 |  |
| Fullime employee | 61,505 | 85.9 | 61,947 | 85.4 | 58,650 | 89.2 |  |
| Part-time consultant | 57,285 | 0.2 | 63,500 | 0.2 | 20,000 | 0.2 |  |
| Part-time employee | 39,111 | 0.5 | 34,700 | 0.3 | 44,625 | 1.8 |  |
| Student/ unemployed | 22,750 | 0.1 | 22,750 | 0.1 | - | - |  |

$\dagger N$ umbers in this column are percentages of respondents in this column, not of the entire set of respondents.
Unsurprisingly, independent consultants make dramatically more money than their salaried counterparts. Of course, they pay more expenses.

But look at those NT vs. UNIX pay rate gaps. Broken down this way, it appears that NT folks earn an average $\$ 10 \mathrm{~K}$ less per year (except students).

## 3 K. DO Mixed OS Shops Pay More? Give Better Ralses?

As the complexity of an operating environment increases, one could conjecture that the financial reward should also increase.

| SALARY VS. NUMBER OF OS TYPES |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| OS TYPE | NT |  |  |  | UNIX |  |  |
|  | SALARY | INCREASE \% | \% RESP $\dagger$ | SALARY | INCREASE \% | \% RESP $\dagger$ |  |
| 1 | 52,363 | 11.8 | 20.2 | 62,762 | 9.1 | 8.5 |  |
| 2 | 51,567 | 12.0 | 32.2 | 62,120 | 10.2 | 18.4 |  |
| 3 | 53,520 | 12.1 | 25.2 | 62,974 | 9.7 | 24.0 |  |
| 4 | 55,886 | 12.1 | 10.9 | 61,841 | 10.9 | 17.6 |  |
| $\geq 5$ | 60,078 | 11.9 | 11.4 | 64,382 | 11.1 | 31.5 |  |

$\dagger$ Numbers in this column are percentages of respondents in this column, not of the entire set of respondents.
As expected, more complexity is an indicator of higher salaries, especially when one has more than than five different types of systems. This table also highlights the difference in salaries between the two groups. Intriguingly, the difference lessens with environmental complexity.

## 3 L. How Does Level of Education Affect Salaries?

An old adage holds that Masters degrees are financially a big win while one can never earn back enough money to make up for the years lost while in school.

| AVERAGE SALARY VS. EDUCATION FOR NT ADMINS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Educ Level | OVERALL |  |  | Male |  |  | FEMALE |  |  |
|  | SAL | INCR | \% | SAL | INCR | \% † | SAL | INCR | \% $\dagger$ |
| HS | 50,155 | 13.50 | 3.3 | 50,687 | 13.80 | 3.4 | 45,670 | 10.92 | 3.0 |
| Tech/ Trade | 47,210 | 12.30 | 11.6 | 47,471 | 12.33 | 12.1 | 44,125 | 12.01 | 7.8 |
| A ssoc | 49,419 | 11.75 | 11.2 | 50,080 | 12.00 | 10.9 | 45,415 | 10.20 | 13.7 |
| Some College | 50,734 | 12.69 | 20.2 | 51,143 | 12.92 | 20.5 | 47,110 | 10.69 | 17.6 |
| BS | 55,619 | 12.07 | 41.2 | 56,095 | 12.14 | 40.8 | 52,228 | 11.59 | 43.7 |
| M S/ M BA | 63,363 | 9.84 | 11.7 | 63,412 | 9.93 | 11.4 | 63,048 | 9.25 | 13.6 |
| PhD | 70,815 | 9.79 | 0.9 | 69,403 | 9.74 | 0.9 | 87,200 | 10.47 | 0.6 |

$\dagger N$ umbers in this column are percentages of respondents in this column, not of the entire set of respondents.

AVERAGE SALARY VS. EDUCATION FOR UNIX ADMINS

| EDUC LeVEL | OVERALL |  |  | Male |  |  | FEMALE |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | SAL | INCR | \% | SAL | INCR | \% $\dagger$ | SAL | INCR | \% $\dagger$ |
| HS | 55,320 | 13.31 | 2.3 | 54,895 | 13.32 | 2.3 | 58,000 | 13.28 | 2.4 |
| Tech/ Trade | 57,060 | 11.32 | 5.2 | 57,564 | 11.03 | 5.3 | 52,944 | 13.73 | 4.4 |
| Assoc | 59,213 | 10.15 | 7.8 | 59,302 | 10.54 | 7.5 | 58,750 | 8.08 | 9.7 |
| Some College | 61,859 | 11.16 | 17.2 | 62,455 | 11.36 | 17.4 | 57,515 | 9.67 | 16.0 |
| BS | 63,002 | 10.35 | 48.0 | 63,572 | 10.54 | 48.0 | 59,176 | 9.08 | 47.9 |
| MS/ M BA | 68,332 | 9.39 | 17.3 | 69,010 | 9.39 | 17.2 | 63,959 | 9.42 | 17.9 |
| PhD | 69,208 | 8.58 | 2.3 | 70,953 | 8.86 | 2.3 | 53,000 | 5.96 | 1.7 |

$\dagger N$ umbers in this column are percentages of respondents in this column, not of the entire set of respondents.
Regrettably for those with Ph.D.s, it appears that the adage is correct. The Masters degree is a big win for salaries (though not for pay increases). The surprising result in this table is the high salary of the non-college attendees, which goes against conventional wisdom. Windows NT school respondents fare surprisingly poorly in this chart.

The salary gap between NT and UNIX shrinks for ever-increasing levels of education which must therefore be viewed as a sort of equalizer for salaries across different environments.

Maybe experience is causing the effects. Here are two charts that examine that:

| AVERAGE SALARY BY |  | EDUCATION |  | \& EXPERIENCE - NT RESPONDENTS |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | <1 | 1-2 | 3-4 | 5-6 | 7-8 | 9-10 | 11-15 | 16-20 | >20 |
| HS | -- | 38,340 | 46,477 | 53,360 | 57,473 | 53,733 | 64,516 | - | - |
| Tech/ Trade | 33,741 | 36,155 | 45,233 | 50,373 | 55,441 | 57,046 | 55,460 | 49,777 | 68,700 |
| Assoc | 39,416 | 39,830 | 46,379 | 49,287 | 54,423 | 59,259 | 61,383 | 63,333 | 59,000 |
| Some College | 33,931 | 39,226 | 46,566 | 52,267 | 60,074 | 57,983 | 66,939 | 67,133 | 70,000 |
| BS | 43,154 | 44,328 | 50,982 | 55,630 | 62,360 | 62,057 | 70,239 | 73,550 | 75,094 |
| MS/ MBA | 52,000 | 47,555 | 58,305 | 61,729 | 66,757 | 67,646 | 74,852 | 82,421 | 83,476 |
| PhD | - | 48,857 | 59,944 | 68,750 | - | - | 91,727 | - | - |


| AVERAGE SALARY BY EDUCATION \& EXPERIENCE - UNIX RESPON DENTS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $<\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{1 - 2}$ | $\mathbf{3 - 4}$ | $\mathbf{5 - 6}$ | $\mathbf{7 - 8}$ | $\mathbf{9 - 1 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 1 - 1 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 6 - 2 0}$ | $\mathbf{7 2 0}$ |
| HS | -- | 30,771 | 46,800 | 54,000 | 53,600 | 65,625 | 61,562 | - | - |
| Tech/ Trade | - | 42,266 | 46,628 | 57,843 | 55,333 | 62,600 | 70,642 | 67,000 | - |
| Assoc | - | 43,227 | 49,906 | 54,805 | 64,692 | 65,098 | 65,377 | 68,809 | - |
| Some College | - | 45,500 | 51,790 | 60,491 | 63,197 | 74,029 | 71,065 | 68,066 | 70,461 |
| BS | 40,789 | 47,197 | 54,647 | 61,427 | 64,481 | 67,283 | 73,433 | 73,971 | 74,028 |
| MS/MBA | - | 44,035 | 61,720 | 64,112 | 73,720 | 68,860 | 72,558 | 79,250 | 76,807 |
| PhD | - | - | 59,875 | 70,000 | 65,250 | 64,545 | 66,562 | 80,285 | - |

Generally, it appears that both education and longevity pay off.

## 3 M. HOW DO I COMPARE MY SALARY?

Both institutions and employees are understandably interested in ensuring fairness and uniformity in salaries. The temptation to consult overall averages like those shown in table below is almost overwhelming:

| TYPE | SALARIES BY JOB DESCRIPTION |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | NT |  |  | UNIX |  |  |
|  | AVg SAL | INCR \% | \% ReSP $\dagger$ | AVg SAL | INCR \% | \% RESP $\dagger$ |
| SEC_CON | 73,711 | 11.7 | 4.5 | 75,645 | 11.1 | 6.8 |
| SEC_AUD | 64,377 | 9.1 | 2.9 | 68,865 | 10.1 | 5.0 |
| O THER | 63,178 | 11.8 | 11.3 | 69,760 | 11.6 | 8.7 |
| DB_ADM | 56,615 | 12.5 | 0.7 | 54,000 | 6.9 | 0.4 |
| SEC_ADM | 56,797 | 11.7 | 3.4 | 60,808 | 9.1 | 8.1 |
| SYS_ADM | 51,529 | 12.0 | 48.7 | 61,106 | 10.3 | 58.7 |
| NET_ADM | 49,486 | 12.3 | 28.6 | 60,639 | 10.8 | 12.3 |

$\dagger N$ umbers in this column are percentages of respondents in this column, not of the entire set of respondents.

Unfortunately, this table says nothing about experience. Another table can include that data, as well:

| SALARY BY EXPERIENCE AND POSITION: ALL REGIONS - NT ADMINS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| EXPER. | SEC_ADM | NET_ADM | SYS_ADM | SEC_AUD | SEC_CON | DB_ADM | OTHER |
| $<1$ | 37,800 | 36,559 | 36,255 | 50,800 | 43,000 | 46,250 | 50,386 |
| $1-2$ | 46,075 | 39,950 | 41,151 | 44,038 | 46,077 | 41,889 | 45,951 |
| $3-4$ | 51,271 | 46,794 | 48,715 | 60,500 | 69,295 | 53,429 | 54,016 |
| $5-6$ | 59,784 | 50,894 | 53,262 | 64,000 | 67,870 | 62,857 | 60,368 |
| $7-8$ | 60,087 | 56,319 | 59,160 | 61,500 | 76,907 | 59,750 | 72,216 |
| $9-10$ | 62,565 | 59,038 | 58,036 | 69,739 | 73,767 | - | 70,059 |
| $11-15$ | 64,750 | 62,543 | 62,122 | 75,000 | 81,800 | 77,286 | 81,295 |
| $16-20$ | 70,143 | 67,485 | 64,172 | 72,688 | 83,292 | - | 84,688 |
| $\mathbf{> 2 0}$ | 69,778 | 64,875 | 65,813 | 82,000 | 93,500 | - | 79,919 |


| SALARY BY EXPERIENCE AND POSITION: ALL REGIONS - UNIX ADMINS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| EXPER. | SEC_ADM | NET_ADM | SYS_ADM | SEC_AUD | SEC_CON | DB_ADM | OTHER |
| $<1$ | 47,167 | - | 44,846 | 35,400 | - | - | 49,571 |
| $1-2$ | 49,688 | 46,300 | 43,064 | 50,640 | 49,083 | - | 48,944 |
| $3-4$ | 53,003 | 49,229 | 52,299 | 64,240 | 63,735 | - | 61,846 |
| $5-6$ | 58,091 | 56,986 | 59,685 | 68,152 | 75,946 | - | 68,441 |
| $7-8$ | 66,172 | 63,800 | 64,304 | 66,636 | 75,917 | - | 65,333 |
| $9-10$ | 64,152 | 68,678 | 66,200 | 68,300 | 82,951 | - | 70,325 |
| $11-15$ | 71,605 | 68,543 | 68,904 | 76,731 | 84,419 | - | 78,431 |
| $16-20$ | 64,611 | 76,000 | 71,331 | 84,056 | 82,056 | - | 76,920 |
| $>20$ | 86,286 | 62,500 | 66,600 | 78,750 | 77,000 | - | 85,222 |

But, this does not take into account the geographical variations that push New York City salaries into stratosphere while those in Norman, Oklahoma remain a bit more "grounded."

The numbers above are relatively unchanged since last year. Either they must change next year or the numbers in Table 3c must change. People can not spend two years in a position, gain an average of $\$ 12,000$ in raises over that time, and maintain the numbers shown here! It will be interesting to see which numbers change.

The tables below are the most valuable in this publication for ascertaining salary comparisons. They show average salaries by region and job description. Find your region (they are in alphabetical order), and then check the position and experience levels to see the comparable salary. Some regions' tables are sparsely populated or missing completely - because they had too few respondents.

| Experience | SALARY BY EXPERIENCE AND POSITION: ALASKA |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | SEC_ADM |  | NET_ADM |  | SYS_ADM |  | SEC_AUD |  | SEC_CON |  | DB_ADM |  | OTHER |  |
|  | NT | UNIX | NT | UNIX | NT | UNIX | NT | UNIX | NT | UNIX | NT | UNIX | NT | UNIX |
| 3-4 | - | - | 44.2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |


| SALARY BY EXPERIENCE AND POSITION: AUSTRALIA |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Experience | SEC_ADM |  | NET_ADM |  | SYS_ADM |  | SEC_AUD |  | SEC_CON |  | DB_ADM |  | OTHER |  |
|  | NT | UNIX | NT | UNIX | NT | UNIX | NT | UNIX | NT | UNIX | NT | UNIX | NT | UNIX |
| 1-2 | - | - | 34.8 | - | 37.3 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 34.7 | - |
| 3-4 | - | - | 38.3 | - | 44.1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 5-6 | - | - | 47.5 | - | 44.5 | 58.4 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 54.8 | - |
| 7-8 | - | - | - | - | 57.0 | 57.2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 9-10 | - | - | - | - | 51.8 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 11-15 | - | - | - | - | 75.7 | 86.5 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |

SALARY BY EXPERIENCE AND POSITION: CANADA - BC

| EXPerience | SEC_ADM |  | NET_ADM |  | SYS_ADM |  | SEC_AUD |  | SEC_CON |  | DB_ADM |  | OTHER |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | NT | UNIX | NT | UNIX | NT | UNIX | NT | UNIX | NT | UNIX | NT | UNIX | NT | UNIX |
| 1-2 | - | - | 34.8 | - | 34.7 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 3-4 | - | - | 35.0 | - | 39.3 | 41.6 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 5-6 | - | - | 39.8 | - | 40.1 | 38.8 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 9-10 | - | - | - | - | 52.5 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 11-15 | - | - | - | - | 58.8 | 49.4 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |


| SALARY BY EXPERIENCE AND POSITION: CANADA - Ontario |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| experience | SEC_ADM |  | NET_ADM |  | SYS_ADM |  | SEC_AUD |  | SEC_CON |  | DB_ADM |  | OTHER |  |
|  | NT | UNIX | NT | UNIX | NT | UNIX | NT | UNIX | NT | UNIX | NT | UNIX | NT | UNIX |
| <1 | - | - | 37.0 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 1-2 | - | - | 41.6 | - | 37.7 | 41.6 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 3-4 | - | - | 41.8 | 33.0 | 41.1 | 45.0 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 46.6 | - |
| 5-6 | - | - | 42.1 | 46.0 | 50.7 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 7-8 | - | - | 48.2 | - | 48.4 | 55.5 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 9-10 | - | - | 46.3 | - | 61.5 | 49.5 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 11-15 | - | - | - | - | 47.2 | 45.8 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 16-20 | - | - | - | - | - | 59.7 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |


| EXPERIENCE | SALARY BY EXPERIENCE AND |  |  |  |  |  | POSITION: <br> SEC AUD |  | CANADA SEC CON |  | OTHER |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | SEC_ADM |  | NET_ADM |  | SYS_ADM |  |  |  | DB_ADM | OTHER |  |
|  | NT | UNIX | NT | UNIX | NT | UNIX | NT | UNIX |  |  | NT | UNIX | NT | UNIX | NT | UNIX |
| 1-2 | - | - | 34.0 | - | 32.0 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 48.7 | - |
| 3-4 | - | - | 47.3 | - | 37.0 | 34.8 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 43.0 | - |
| 5-6 | - | - | 42.3 | - | 43.0 | 45.4 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 7-8 | - | - | 46.5 | - | 48.7 | 50.0 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 52.5 | - |
| 9-10 | - | - | - | - | 45.2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 11-15 | - | - | 48.0 | - | 48.5 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |


| Experience | SALARY B |  |  | EXPE | ENC | AND | Pos | ION: | CAN | DA - | U |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | SEC_ADM |  | NET_ADM |  | SYS_ADM |  | SEC_AUD |  | SEC_CON |  | DB_ADM |  | OTHER |  |
|  | NT | UNIX | NT | UNIX | NT | UNIX | NT | UNIX | NT | UNIX | NT | UNIX | NT | UNIX |
| 1-2 | - | - | - | - | 36.6 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 3-4 | - | - | 34.4 | - | 38.0 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 5-6 | - | - | - | - | 50.6 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 11-15 | - | - | - | - | 49.0 | 63.0 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |

SALARY BY EXPERIENCE AND POSITION: EUR: GERM/ AUS/ SWITZ

| experience | SEC_ADM |  | NET_ADM |  | SYS_ADM |  | SEC_AUD |  | SEC_CON |  | DB_ADM |  | OTHER |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | NT | UNIX | NT | UNIX | NT | UNIX | NT | UNIX | NT | UNIX | NT | UNIX | NT | UNIX |
| 1-2 | - | - | 47.7 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 3-4 | - | - | - | - | 50.5 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 5-6 | - | - | - | - | 64.8 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 7-8 | - | - | - | - | - | 58.5 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |

SALARY BY EXPERIENCE AND POSItION: EUR: SCANDINAVIA/ BENELUX

| Experience | SALARY BY |  | EXPERIENCE AND POSITION: EUR: |  |  |  |  |  | Scandinavia/ Benelux |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | SEC_ADM |  | NET_ADM |  | SYS_ADM |  | SEC_AUD |  | SEC_CON |  | DB_ADM |  | OTHER |  |
|  | NT | UNIX | NT | UNIX | NT | UNIX | NT | UNIX | NT | UNIX | NT | UNIX | NT | UNIX |
| 1-2 | - | - | 46.7 | - | 36.7 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 3-4 | - | - | 41.8 | - | 45.0 | 44.8 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 5-6 | - | - | - | - | 45.5 | 45.5 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 7-8 | - | - | - | - | 60.2 | 59.0 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 9-10 | - | - | - | - | 53.5 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |

SALARY BY EXPERIENCE AND POSITION: EUR: UK

| Experience | SEC_ADM |  | NET_ADM |  | SYS_ADM |  | SEC_AUD |  | SEC_CON |  | DB_ADM |  | OTHER |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | NT | UNIX | NT | UNIX | NT | UNIX | NT | UNIX | NT | UNIX | NT | UNIX | NT | UNIX |
| <1 | - | - | - | - | 32.5 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 1-2 | - | - | 40.5 | - | 39.7 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 48.6 | - |
| 3-4 | - | - | 45.2 | - | 50.6 | 61.5 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 5-6 | - | - | 54.8 | - | 64.6 | 76.2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 58.8 | - |
| 7-8 | - | - | - | - | 63.1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 9-10 | - | - | - | - | 57.2 | 87.5 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 11-15 | - | - | - | - | 75.8 | 72.0 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 114.5 | - |


| EXPERIENCE | SALARY BY |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { EXPERIENCE } \\ & \text { SYS_ADM } \end{aligned}$ |  | AND POSI SEC AUD |  | ON | HAW |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | SEC_ADM |  | NEt_ADM |  |  |  | SEC_CON | DB_ADM |  | OTHER |  |
|  | NT | UNIX | NT | UNIX | NT | UNIX |  |  | NT | UNIX | NT | UNIX | NT | UNIX | NT | UNIX |
| 3-4 | - | - | - | - | 42.5 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 11-15 | - | - | - | - | - | 69.2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |

SALARY BY EXPERIENCE AND POSITION: MIDDLE EAST

| EXPERIENCE | SEC_ADM |  | NET_ADM |  | SYS_ADM |  | SEC_AUD |  | SEC_CON |  | DB_ADM |  | OTHER |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | NT | UNIX | NT | UNIX | NT | UNIX | NT | UNIX | NT | UNIX | NT | UNIX | NT | UNIX |
| 5-6 | - | - | - | - | 44.9 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |


| Salary by Experience and Position: New Zealand |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| EXPERIENCE | SEC_ADM |  | NET_ADM |  | SYS_ADM |  | SEC_AUD |  | SEC_CON |  | DB_ADM |  | OTHER |  |
|  | NT | UNIX | NT | UNIX | NT | UNIX | NT | UNIX | NT | UNIX | NT | UNIX | NT | UNIX |
| 1-2 | - | - | - | - | 26.0 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |


| SALARY BY EXPERIENCE AND POSITION: OTHER ASIA |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| EXPERIENCE | SEC_ADM |  | NET_ADM |  | SYS_ADM |  | SEC_AUD |  | SEC_CON |  | DB_ADM |  | OTHER |  |
|  | NT | UNIX | NT | UNIX | NT | UNIX | NT | UNIX | NT | UNIX | NT | UNIX | NT | UNIX |
| 1-2 | - | - | - | - | 44.0 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 3-4 | - | - | - | - | 52.6 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |


| Experience | SALARY |  | BY EXPERIENCE ANDNET ADM SYS ADM |  |  |  | SI | N: | HER | Wes | EU | PE |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | SEC_ADM |  |  |  |  |  | SEC_AUD |  | SEC_CON |  | DB_ADM |  | OTHER |  |
|  | NT | UNIX | NT | UNIX | NT | UNIX | NT | UNIX | NT | UNIX | NT | UNIX | NT | UNIX |
| 1-2 | - | - | - | - | 33.4 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 3-4 | - | - | - | - | 41.8 | 35.8 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 5-6 | - | - | - | - | 43.5 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |


| SALARY BY EXPERIENCE AND POSITION: SOUTH AMERICA |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| EXPerience | SEC_ADM |  | NET_ADM |  | SYS_ADM |  | SEC_AUD |  | SEC_CON |  | DB_ADM |  | OTHER |  |
|  | NT | UNIX | NT | UNIX | NT | UNIX | NT | UNIX | NT | UNIX | NT | UNIX | NT | UNIX |
| 3-4 | - | - | - | - | 32.4 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |


| SALARY BY EXPERIENCE AND POSITION: US-MIDWEST |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Experience | SEC_ADM |  | NET_ADM |  | SYS_ADM |  | SEC_AUD |  | SEC_CON |  | DB_ADM |  | OTHER |  |
|  | NT | UNIX | NT | UNIX | NT | UNIX | NT | UNIX | NT | UNIX | NT | UNIX | NT | UNIX |
| <1 | - | - | 41.7 | - | 48.8 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 47.7 | 49.5 |
| 1-2 | 45.4 | - | 45.0 | - | 47.8 | 48.5 | 54.7 | - | - | - | - | - | 54.1 | 49.4 |
| 3-4 | 64.0 | 58.8 | 50.7 | 55.6 | 53.1 | 57.6 | 61.6 | 74.8 | 76.7 | 74.6 | 58.0 | - | 56.7 | 66.2 |
| 5-6 | 52.2 | 60.2 | 55.3 | 65.5 | 57.1 | 63.7 | 70.0 | 71.4 | 75.1 | 76.4 | - | - | 62.0 | 82.0 |
| 7-8 | 66.5 | - | 60.1 | 67.3 | 65.2 | 66.2 | - | - | 83.6 | - | - | - | 70.3 | - |
| 9-10 | 61.5 | 63.6 | 64.7 | 64.0 | 66.5 | 70.3 | 87.0 | 74.0 | 69.5 | 80.2 | - | - | 80.2 | 73.6 |
| 11-15 | 70.8 | 69.5 | 66.2 | 67.2 | 60.8 | 74.0 | 77.8 | - | 90.3 | 106.2 | - | - | 81.0 | - |
| 16-20 | - | 66.2 | 57.8 | 88.6 | 62.2 | 74.5 | - | - | 84.0 | - | - | - | - | 75.7 |
| $>20$ | - | - | - | - | 68.4 | 76.0 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 79.0 | - |


| SALARY BY EXPERIENCE AND POSITION: US-NORTHEAST |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| EXPERIENCE | SEC_ADM |  | NET_ADM |  | SYS_ADM |  | SEC_AUD |  | SEC_CON |  | DB_ADM |  | OTHER |  |
|  | NT | UNIX | NT | UNIX | NT | UNIX | NT | UNIX | NT | UNIX | NT | UNIX | NT | UNIX |
| <1 | - | - | 46.3 | - | 40.9 | 51.2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 65.1 | - |
| 1-2 | 54.6 | 60.5 | 49.3 | - | 50.5 | 54.1 | 54.5 | - | 57.1 | 54.7 | - | - | 57.7 | - |
| 3-4 | 60.4 | 64.2 | 58.9 | 53.6 | 61.1 | 61.3 | 75.3 | 71.0 | 81.8 | 66.6 | - | - | 62.7 | 68.6 |
| 5-6 | 66.0 | 75.1 | 62.3 | 71.9 | 63.1 | 65.1 | 81.5 | 81.8 | 72.0 | 88.0 | - | - | 73.3 | 77.6 |
| 7-8 | 82.0 | 60.6 | 69.3 | 67.4 | 68.0 | 73.8 | 73.6 | - | 84.3 | 89.8 | - | - | 89.6 | 84.8 |
| 9-10 | 70.0 | 74.2 | 67.0 | 82.6 | 67.4 | 73.3 | 86.0 | 95.0 | 88.8 | 91.9 | - | - | 82.9 | 77.8 |
| 11-15 | 87.2 | 74.9 | 74.9 | 81.8 | 75.6 | 76.9 | 102.6 | 94.2 | 89.1 | 89.0 | - | - | 95.4 | 78.5 |
| 16-20 | 75.7 | 67.7 | 65.8 | - | 73.4 | 80.0 | 97.0 | 99.4 | 99.3 | 99.0 | - | - | 93.9 | 78.4 |
| $>20$ | - | 99.8 | - | - | 70.9 | 75.2 | 98.4 | - | 105.4 | 93.6 | - | - | 80.3 | 102.3 |

SALARY BY EXPERIENCE AND POSITION: US-NORTHWEST

| experience | SEC_ADM |  | NET_ADM |  | SYS_ADM |  | SEC_AUD |  | SEC_CON |  | DB_ADM |  | OTHER |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | NT | UNIX | NT | UNIX | NT | UNIX | NT | UNIX | NT | UNIX | NT | UNIX | NT | UNIX |
| <1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 46.0 | - |
| 1-2 | - | - | 42.8 | - | 45.6 | 52.0 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 60.8 | - |
| 3-4 | - | - | 50.3 | - | 51.5 | 62.3 | - | - | 72.0 | 67.0 | - | - | 53.8 | - |
| 5-6 | 65.7 | - | 52.0 | 61.6 | 56.3 | 59.2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 66.5 | - |
| 7-8 | 52.7 | - | 59.2 | 73.2 | 64.9 | 68.0 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 9-10 | - | - | 60.3 | - | 57.9 | 68.6 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 76.5 | - |
| 11-15 | - | - | 67.6 | 64.5 | 59.6 | 70.0 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 76.0 | - |
| 16-20 | - | - | - | - | 69.2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| $>20$ | - | - | - | - | 70.7 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |

SALARY BY EXPERIENCE AND POSITION: US-SOUTH

| experience | SEC_ADM |  | NET_ADM |  | SYS_ADM |  | SEC_AUD |  | SEC_CON |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | DB_ADM | OTHER |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | NT | UNIX |  |  | NT | UNIX | NT | UNIX | NT | UNIX | NT | UNIX | NT | UNIX | NT | UNIX |
| <1 | - | - | 42.0 | - |  |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 1-2 | - | 52.2 | 43.2 | 46.2 | 46.9 | 44.5 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 44.8 | - |
| 3-4 | 52.6 | - | 49.4 | 50.8 | 53.9 | 56.7 | - | - | 80.5 | 74.2 | - | - | 49.8 | - |
| 5-6 | - | - | 54.3 | 67.8 | 58.8 | 67.1 | 61.6 | - | 84.1 | 90.4 | - | - | 53.9 | 70.7 |
| 7-8 | 61.5 | - | 62.7 | 71.6 | 68.9 | 70.5 | - | - | 86.0 | - | - | - | 74.6 | 80.5 |
| 9-10 | 79.0 | - | 58.3 | 81.7 | 64.5 | 74.1 | - | - | - | 92.8 | - | - | 73.8 | - |
| 11-15 | - | 69.7 | 67.7 | - | 63.2 | 76.5 | - | - | 80.5 | - | - | - | 78.5 | - |
| 16-20 | - | - | 73.5 | - | - | 74.9 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 98.5 |
| $>20$ | - | - | - | - | 72.7 | 81.2 | - | - | 73.5 | - | - | - | 81.4 | - |

SALARY BY EXPERIENCE AND POSITION: US-SOUTHEAST

| EXPERIENCE | SEC_ADM |  | RY | EX | IEN | CE AN | Po | TIO |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | NET_ADM |  | SYS_ADM |  | SEC_AUD |  | SEC_CON |  | DB_ADM |  | OTHER |  |
|  | NT | UNIX | NT | UNIX | NT | UNIX | NT | UNIX | NT | UNIX | NT | UNIX | NT | UNIX |
| <1 | - | - | 38.6 | - | 43.6 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 66.8 | - |
| 1-2 | 46.2 | 58.2 | 46.3 | - | 48.5 | 45.0 | 42.0 | - | - | - | - | - | 43.0 | - |
| 3-4 | 68.5 | 63.0 | 52.4 | 56.2 | 53.5 | 55.6 | 59.1 | - | 72.9 | - | - | - | 72.8 | - |
| 5-6 | - | - | 56.2 | - | 56.4 | 62.5 | 60.7 | - | 76.5 | - | - | - | 74.0 | - |
| 7-8 | - | 75.0 | 53.9 | 63.8 | 59.9 | 70.3 | - | - | 65.0 | 84.8 | - | - | 76.1 | 53.4 |
| 9-10 | - | 59.0 | 61.4 | 75.5 | 58.3 | 69.6 | 58.5 | - | - | 82.6 | - | - | 75.1 | - |
| 11-15 | 66.0 | 83.5 | 62.0 | 71.0 | 64.8 | 67.9 | - | - | 85.2 | - | - | - | 81.1 | 86.1 |
| 16-20 | - | - | 69.2 | - | 62.2 | 81.8 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 88.2 | - |
| >20 | - | - | - | - | 58.2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 92.7 | - |

SALARY BY EXPERIENCE AND POSITION: US-SOUTHWEST

| EXPERIENCE | SEC_ADM |  | NET_ADM |  | SYS_ADM |  | SEC_AUD |  | SEC_CON |  | DB_ADM |  | OTHER |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | NT | UNIX | NT | UNIX | NT | UNIX | NT | UNIX | NT | UNIX | NT | UNIX | NT | UNIX |
| <1 | - | - | 44.3 | - | 50.6 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 47.0 | - |
| 1-2 | 57.5 | 60.0 | 46.2 | - | 51.2 | 49.6 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 63.5 | - |
| 3-4 | 56.0 | 69.5 | 53.1 | 63.5 | 57.2 | 63.2 | 73.8 | 78.1 | 85.0 | - | - | - | 66.8 | 79.0 |
| 5-6 | - | 77.8 | 61.1 | 68.2 | 63.1 | 70.9 | - | 81.0 | - | 79.4 | - | - | 70.7 | 92.3 |
| 7-8 | - | 83.3 | 62.7 | 76.9 | 69.0 | 75.8 | 66.7 | - | 88.2 | - | - | - | 76.2 | - |
| 9-10 | - | 82.0 | 75.3 | 78.2 | 67.8 | 78.0 | 80.5 | - | 70.7 | 108.2 | - | - | 88.6 | 75.7 |
| 11-15 | 72.0 | 94.1 | 70.4 | 74.6 | 75.5 | 81.8 | - | 69.5 | 89.4 | 81.2 | - | - | 92.5 | 102.1 |
| 16-20 | - | - | 76.4 | 82.2 | 77.5 | 80.3 | - | 84.1 | - | - | - | - | 91.7 | 90.0 |
| $>20$ | 73.5 | - | - | - | 90.2 | 72.5 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 93.8 | 93.5 |

## 3 n. HOW DOES MANAGEMENT RESPONSIBILITY AFFECT SALARIES?

Supervising subordinates has long been a means to increase one's salary. This table examines that hypothesis.

SUBORDINATES VS. SALARY AND INCREASE

| SUBORDS | NT |  |  | UNIX |  |  |
| :---: | ---: | :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | SALARY | INCR \% | \% RESP $\dagger$ | SALARY | INCR \% $\%$ RESP $\dagger ~$ |  |
| 0 | 50,495 | 11.7 | 51.7 | 60,696 | 10.3 | 54.5 |
| 1 | 50,174 | 11.8 | 11.7 | 57,941 | 9.8 | 8.8 |
| 2 | 53,695 | 13.0 | 10.1 | 61,097 | 10.5 | 8.6 |
| 3 | 56,200 | 12.4 | 6.8 | 64,857 | 10.9 | 6.3 |
| 4 | 59,099 | 12.1 | 4.8 | 69,673 | 9.9 | 4.4 |
| 5 | 60,961 | 12.7 | 4.7 | 68,145 | 11.8 | 5.0 |
| 6 | 65,267 | 12.2 | 2.1 | 69,623 | 10.3 | 2.5 |
| 7 | 65,558 | 11.2 | 1.2 | 72,666 | 8.7 | 1.2 |
| 8 | 66,725 | 13.7 | 1.2 | 71,226 | 8.1 | 1.5 |
| 9 | 64,650 | 7.7 | 0.6 | 74,233 | 12.7 | 1.0 |
| $\geq 10$ | 72,408 | 11.5 | 5.2 | 76,437 | 10.0 | 6.1 |

Those with no subordinates include consultants and experienced technical wizards, so that pushes the average up. Note that management responsibility does not reduce the salary gap between the two groups. Each supervised subordinate seems to add substantially to the pay rate (though this table does not account for experience).

## 30. IS There A Gender Gap in Salaries or Pay Increases?

The notion of a "pink ceiling" for salaries has long been debated. This table examines the assertion that women with more than five years of experience can not move up past a certain point in salary.

| Years | ALL |  | Male |  | FEMALE |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Avg SAL | \% | AVg SAL | \% $\dagger$ | Avg SAL | \% $\dagger$ |
| <1 | 39,094 | 3.5 | 38,980 | 3.2 | 39,641 | 5.2 |
| 1-2 | 41,335 | 17.8 | 41,262 | 17.6 | 41,838 | 19.3 |
| 3-4 | 49,550 | 27.9 | 49,547 | 28.1 | 49,576 | 26.3 |
| 5-6 | 54,573 | 18.9 | 55,020 | 19.1 | 50,857 | 17.5 |
| 7-8 | 60,969 | 10.2 | 61,968 | 10.3 | 52,931 | 9.8 |
| 9-10 | 61,471 | 8.6 | 61,737 | 8.7 | 59,202 | 7.7 |
| 11-15 | 68,299 | 8.6 | 68,705 | 8.5 | 65,463 | 9.3 |
| 16-20 | 71,894 | 2.5 | 72,168 | 2.4 | 70,433 | 3.4 |
| >20 | 77,025 | 2.0 | 78,139 | 2.1 | 65,642 | 1.6 |

$\dagger$ Numbers in this column are percentages of respondents in this column, not of the entire set of respondents.

| Years | ALL |  | Male |  | FEMALE |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Avg SAL | \% | AVg SAL | \% $\dagger$ | Avg SAL | \% † |
| <1 | 43,180 | 1.5 | 41,694 | 1.2 | 47,000 | 3.2 |
| 1-2 | 45,786 | 7.9 | 45,575 | 7.7 | 46,921 | 9.6 |
| 3-4 | 54,421 | 19.2 | 54,423 | 19.3 | 54,407 | 18.1 |
| 5-6 | 60,923 | 18.6 | 60,973 | 19.2 | 60,476 | 14.4 |
| 7-8 | 65,141 | 12.5 | 65,792 | 12.8 | 60,062 | 11.0 |
| 9-10 | 68,841 | 13.8 | 69,721 | 13.8 | 62,983 | 14.0 |
| 11-15 | 71,746 | 17.3 | 73,367 | 16.8 | 62,866 | 20.6 |
| 16-20 | 73,666 | 6.7 | 74,369 | 6.5 | 69,575 | 7.6 |
| >20 | 74,406 | 2.5 | 74,200 | 2.7 | 77,166 | 1.4 |

$\dagger \mathrm{N}$ umbers in this column are percentages of respondents in this column, not of the entire set of respondents.
These two tables suggest that female respondents are keeping up in salaries for the first four years of an administrative career but then tend to fall behind.

## 3 P. DO Different AdMin Types Get Higher RAlses?

Are Security Administrators moving up the pay scale more rapidly than other administrators? This chart answers this and other questions.

| SALARY | IN CREASES |  | BY SALARY SYS_ADM |  | AND ADMIN NET ADM |  | TYPE - NT ADMINS |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | SEC_CON |  |  |  | DB_ADM | SEC_ADM |  | SEC_AUD |  |
|  | INCR | \% † | INCR | \% † |  |  | INCR | \% $\dagger$ | INCR | \% $\dagger$ | INCR | \% $\dagger$ | INCR | \% $\dagger$ |
| <20,000 | 10.0 | 0.3 | 12.9 | 1.1 | 8.3 | 1.0 | 5.6 | 1.9 | 36.9 | 1.7 | 0.0 | 0.5 |
| 20,000-29,999 | 16.2 | 1.3 | 11.5 | 5.9 | 11.1 | 6.2 | 10.4 | 3.8 | 11.4 | 2.5 | 20.0 | 1.9 |
| 30,000-39,999 | 11.9 | 3.8 | 11.2 | 16.5 | 11.5 | 20.4 | 19.4 | 11.5 | 13.8 | 9.1 | 9.6 | 10.6 |
| 40,000-49,999 | 11.8 | 11.9 | 11.7 | 24.8 | 12.8 | 27.8 | 10.4 | 15.4 | 10.1 | 23.7 | 11.4 | 12.6 |
| 50,000-59,999 | 10.3 | 12.5 | 11.9 | 21.4 | 12.4 | 20.0 | 10.3 | 21.2 | 10.1 | 18.3 | 8.5 | 15.5 |
| 60,000-69,999 | 11.7 | 16.6 | 13.0 | 15.5 | 12.1 | 13.1 | 8.2 | 17.3 | 12.1 | 21.6 | 9.5 | 19.3 |
| 70,000-79,999 | 14.7 | 14.7 | 11.9 | 8.5 | 13.1 | 6.2 | 15.6 | 21.2 | 10.9 | 10.0 | 8.1 | 13.5 |
| 80,000-89,999 | 10.6 | 14.4 | 11.9 | 3.2 | 11.9 | 2.9 | 6.0 | 3.8 | 11.4 | 11.6 | 8.2 | 11.6 |
| 90,000-99,999 | 10.0 | 9.7 | 13.6 | 1.2 | 14.5 | 0.7 | - | - | 8.1 | 0.8 | 9.7 | 7.2 |
| 100,000 and up | 11.3 | 14.7 | 16.2 | 1.9 | 17.9 | 1.7 | 25.9 | 3.8 | 29.3 | 0.8 | 5.6 | 7.2 |
| AL | 11.7 | 100.0 | 12.0 | 100.0 | 12.3 | 100.0 | 12.5 | 100.0 | 11.7 | 100.0 | 9.1 | 100.0 |

$\dagger N$ umbers in this column are percentages of respondents in this column, not of the entire set of respondents.

| SALARY | INCREASES B |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SALARY A } \\ & \text { SYS_ADM } \end{aligned}$ |  | ND ADMIN <br> NET_ADM |  | YPE - UNIX ADMINS |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | SEC_CON |  |  |  | DB_ADM | SEC_ADM |  | SEC_AUD |  |
|  | INCR | \% $\dagger$ | INCR | \% ¢ |  |  | INCR | \% ¢ | INCR | \% † | INCR | \% † | INCR | \% $\dagger$ |
| <20,000 | 9.1 | 0.5 | 50.0 | 0.3 | 12.8 | 0.7 | 0.0 | 8.3 | 0.0 | 0.6 | 18.8 | 1.5 |
| 20,000-29,999 | 10.0 | 0.5 | 9.6 | 3.0 | 9.2 | 2.2 | - | - | 10.4 | 2.5 | 21.5 | 1.5 |
| 30,000-39,999 | 12.5 | 4.1 | 10.1 | 8.1 | 10.3 | 7.2 | 0.0 | 8.3 | 7.8 | 5.0 | 10.3 | 10.0 |
| 40,000-49,999 | 15.3 | 5.5 | 11.0 | 18.7 | 9.6 | 17.1 | 13.4 | 16.7 | 12.2 | 9.4 | 9.0 | 16.2 |
| 50,000-59,999 | 10.8 | 12.7 | 7.9 | 20.7 | 9.7 | 20.3 | 8.4 | 25.0 | 8.6 | 16.2 | 8.7 | 20.4 |
| 60,000-69,999 | 13.1 | 16.8 | 11.1 | 20.5 | 10.4 | 21.3 | 6.4 | 16.7 | 9.8 | 18.1 | 8.8 | 19.2 |
| 70,000-79,999 | 8.7 | 21.4 | 13.1 | 13.6 | 10.4 | 16.2 | 4.5 | 16.7 | 11.0 | 20.0 | 8.9 | 14.6 |
| 80,000-89,999 | 11.9 | 14.5 | 11.5 | 6.6 | 10.8 | 8.1 | 9.6 | 8.3 | 7.1 | 10.0 | 5.9 | 6.5 |
| 90,000-99,999 | 7.6 | 9.5 | 9.0 | 3.5 | 10.3 | 3.4 | - | - | 9.3 | 9.4 | 8.9 | 6.5 |
| 100,000 and up | 12.4 | 14.5 | 13.8 | 5.1 | 14.0 | 3.4 | - | - | 15.3 | 8.8 | 9.0 | 3.5 |
| AL | 11.1 | 100.0 | 10.8 | 100.0 | 10.3 | 100.0 | 6.9 | 100.0 | 10.1 | 100.0 | 9.1 | 100.0 |

$\dagger N$ umbers in this column are percentages of respondents in this column, not of the entire set of respondents.
The counterintuitive result from this chart is that those few who are high up on the pay scale are increasing their pay at a higher rate than almost anyone else. This might be due to the scarcity of consultants or maybe to companies trying to keep their highly paid ("best"?) employees. Some other factor might also be operating.

## 4. Interesting Findings

## 4 a. Are SAGE Job Classifications Correlated with Salary?

| CLASS | \% NT | \% UNIX |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| N ovice | 3.7 | 2.3 |
| Junior | 38.5 | 28.3 |
| Senior | 57.8 | 69.4 |

Respondents classified themselves according to SAGE's system administrator classification system:

Their reported salaries broke down like this:

| Years | Novice |  | Junior |  | SEnIor |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | SAL | INCR \% | SAL | INCR \% | SAL | INCR \% |
| <1 | 35,153 | 12.9 | 38,410 | 14.1 | 53,501 | 18.4 |
| 1-2 | 36,065 | 13.4 | 40,149 | 14.2 | 47,120 | 14.9 |
| 3-4 | 41,304 | 12.9 | 44,914 | 13.0 | 54,445 | 14.7 |
| 5-6 | 42,856 | 11.4 | 47,235 | 11.1 | 58,028 | 11.3 |
| 7-8 | 42,000 | 11.8 | 51,245 | 9.8 | 63,958 | 10.9 |
| 9-10 | - | - | 52,769 | 8.1 | 63,036 | 9.2 |
| 11-15 | - | - | 52,449 | 7.3 | 70,179 | 9.2 |
| 16-20 | - | - | 57,538 | 7.5 | 73,150 | 7.9 |
| >20 | - | - | 52,063 | 6.4 | 78,895 | 6.8 |

## COMPARATIVE PAYRATES FOR SAGE CATS FOR NT UNIX

| YeARS | NOVICE |  | JUNIOR |  | SENIOR |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | SAL | INCR \% | SAL | INCR \% | SAL | INCR \% |
| $<1$ | 39,286 | 19.0 | 46,111 | 9.1 | - | - |
| $1-2$ | 42,762 | 18.5 | 42,087 | 13.8 | 55,000 | 12.6 |
| $3-4$ | 45,692 | 18.8 | 49,462 | 12.5 | 58,975 | 13.6 |
| $5-6$ | - | - | 52,569 | 9.9 | 64,788 | 11.5 |
| $7-8$ | - | - | 56,202 | 8.7 | 67,654 | 11.0 |
| $9-10$ | - | - | 57,766 | 6.7 | 70,295 | 9.6 |
| $11-15$ | - | - | 59,680 | 7.1 | 72,642 | 8.6 |
| $16-20$ | - | - | 57,615 | 6.2 | 75,436 | 6.6 |
| $>20$ | - | - | 62,625 | 3.0 | 75,692 | 5.9 |

The progression of increasing salaries across the self-identified categories is quite amazing.
Likewise, the salary compression for those with more experience is shown strongly by this table.

4 b. HOW MANY HOURS DO ADMINISTRATORS WORK EACH WeEK? DO LONGER-WORKER ADMINS GET BIGGER RAISES?

Computer professionals are always rumored to be long on time commitment. And maybe all that hard work pays off in bigger raises. This chart tests that idea.

| HOURS WORKED PER WEEK |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Hours | NT |  | UNIX |  |
| PER WEEK | INCREASE | \% RESP $\dagger$ | INCREASE | \% RESP $\dagger$ |
| $<30$ | 10.12 | 0.3 | 23.59 | 0.2 |
| $30-39.99$ | 10.51 | 3.7 | 8.93 | 3.4 |
| $40-44.99$ | 11.25 | 29.6 | 9.70 | 30.5 |
| $45-49.99$ | 11.69 | 27.3 | 9.84 | 27.3 |
| $50-54.99$ | 12.47 | 24.0 | 10.85 | 23.5 |
| $55-59.99$ | 13.12 | 7.2 | 12.07 | 7.2 |
| $\geq 60$ | 13.82 | 7.9 | 11.16 | 7.8 |

$\dagger N$ umbers in this column are percentages of respondents in this column, not of the entire set of respondents.

The average hours per week over all respondents comes to 46.850. NT Admins average 46.89 hours per week; the UNIX Admins average 46.76 .

More than two thirds of the respondents work 45 or more hours per week. About $39 \%$ work 50 hours or more per week. About one in twelve reports working sixty or more hours per week. Part-time factors are at work in the higher increase for the works of less than 30 hours.

Those who work more than 55 hours - over $15 \%$ of respondents - did better for raises. This is a huge commitment, of course, to get a 1-2\% higher raise (which works out to $\$ 800$ per year or so).

## 4 C. DO PEOPLE WITH MORE SYSTEMS WORK MORE HOURS?

Maybe all that hard work is due to site complexity. This graph checks that assertion.

| HoURS/ WEEK BY NUMBER OF SYSTEMS |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | NT |  | UNIX |  |
|  | Hours/ WK | \% Resp | Hours/ WK | \% Resp |
| 1 | 45.8 | 20.3 | 45.4 | 8.2 |
| 2 | 46.3 | 32.2 | 45.0 | 18.4 |
| 3 | 47.3 | 25.3 | 46.8 | 24.4 |
| 4 | 48.1 | 11.1 | 46.7 | 18.0 |
| 5 or more | 49.0 | 11.1 | 48.3 | 31.0 |
| All | $\mathbf{4 7 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{4 6 . 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

While 46.9 hours is the overall average (same as last year), added complexity apparently results in more work hours.

## 4d. Do Men Work More Hours On Average Than Women?

Years ago, there was a notion that women were simply not as dedicated to computer careers as their male counterparts. This chart looks at the data submitted to see if that notion holds water.

| Hours Per Week vs. Gender |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Hours | NT |  | UNIX |  |
| Per Week | \% MALE $\dagger$ | \% FEMALE † | \% MALE † | \% FEMALE ¢ |
| <30 | 0.3 | 0.5 | 0.2 | 0.3 |
| 30-39.99 | 3.6 | 5.0 | 3.5 | 3.4 |
| 40-44.99 | 28.5 | 36.9 | 30.3 | 33.2 |
| 45-49.99 | 27.3 | 25.2 | 26.4 | 29.5 |
| 50-54.99 | 24.4 | 21.6 | 23.8 | 20.0 |
| 55-59.99 | 7.5 | 5.7 | 7.4 | 7.4 |
| $\geq 60$ | 5.0 | 0.0 | 6.3 | 0.0 |

The differences are fairly minimal, though men tend to be better represented than women in the higher parts of the distribution.
$\dagger N$ umbers in this column are percentages of respondents in this column, not of the entire set of respondents.

## 4 e. DO DIfferent Job DesCriptions HaVe Different Vacations?

It appears that three weeks is the norm for vacation.

| VACATION VS. JOB DESCRIPTION |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| JOB | AVG. VAC.WEEKS |
| DB_ADM | 3.0 |
| NET_ADM | 2.6 |
| SEC_ADM | 3.1 |
| SEC_AUD | 3.4 |
| SEC_CON | 3.0 |
| SYS_ADM | 2.8 |

Network administrators seem to be getting the short end of the vacation stick. Consider the average vacation reported when broken down by job description and experience.

| VACATION WEEKS, \% |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| EXP. | DB_ADM | NET_ADM | SEC_ADM | SEC_AUD | SEC_CON | SYS_ADM |
| $<1$ | 2.0 | 2.1 | 2.6 | 2.8 | 2.8 | 2.3 |
| $1-2$ | 3.3 | 2.3 | 2.9 | 3.2 | 3.1 | 2.5 |
| $3-4$ | 2.9 | 2.6 | 3.0 | 3.2 | 3.0 | 2.7 |
| $5-6$ | 3.4 | 2.6 | 3.2 | 3.4 | 2.7 | 2.8 |
| $7-8$ | 3.0 | 2.7 | 3.3 | 3.5 | 3.1 | 2.9 |
| $9-10$ | 3.1 | 2.9 | 3.2 | 3.6 | 3.0 | 3.1 |
| $11-15$ | 3.2 | 3.0 | 3.4 | 3.6 | 3.2 | 3.2 |
| $16-20$ | - | 2.9 | 3.4 | 3.4 | 3.2 | 3.4 |
| $>20$ | - | 3.3 | 3.6 | 3.5 | 2.6 | 3.3 |

This generally shows that people get more vacation as they gain experience. Security administrators and security auditors do report significantly more vacation than others.

## 4 F. FAVORITE BENEFITS

The survey asked people to list a few of their favorite benefits from their compensation packages.

| BeNEFIT | \% LISTED |
| :--- | :---: |
| Health | 83.3 |
| Training | 76.7 |
| 401 K match | 59.3 |
| Tuition | 52.2 |
| Perfbonus | 34.4 |
| Stockpurch | 23.3 |
| Stock | 19.8 |
| Other bonus | 19.6 |
| Signbonus | 6.4 |
| Car | 3.1 |
| Daycare | 1.9 |

Not surprisingly, health care came out \#1. Training was mentioned by over three quarters of the respondents! Tuition was fourth on the list, mentioned by over half. This appears to be a group of people who really enjoy learning!

## 4G. BONUSES

The survey also asked about bonuses. Here is a table that shows the distribution of bonuses (for those who reported more than $0 \%$ bonus):

| BoNUS\% | \% NT LISTED $\%$ UNIX LISTED |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $0-1.99$ | 3.2 | 1.9 |
| $2-4.99$ | 10.0 | 7.1 |
| $5-9.99$ | 21.8 | 19.3 |
| $10-14.99$ | 23.4 | 21.2 |
| $15-19.99$ | 12.8 | 14.2 |
| $20-29.99$ | 17.6 | 20.7 |
| $30-49.99$ | 8.4 | 10.8 |
| $50-u p$ | 2.9 | 4.7 |

Almost 75\% of the respondents who received bonuses report $5 \%-29.99 \%$ as their bonus size.

## 4 h. To What Do Those With Raises Attribute Their Success?

| TRAIT | \% LISTED |
| :--- | :---: |
| W ork hard | 57.8 |
| Good attitude | 47.0 |
| M aintain stable network | 40.4 |
| More active role mgmt | 39.8 |
| Upgrade skills | 39.6 |
| M eet obligations | 33.6 |
| Change jobs | 31.4 |
| G et certification | 30.3 |
| Improve skills | 24.9 |
| Publicize achievements | 16.4 |
| High profile project | 15.9 |
| Go into consulting | 9.1 |
| Go into mgmt | 8.5 |
| Proof of demand | 8.4 |
| College degree | 6.9 |

Respondents were asked to list a few items they attributed to their successful raise.

Hard work won out (which is good!). Skill upgrades, certification, skill improvement were mentioned a fair number of times. These are clearly important markers for those yearning for more salary.

## 4 I. WHAT'S IMPORTANT ABOUT THE JOB?

| TRAIT | \% LISTED |
| :--- | :---: |
| A bility work with adv tech | 64.8 |
| M gmt respects and trusts decisions | 55.9 |
| Education opportunity | 53.0 |
| Challenge of job | 51.3 |
| Base pay | 48.5 |
| Job atmosphere | 40.7 |
| Up to date tools | 33.4 |
| Flexible schedule | 31.4 |
| Benefits | 23.7 |
| Job stability | 22.6 |
| Casual attire | 19.6 |
| Vacation time | 18.7 |
| Potential for promotion | 17.9 |
| Bonus opportunities | 14.4 |
| Seeing how job helps company | 13.0 |
| Telecommuting | 12.8 |
| Effectiveness of supervision | 11.8 |
| Corporate culture | 11.3 |
| Financial stability of company | 10.3 |
| Company stock | 8.4 |
| Reputation of company | 6.8 |
| Company provided computer | 6.7 |
| Understanding company's business strategy | 5.6 |
| Workout facilities | 2.4 |
| Domestic partner benefits | 1.6 |
|  |  |

Respondents were asked to choose a few of the most important facets of their work.

The high rates of pay were not mentioned by half the people. Instead, working with high tech, trust, education, and challenge were rated higher. This is certainly a group that enjoys technical challenge, independence, and growth.

## CONCLUSION by Rob Kolstad

Salaries are certainly doing extremely well for the administrator and auditor professions. The feverish pitch of job-changing seems to have abated somewhat, though the salary increases have not.

The gap between NT and UNIX salaries is a real one and seems to average about $\$ 10 \mathrm{~K} / y e a r$ for those with similar experience levels. It will be interesting (especially in light of "The Free Software Movement" which promotes UNIXlike solutions) to see whether the salaries ultimately converge.

It is unknown either how long this phenomenon will continue or how high salaries can go. It is clear that a huge number of PCs continue to be sold and, sooner or later, they require administration (presuming we're talking about commercial sales, of course).

OS vendors are doing everything they can to reduce administrative costs, which now appear to be the dominant expense for keeping computers in a business. It is incumbent on admins to ensure that employers understand your value, though this lesson is apparently becoming universally understood.

Maybe someday computers will be tools that "just work." Until then, keep on learning and let's build this profession into a great model for the modern work environment!

# Additional Offerings From The SANS Insmtute 

The SANS Institute is a cooperative research and education organization through which system administrators, security professionals, and network administrators share the lessons they are learning. It offers educational conferences and indepth courses, cooperative research reports, and electronic digests of authoritative answers to current questions.

## ELECTRONIC DIG ESTS

## SANS NewsBites

Published weekly, the NewsBites keep up with everything going on in the computer security word. A dozen or two articles, each just one, two, or three sentences in length elaborate a URL that points to the source of the detailed information. Subscribe by sending a "subscribe newsbites" note to [digest@sans.org](mailto:digest@sans.org).

## The SANS Network Security Digest

Published monthly and distributed via email, the SANS Network Security Digest reports on the most important new security threats and gives guidance finding the latest patches or additional information on the threats. Each issue can be read in about eight minutes. Subscribe to this digest by sending a message with the subject "subscribe" to [digest@sans.org](mailto:digest@sans.org).

## The NT Digest

The NT digest provides updates to NT Security: Step-by-Step and guidance on new Hotfixes and Service Packs that should and should not be implemented. It also summarizes new threats and bugs found in NT and its services. Subscribe by sending a message with the subject "subscribe nt digest" to [digest@sans.org](mailto:digest@sans.org).

## SELECTED TO PICS CO URSES

In addition to two major conferences in the spring and fall, SANS schedules courses in cities around the US and around the world. Topics include Intrusion Detection, UNIX Security, Windows NT Security and other advanced technical subjects. These courses feature the top-rated speakers from SANS conferences. If you would like advance notice of courses in your city, send email to [info@sans.org](mailto:info@sans.org) with the subject Selected Topics Courses and in the body tell us your name, company, address, preferred email address, and which topics you wish to learn about: Windows NT Security, UNIX Security, or Intrusion Detection.

## SECURITY POSTER

The SANS Roadmap To Network Security Wall Poster and Web Security Roadmap Poster are updated twice a year. These posters present "top ten" lists of answers to common questions: the best security books, the best security web sites, the biggest threats, the vendor contacts, and more. They are mailed automatically to all subscribers and also to people who attend the Institute conferences.

## SNAP TRAINING

A brand new SANS program, SNAP training brings several levels of security development directly to your desktop in the form of multimedia presentations by the experts. After completing an ensemble of courses, passing online tests and hands-on quizzes, certification for various computer security levels can be obtained.

## COOPERATIVE RESEARCH AND PROJECTS

## The SANS Salary Survey

Published annually, the survey reports salaries of sysadmin, networking, and security professionals based on their primary operating environment (UNIX, NT, Netware, or combination) where they live, the type and size of employer, the machines they manage, whether they are employees or consultants, and other characteristics. It also reports the size of their raises, by salary level, and the principal reasons reported for aboveaverage raises. More than 11,000 people participated in the 1998 survey.

## Windows NT Security: Step-by-Step

A consensus of security professionals from seventy-seven large user organizations-who worked together to develop a list of 93 actions in eight phases that should be done to secure an NT server. 36 pages.

## Computer Security Incident Handling: Step-by-Step

A consensus of the leading incident handling agencies and experts plus fifty other experienced incident handling professionals. 44 pages.

## Windows NT PowerTools: Administrators' Consensus

This is a consensus report which 220 NT administrators shared their experiences in implementing and using twenty of the most popular tools for improving efficiency and security on Windows NT systems.

## Solaris Security: Step-by-Step

A SANS consensus report on how to create a secure Solaris system. Edited by Hal Pomeranz, the document lists everything you need to know.

For more information:
Email: [info@sans.org](mailto:info@sans.org)
Web Site: http://www.sans.org
5401 Westbard Ave. Suite 802
Bethesda, MD 20816
Phone: +1 301-951-0102


[^0]:    $\dagger N$ umbers in this column are percentages of respondents in this column, not of the entire set of respondents.

