The Space Professional’s Networking & Negotiation Field Guide

A companion for professionals entering the space sector — the science of connection, the art of negotiation, and the formation principles that turn careers into vocations.

Owner: Patrick Connolly | **Version:** 1.0 | **Date:** April 9, 2026

How to Use This Field Guide

This is not a textbook. It is not a career services handout. It is a field guide — the kind of document you open when you are sitting in a café in Darmstadt trying to figure out how to follow up with someone you met at a conference, or when HR has just sent you a contract and you have forty-eight hours to respond.

It is built from the best peer-reviewed research in negotiation science, social network theory, career psychology, and organisational behaviour — and filtered through one further lens: the formation methods of the teacher who turned fishermen into leaders of a global movement. Whatever your own position on the theological question, the pedagogical and relational record is unambiguous. The principles work.

Three ways to use this guide:

1. Read it straight through when you are beginning a job search or preparing for a career transition.
2. Return to a specific chapter when you face a networking moment, an interview, or a compensation conversation.
3. Use the Five-Year Architecture (Chapter 10) as an annual discipline for building a career that compounds.

A note on the research. Every framework in this guide has a peer-reviewed foundation. Where a concept originates in a single seminal source, that source is named. Where a concept is supported by a body of research, representative studies are referenced. The guide is designed for practitioners, not academics — the research serves the application, not the other way around.

CHAPTER ONE — The Professional You Are Becoming

Why identity precedes strategy

Most career guides start with tactics: how to write a CV, how to cold-email, how to answer interview questions. This guide does not start there, because the research does not start there. The research starts with identity.

Herminia Ibarra’s longitudinal study of career transitions (*Working Identity*, Harvard Business School Press, 2003) found that successful career changers do not first decide who they want to become and then execute a plan. They experiment with *provisional selves* — trying on new professional identities through small, low-risk actions — and refine through experience. The insight: identity is not a prerequisite for action. Identity *emerges from* action. But the kind of action matters.

The space sector amplifies this. You are entering a field where your previous identity — engineer, geoscientist, policy analyst, biologist, military officer — is necessary but insufficient. The space sector does not have a single professional culture. It has dozens, layered across agencies (ESA, NASA, CNES, DLR, ISRO, JAXA), primes (Airbus, Thales, OHB), and a rapidly expanding NewSpace ecosystem where the rules are still being written. Your task is not to abandon who you were. It is to discover who you are becoming.

The growth mindset in career transition

Carol Dweck’s research on mindset (2006) has a specific application in career transitions that most people miss. The fixed-mindset trap is not thinking “I can’t learn new things.” Most high-achievers believe they can learn. The trap is subtler: *I should already know how to do this.*

You have a master’s degree. You have research experience. You may have years of professional experience in another sector. And now you are in a position where you do not know the unwritten rules, you cannot read the room, and you feel like a beginner. The fixed-mindset response is to hide

the uncertainty — to perform confidence you do not feel and avoid situations where your inexperience might be visible. The growth-mindset response is to name the uncertainty honestly and treat it as the learning edge it actually is.

FIXED MINDSET IN CAREER TRANSITION	GROWTH MINDSET IN CAREER TRANSITION
“I should already know how this industry works.”	“I am actively learning how this industry works.”
Networking feels like performing.	Networking feels like learning.
Asking questions reveals weakness.	Asking questions reveals curiosity.
Rejection means I don’t belong.	Rejection means this wasn’t the right fit — yet.
“I need to have my career figured out.”	“I’m running experiments to figure out my career.”

The psychology of transition: Bridges’ model

William Bridges’ research on transitions (*Managing Transitions*, 1991; revised 2009) identifies a pattern that every career changer needs to understand. A transition is not the same as a change. A *change* is the external event — you graduate, you move to a new country, you start a new job. A *transition* is the internal psychological process of letting go of one identity and forming another. Bridges identifies three phases:

PHASE	WHAT HAPPENS	WHAT IT FEELS LIKE
Ending	Letting go of the old identity, old routines, old competence.	Loss, disorientation, grief — even when the change was chosen.
Neutral zone	The old identity has ended but the new one has not yet formed.	Confusion, anxiety, creativity, heightened vulnerability.
New beginning	The new identity takes hold. Energy returns. Competence rebuilds.	Clarity, momentum, purpose.

The critical insight: **the neutral zone is where the real development happens**, but it is also where most people panic. The temptation is to rush through it — to grab the first job offer, the first clear identity, the first stable ground. The professionals who build the strongest careers are those who can tolerate the ambiguity of the neutral zone long enough for the right opportunity to emerge.

This is not passivity. It is discernment. There is a difference between waiting because you are afraid and waiting because you are listening.

What the research says about international professionals

International space professionals entering the European market face every challenge of career transition plus the additional weight of cultural displacement, visa uncertainty, and the quiet pressure of being far from home.

Research on expatriate adjustment (Black, Mendenhall & Oddou, 1991, *Academy of Management Review*) identifies three dimensions of adjustment that operate simultaneously:

1. **Work adjustment** — adapting to the new professional culture, expectations, and norms.
2. **Interaction adjustment** — learning to communicate and build relationships across cultural difference.
3. **General living adjustment** — navigating daily life in a new country (language, housing, bureaucracy, food, loneliness).

These three dimensions are not independent. Struggle in general living adjustment (you are exhausted from navigating French bureaucracy) depletes the cognitive and emotional resources you need for work and interaction adjustment. The practical implication: *invest in your daily life infrastructure first.* The professional who has stable housing, a functioning phone, a routine for meals, and one friend they can call when the loneliness hits is in a dramatically stronger position for everything else.

The formation principle

The greatest teacher in history did not begin his public work by giving a lecture. He began with forty days in the wilderness — alone, hungry, tested. The formation happened in the desert, not in the synagogue. The desert stripped away everything that was not essential and revealed what was.

Your transition into the space sector is a kind of desert. It will strip away the comfortable competence of your previous identity and leave you with the question: *who am I when I cannot rely on what I already know?* The answer to that question — arrived at honestly, not performed — is the foundation for everything that follows.

Application: The transition inventory

Before you write a single application or send a single networking message, complete this inventory. Write honestly. No one else needs to see it.

1. **What am I letting go of?** (Previous professional identity, status, competence, geographic home)
2. **What am I afraid of?** (Name it specifically. "I'm afraid I won't find a job" is too vague. "I'm afraid my visa will expire before I secure a position and I'll have to go home" is honest.)
3. **What do I already bring that has value here?** (Not credentials — *capacities.* Problem-solving. Tenacity. Cross-cultural fluency. Technical depth.)
4. **What do I not yet know that I need to learn?** (Industry norms, salary structures, networking conventions, language, professional culture.)
5. **Who is one person already in this industry I could learn from?** (Not impress. Learn from.)

CHAPTER TWO — Network Architecture

Why your network is a structure, not a list

The word "networking" makes most technically-trained professionals wince. It conjures images of cocktail parties, forced small talk, and the vaguely transactional exchange of business cards. This is not what the research describes.

Network science — beginning with Mark Granovetter's foundational 1973 paper "The Strength of Weak Ties" (*American Journal of Sociology*) — reveals that professional networks are *structures* with measurable properties, and those structural properties predict career outcomes more reliably than individual talent, credentials, or effort.

Granovetter's central finding was counterintuitive and has been replicated across industries and cultures for fifty years: **the people most likely to connect you with a new job are not your close friends.** They are your *weak ties* — acquaintances, former colleagues, people you met at a conference once. The reason is structural: your close friends know the same people and the same information you do. Your weak ties move in different circles and therefore have access to opportunities you would never encounter through your close network.

Structural holes and the broker advantage

Ronald Burt's research on structural holes (*American Journal of Sociology*, 2004) extends Granovetter's insight. Burt studied managers at a large electronics company and found that those who *bridged structural holes* — who connected groups that were not otherwise connected — received earlier promotions, higher compensation, and more positive performance evaluations than peers with equivalent credentials and experience.

The mechanism is straightforward: brokers see opportunities that neither group sees on its own. They can combine ideas from different worlds. They hear about openings, trends, and needs before they become public knowledge. In a sector as interdisciplinary as space — where a single mission requires engineers, lawyers, businesspeople, policymakers, scientists, and communicators — the broker advantage is enormous.

NETWORK POSITION	ACCESS TO INFORMATION	CAREER ADVANTAGE
Closed network (all friends know each other)	Redundant — everyone knows the same things	Low. Comfortable but informationally trapped.
Brokerage position (connects otherwise separate groups)	Non-redundant — different groups know different things	High. Sees opportunities others miss.
Peripheral isolate (few connections of any kind)	Minimal	Very low. Invisible to the system.

The space sector as network laboratory

You are in one of the most network-rich environments on Earth. A single international space programme or graduate cohort can contain professionals from every continent, every space discipline, and multiple career stages. Your classmates and peers will, over the next twenty years,

populate agencies, primes, startups, regulatory bodies, and research institutions across the globe. The relationships you form now are not social pleasantries. They are the structural foundations of a thirty-year career.

But here is the mistake most people make: they network *horizontally* — building connections exclusively with peers at their own career stage. Horizontal networks feel natural and low-risk. They are also the least structurally valuable for career development. The research (Ibarra & Hunter, 2007, *Harvard Business Review*) identifies three distinct network types, and you need all three:

NETWORK TYPE	PURPOSE	WHO IS IN IT
Operational	Getting current work done	Immediate colleagues, project teammates
Personal	Development, support, identity	Peers, mentors, friends in the industry
Strategic	Positioning for future opportunities	Senior professionals, people in different functions, people at organisations you might want to join

Most early-career professionals have an operational network and a personal network. Few have a strategic network. Building one is not about being calculating — it is about being *intentional* about where you invest relational energy.

The research on how people actually get jobs

The research on job acquisition is clear and has been remarkably stable across decades and industries:

- **Granovetter (1974, *Getting a Job*):** 56% of professionals found their position through personal contacts. Of those, the majority came through weak ties, not close friends.
- **Crispin & Mehler (CareerXroads, multiple annual surveys):** Employee referrals consistently account for 25–40% of hires at major organisations — and referred candidates are hired at significantly higher rates than applicants through job boards.
- **LinkedIn Economic Graph data (2023):** Professionals who are "actively networking" (engaging with contacts outside their immediate circle) are 3x more likely to receive an unsolicited job opportunity.
- **Fernandez, Castilla & Moore (2000, *American Journal of Sociology*):** Referral hires have lower turnover and higher performance ratings — which means organisations are *motivated* to hire through networks, not just willing.

The implication is direct: **the most effective job-search strategy is not applying to postings. It is building and activating a network that surfaces opportunities before they are posted.** In the European space sector, where many positions are filled through word-of-mouth, internal referral, or direct recruitment from known networks (ESA contractor pools, conference contacts, university alumni networks), this effect is amplified.

Practical architecture: Building your network in 90 days

This is not a personality exercise. It is an engineering exercise. You are building infrastructure.

Week 1–2: Map your existing network. Write down every professional contact you have — classmates, professors, internship supervisors, conference acquaintances, alumni, family friends in adjacent fields. For each one, note: What world do they operate in? What do they know that I don't? Do they know people I don't know?

Week 3–4: Identify structural holes. Where are you *not* connected? If you are an engineer, do you know anyone in space policy? Space law? Space finance? If you know people at ESA, do you know anyone at a national agency? At a NewSpace startup? At a defence prime? The gaps are the opportunities.

Week 5–8: Fill the gaps with intentional outreach. One to two informational conversations per week (see Chapter Three). Targeted, researched, respectful. Not "Can you help me find a job?" but "I am trying to understand how [their world] works, and you are someone who would know."

Week 9–12: Give before you ask. Every conversation should include this question: "Is there anything I can help *you* with?" Or: "Is there someone I know who you should meet?" The research on reciprocity (Cialdini, 1984; Grant, 2013) is unequivocal: the professionals who give first — who create value for others before asking for anything — build the strongest, most durable networks.

The formation principle

The teacher who forms this guide's method did not build a network. He built a *community.* The difference is that a network serves the individual at the centre. A community serves everyone in it.

The twelve were not selected because they were useful to the mission. Several of them were liabilities. They were selected because they were *called* — and the investment in them was total, not transactional. The practical translation: treat every professional relationship as an opportunity to serve the other person, not just to extract value. This is not naive. It is the strategy that compounds over thirty years when every other strategy burns out.

Adam Grant's research (*Give and Take*, 2013) provides the empirical foundation: in every profession he studied, the top performers were Givers — people whose default orientation is to contribute value to others. But successful Givers are not martyrs. They give strategically, protect their time, and have clear boundaries. The giving is genuine. The strategy is in how they manage energy, not how they calculate return.

CHAPTER THREE — The Informational Conversation

The most powerful tool you are not using

The informational conversation — sometimes called an informational interview — is the single most effective career-development tool available to an early-career professional. It is not a job interview. It is not a sales pitch. It is a genuine conversation with someone who works in a role, organisation, or domain you want to understand, and its purpose is learning.

The research on career exploration (Wanberg, Kanfer & Banas, 2000, *Personnel Psychology*) shows that the quality of career exploration — not just the quantity of applications submitted — is the strongest predictor of job-search success. Informational conversations are how you conduct high-quality exploration.

Why they work

Informational conversations work because of three converging psychological mechanisms:

1. **The Ben Franklin effect** (Jecker & Landy, 1969, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*): People who do you a favour come to like you *more*, not less. When someone gives you thirty minutes of their time to talk about their career, they become psychologically invested in your success. This is not manipulation — it is a well-documented feature of human cognition. Asking for help, when done respectfully, *builds* relationships.
2. **The norm of reciprocity** (Gouldner, 1960, *American Sociological Review*): When someone gives you something of value (their time, their insight, their contact), you feel obligated to reciprocate. But the more important reciprocity runs in the other direction: when *they* give to *you*, they feel a subtle investment in the outcome. They want their advice to work. They pay attention to your progress. They think of you when an opportunity arises.
3. **Network activation** (Obukhova, 2012, *Management Science*): The act of reaching out to a dormant contact — someone you haven't spoken with recently — reactivates the relationship and restores its network function. Research shows that dormant ties are often *more* valuable than active ones for job search, because they have had time to move into new social circles.

How to request an informational conversation

The request is the hardest part — and the part most people get wrong. Here is what the research and practitioner experience say about effective requests:

Do: - Be specific about *why you are reaching out to this person* (not a generic message sent to fifty people). - State clearly that you are seeking insight, not a job. - Request a specific, bounded amount of time (twenty to thirty minutes). - Make it easy to say yes (offer to come to them, accommodate their schedule, do it by video if geography requires). - Reference a specific connection or shared context (your university or programme, a conference, a mutual contact, their published work).

Do not: - Ask "Can I pick your brain?" (vague, low-effort, and subtly commodifying). - Send a message longer than three short paragraphs. - Attach your CV unless they ask for it. - Ask for a job in the request. - Follow up more than twice if they don't respond (respect silence).

Example:

> Subject: [Your programme] student — quick question about [their organisation/role]
>
> Dear [Name],
>
> I am a current [master's student at / participant in] [your university or programme], focused on [your track]. I've been researching [their domain — e.g., mission operations career paths in Europe / the ESA Young Graduate Trainee programme / NewSpace business development], and your work at [Organisation] stood out — particularly [something specific you found].
>
> I would be grateful for twenty minutes of your time to learn about your experience navigating [specific topic]. I am not looking for a position — I am trying to understand the landscape better before I make my next move.
>
> I am happy to meet at your convenience — in person if you are in [city], or by video call. Thank you for considering it.

The conversation itself

You have twenty to thirty minutes. Use them well.

The structure:

PHASE	TIME	PURPOSE
Opening	2 min	Thank them. Briefly explain who you are and why you reached out to *them specifically.*
Their story	10 min	Ask about their career path. How did they get to where they are? What surprised them? What do they wish they'd known?
Your questions	10 min	Ask 2–3 specific, researched questions. Not "What's it like to work at ESA?" but "I've read that the YGT programme often leads to contractor positions rather than direct staff — is that your experience, and how does the transition work?"
The close	3 min	Ask: "Who else would you suggest I speak with?" This is the single most important question. It extends your network through their network.
Follow-up	Within 24 hr	A brief thank-you message. Reference something specific from the conversation. This is not optional.

The one question that changes everything

At the end of the conversation, after you have learned what you came to learn, ask this: *"Is there anything I can help you with?"*

Most of the time, the answer will be no. But the question itself signals something: you are not extracting. You are relating. Occasionally, the answer will be yes — and the favour you do for someone who gave you their time becomes the foundation of a genuine professional relationship.

The formation principle

The teacher who forms this guide's method was a master of the question. He rarely answered directly. He asked: *What do you want?* (John 1:38). *Who do you say I am?* (Mark 8:29). *Do you love me?* (John 21:17). Each question required the listener to reveal themselves — and in the revealing, the relationship deepened.

The informational conversation works on the same principle. You are not there to perform. You are there to *listen* — genuinely, with the full weight of your attention. The person across from you has a story. They have struggled, doubted, taken risks, made mistakes, and built something real. Honour that. The listening is the gift, and the relationship grows from it.

Application: Your first five conversations

Before you apply to a single job, schedule five informational conversations:

1. **One with an alumnus of your university or programme in your target role.** (Your alumni network is often your single strongest structural asset. Use it.)
2. **One with someone at an organisation you admire.** (Not in HR. A working professional doing the kind of work you want to do.)
3. **One with someone in a domain adjacent to yours.** (If you are an engineer, talk to a space lawyer. If you are in policy, talk to a mission planner. Cross-domain fluency is built through conversation.)
4. **One with someone senior enough to see the landscape.** (A head of department, a programme manager, a VP. They see patterns and trends that are invisible at the entry level.)
5. **One with someone who recently made the transition you are trying to make.** (Someone who was in a master's programme 2–3 years ago and is now working. Their experience is the most directly applicable.)

After each conversation, write a 10-minute debrief: What did I learn? What surprised me? What do I need to explore next? Who did they suggest I talk to?

CHAPTER FOUR — The Application

Why most applications fail — and what the research says about the ones that don't

The brutal reality of the space sector job market — particularly for international professionals in Europe — is that the majority of applications go nowhere. ESA's Young Graduate Trainee (YGT) programme receives thousands of applications per cycle. Airbus Defence & Space's graduate programmes are similarly oversubscribed. The statistical odds of any individual application yielding a result are low.

This is not a reason for despair. It is a reason for *strategy*.

The research on personnel selection (Schmidt & Hunter, 1998, *Psychological Bulletin* — the most comprehensive meta-analysis of hiring predictors ever published) tells us something that most job seekers do not know: the strongest predictor of job performance is *general mental ability* (GMA), followed by *structured interviews* and *work sample tests*. The weakest predictors include years of experience, years of education, and — critically — the unstructured interview, which most hiring in the space sector still relies on.

What this means for you: the hiring process is imperfect. It is not a meritocracy that perfectly sorts candidates by quality. Good candidates are rejected. Mediocre candidates are hired. The process has noise (Kahneman, Sibony & Sunstein, *Noise*, 2021). Your job is not to be the "best" candidate in some abstract sense. Your job is to *reduce the noise* — to make it as easy as possible for the hiring manager to see clearly who you are and what you bring.

The CV: Substance over performance

The research on resume screening (Cole et al., 2007, *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*) shows that hiring managers spend an average of 6–30 seconds on an initial CV review. They are not reading. They are scanning for *signals*.

What signals work:

SIGNAL	WHY IT WORKS
Quantified achievements ("Reduced test cycle time by 30%")	Concrete evidence of impact, not just activity.
Relevant keywords matching the job description	Many large organisations (ESA, Airbus, Thales) use automated screening. If the keywords aren't there, a human may never see it.
Clear, logical structure	Reduces cognitive load for the reviewer. If they have to work to find information, they move on.
Tailored content for each application	Demonstrates you understand what *this* role requires — not that you are broadcasting to everyone.

What signals fail:

SIGNAL	WHY IT FAILS
Objective statements (“Seeking a challenging role…”)	Tells the reviewer nothing about what you bring.
Exhaustive lists of every course, tool, or software	Quantity is not quality. Curate ruthlessly.
Creative formatting, unusual fonts, graphics	In engineering and science hiring, this reads as compensating for substance.
Gaps or inconsistencies left unexplained	The reviewer’s brain fills gaps with assumptions — usually unfavourable.

The cover letter: Connection, not summary

The cover letter is not a prose restatement of your CV. It is where you do something the CV cannot: *tell a story that connects who you are to what they need.*

Narrative transportation theory (Green & Brock, 2000, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*) shows that when people are absorbed into a story, their attitudes shift in the direction of the narrative. A cover letter that opens with a brief, vivid, honest story — why you are drawn to this work, what experience ignited the path — engages the reader’s attention in a way that bullet points cannot.

Structure:

1. **Opening** (2–3 sentences): Why this role, this organisation, this mission. Be specific. Reference something real — a recent project, a publication, a strategic direction.
2. **Bridge** (1 paragraph): The connection between your background and what they need. Not “I have skills X, Y, Z” but “My experience doing [specific thing] prepared me to contribute to [their specific challenge].”
3. **Close** (2–3 sentences): Forward-looking. What you want to explore, build, or contribute. End with energy, not formality.

The European space sector application landscape

The European market has specific features that international applicants need to understand:

CHANNEL	WHAT TO KNOW
ESA YGT / Research Fellowships	Highly competitive. Nationality quotas apply (ESA member states). Applications through the ESA careers portal. Strong technical CV and targeted motivation letter are essential. Internal referrals help — ESA staff see candidates flagged by colleagues.
National agency positions (CNES, DLR, ASI, UKSA)	Often require national citizenship or EU residency. Language requirements vary (French for CNES, German for DLR). Check early — do not invest in an application you are not eligible for.
Defence primes (Airbus DS, Thales Alenia, OHB, Leonardo)	Graduate programmes and direct hire. Often require security clearance — which may exclude non-EU nationals from certain programmes. Contractor positions (through staffing agencies) offer a way in.
NewSpace (Isar Aerospace, Exotrail, D-Orbit, Open Cosmos, Satellogic)	Smaller, faster hiring cycles. Often more open to international candidates. Network-driven — founders hire from their circles. Informational conversations are your way in.
Research institutions (ESTEC, ESOC, Max Planck, ONERA)	PhD or postdoc positions often available to international candidates. Supervisor relationships matter more than formal applications. Contact the PI directly.
ESA contractor pool	The majority of the ESA workforce is contractor staff. Companies like Telespazio, Serco, Rhea Group, SCISYS, GMV hold ESA support contracts. These are often the most accessible entry point for international professionals.

Visa and work authorisation: The reality

If you are a non-EU national, work authorisation is the structural constraint that shapes everything. The key instruments:

- **EU Blue Card:** Available in most EU member states for highly qualified employment. Requires a job offer at a minimum salary threshold (varies by country; typically €45–58K). Portable across EU after 18 months.
- **National work visas:** Each country has its own system. France has the *Passeport Talent*; Germany has a skilled worker visa. Processing times vary.
- **ESA staff contracts:** ESA is an international organisation — staff are not subject to national immigration law. But ESA hires are extremely competitive.
- **Student-to-work transition:** France allows a 12-month *Autorisation Provisoire de Séjour* (APS) after graduation for job search. Other countries have similar but varying provisions.

The strategic implication: Know your legal options *before* you begin applying. A job offer you cannot accept because of visa barriers is wasted effort. Consult your university's international office, and if possible, a specialised immigration advisor.

The formation principle

The teacher who forms this guide's method sent out his followers with clear instructions: take nothing extra for the journey. No bag, no bread, no money (Mark 6:8). The principle was radical simplicity and total dependence on the quality of what they carried *inside*, not what they carried with them.

Your application is the same. Strip away everything that is performance, padding, or pretension. What remains — your real experience, your honest motivation, your actual capacity — is enough. The right organisation will recognise it. The one that doesn't was not the right fit.

Application: The pre-application checklist

Before submitting any application, verify:

- ☐ I have researched this organisation beyond their website — news, recent projects, strategic direction.
- ☐ I have tailored my CV to *this specific role*, not sent a generic version.
- ☐ My cover letter connects a specific experience of mine to a specific need of theirs.
- ☐ I have checked the visa/work authorisation requirements and confirmed I am eligible.
- ☐ I know the name of the hiring manager or team lead (and have tried to have an informational conversation with someone at this organisation first).
- ☐ I have asked someone I trust to read my application for clarity, substance, and tone.

CHAPTER FIVE — The Interview

Preparation, presence, and what the research actually says about performance

The interview is where most career guides focus. This is a mistake — if you have done the work in Chapters 1–4, you arrive at the interview with a genuine understanding of the role, a real network that has informed your thinking, and an application that honestly represents who you are. The interview is not the make-or-break moment. It is the natural continuation of a process you have been running for weeks or months.

That said, interviews produce anxiety. The stakes are real. The research can help.

What interviewers are actually evaluating

Meta-analytic research on employment interviews (Huffcutt et al., 2001, *Journal of Applied Psychology*) identifies the constructs that interviews most reliably assess:

1. **Mental capability** — Can this person think clearly, reason through problems, and communicate their reasoning?
2. **Personality and social skills** — Is this person someone the team can work with? Do they listen? Are they adaptable?
3. **Knowledge and skills** — Do they have the technical foundation the role requires?

4. **Person-organisation fit** — Do their values, working style, and motivations align with the team and organisation?

Notice what is *not* on the list: polish, charisma, the ability to perform confidence. The research is clear that structured interviews — where every candidate is asked the same questions and evaluated against the same rubric — are vastly more predictive than unstructured conversations. In practice, most interviews in the space sector fall somewhere between structured and unstructured, which means your job is to bring structure to *your side* of the conversation.

The STAR method — and why it works

The STAR method (Situation, Task, Action, Result) is not a trick. It is a structure that forces you to give specific, concrete answers instead of vague generalisations. Research on behavioural interviews (Janz, 1982, *Journal of Applied Psychology*) shows that past behaviour in specific situations is the strongest predictor of future behaviour.

COMPONENT	WHAT TO DO
Situation	Briefly describe the context. Where were you? What was happening?
Task	What was your specific responsibility or challenge?
Action	What did *you* do? (Not the team. You.) Be specific about your reasoning and choices.
Result	What happened? Quantify if possible. What did you learn?

The most important part is the last sentence. "What did you learn?" signals growth mindset, reflective capacity, and intellectual honesty — the qualities that matter most in an early-career hire.

Managing interview anxiety: What the science says

Performance anxiety in interviews is not a character flaw. It is a neurobiological response. The hypothalamic-pituitary-adrenal (HPA) axis activates under conditions of social-evaluative threat — situations where your competence and social standing are being judged by others (Dickerson & Kemeny, 2004, *Psychological Bulletin*). Understanding this helps you work *with* the physiology rather than against it.

Evidence-based strategies:

STRATEGY	RESEARCH BASIS	WHAT TO DO
Reappraisal	Jamieson et al. (2010, *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*)	Tell yourself "I am excited" rather than "I am calm." Reframing arousal as excitement (which shares the same physiological signature as anxiety) improves performance.
Pre-performance routine	Mesagno & Mullane-Grant (2010, *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*)	Athletes use pre-performance routines to regulate arousal. Develop a 5-minute routine before every interview: slow breathing, review your key stories, a brief physical movement.
Power posing (with caveats)	Carney, Cuddy & Yap (2010) — contested but partially supported	The original "power pose" research has been disputed. What *is* supported: expansive posture before a stressful event modestly improves subjective confidence. It costs nothing to try.
Preparation	The strongest anxiety reducer in all the research	Know your stories. Know the organisation. Know your questions. Anxiety is highest when uncertainty is highest. Preparation reduces uncertainty.

Questions to ask them

The questions you ask at the end of an interview reveal more about you than the answers you gave during it. They signal what you *actually* care about.

Strong questions: - “What does success look like in this role in the first six months?” - “What is the biggest challenge the team is facing right now?” - “How does this role interact with [another department/function]?” - “What made the last person in this role effective — or what would you change?”

Weak questions: - “What’s the work-life balance like?” (Legitimate concern, wrong moment — save for later.) - “How quickly can I be promoted?” (Signals you’re already looking past the role.) - Anything you could have found on the website.

The formation principle

The teacher who forms this guide’s method was interviewed — repeatedly, by hostile questioners with authority over his life. Before Pilate, before the Sanhedrin, before Herod. His responses were remarkable not for their brilliance but for their *clarity* and *presence*. He did not perform. He did not deflect. He said what was true, without embellishment or apology, and let the truth do the work.

You do not need to be brilliant in an interview. You need to be *present* — genuinely there, genuinely listening, genuinely offering what you actually know and who you actually are. The interview that goes “badly” because you were honest is better than the interview that goes “well” because you performed a version of yourself you can’t sustain.

Application: Interview preparation protocol

For every interview, complete this preparation:

1. **Research the organisation** (30 min): Recent news, strategic direction, team structure, key projects.
2. **Research the interviewers** (15 min): LinkedIn, publications, conference talks. Find common ground.
3. **Prepare 5 STAR stories** covering: a technical challenge, a teamwork success, a failure and what you learned, a time you showed initiative, a cross-cultural or communication challenge.
4. **Prepare 3 questions to ask them** that demonstrate you have thought about the role.
5. **Run a 5-minute pre-interview routine**: Breathe, review your stories, remind yourself why you want this.

CHAPTER SIX — Know Your Worth

The market data that nobody explains at orientation

You cannot negotiate what you do not understand. This chapter gives you the compensation landscape of the European space sector — not in vague terms, but with the specificity you need to have an informed conversation.

The European space compensation architecture

The European space sector does not have a single compensation system. It has at least five, and they operate on fundamentally different principles:

SYSTEM	HOW COMPENSATION WORKS	KEY FEATURES
ESA staff	Coordinated organisation salary. Tax-exempt under the Protocol on Privileges and Immunities of the European Communities. Salary grids published.	Net salary is significantly higher than commercial equivalents at the same nominal amount. A €65K ESA salary may net more than a €90K commercial salary in the Netherlands. Education allowances, expatriation allowances, pension.
ESA contractors	Employed by companies (Telespazio, Serco, Rhea, GMV) who hold ESA support contracts. National employment law applies.	Salary determined by the contracting company, not by ESA. Wide variation. Often significantly lower than ESA staff in the same building doing similar work. Benefits depend on the contracting company and the country.
National agencies (CNES, DLR, ASI, UKSA)	Public-sector pay scales. CNES uses French civil service grading. DLR uses TVöD (German public-sector collective agreement).	Pay is structured and somewhat transparent. Negotiation margins exist but are narrower than commercial. Benefits (pension, job security, work-life balance) are often strong.
Defence primes (Airbus DS, Thales, OHB, Leonardo)	Corporate compensation structures with collective agreements (particularly in France and Germany).	Base salary plus bonus. Benefits vary by country and seniority. 13th or 14th month salaries common in some countries. Works council agreements may set floors.
NewSpace / startups	Variable. Often equity-heavy. Less structured.	Base pay may be lower than primes. Equity upside exists but is uncertain. Culture and growth opportunity are part of the implicit compensation.

Researching your market value

The research on anchoring (Tversky & Kahneman, 1974, *Science*) demonstrates that the first number in a negotiation disproportionately influences the final outcome. If you do not know your market value, someone else will set the anchor — and it will not be in your favour.

Reliable data sources for the European space sector:

SOURCE	WHAT IT PROVIDES	LIMITATIONS
Glassdoor Europe	Salary reports by company, role, and location	Self-reported; sample sizes for space-specific roles can be small
ESA salary grids (published)	Official salary scales for ESA staff positions	Covers ESA staff only, not contractors
SpaceCareers.uk	UK-focused space job listings, some with salary ranges	UK-centric; ranges may not reflect continental Europe
Rocketeer.careers	European space job listings	Growing database; salary data not always included
Levels.fyi (for tech-adjacent roles)	Detailed compensation data including equity	Better for software/data roles than traditional aerospace
Robert Walters / Hays salary guides	Annual engineering salary surveys by country	Broad engineering, not space-specific
Collective agreements (where applicable)	Minimum salary floors for specific roles and grades	Available for DLR (TVöD), many French employers (convention collective)
Your network	The most accurate data available	Requires trust and directness — see below

How to talk about salary with people you know

Salary transparency is culturally sensitive — particularly in Europe, where discussing compensation is less normalised than in the US. But the information is essential, and there are respectful ways to access it.

The range question: "I'm researching compensation benchmarks for [role type] in [country/city]. Would you be comfortable sharing the salary range for your position — not the exact number, just the approximate band?"

The market question: "Based on what you've seen, what should someone with my background expect as a starting salary for [role type] in [location]?"

The benefit question: "Beyond base salary, what benefits have been most valuable to you? Were there things you didn't know to ask about when you started?"

Most people are willing to share ranges and advice when the request is specific, respectful, and framed as market research rather than personal prying.

Gross-to-net: The number that actually matters

One of the most common mistakes international professionals make in Europe is evaluating offers by gross salary. In Europe, gross-to-net ratios vary dramatically by country due to differences in income tax, social security contributions, and mandatory health insurance:

Approximate figures, compiled in April 2026. Tax and social-security rules change every year; check the current rules before relying on any number below.

COUNTRY	APPROXIMATE EMPLOYEE DEDUCTIONS (INCOME TAX + SOCIAL SECURITY) ON A €50K GROSS SALARY (2026)	ESTIMATED ANNUAL NET
Netherlands	~37%	~€31,500
France	~28–30%	~€35,000
Germany	~40%	~€30,000
Italy	~35%	~€32,500
UK	~28%	~€36,000
ESA (tax-exempt)	Internal tax only (~8–12%)	~€44,000+

Figures are approximate and illustrative (as of 2026), and depend on individual circumstances, filing status, and deductions. Always use a country-specific net salary calculator (e.g., brut-en-net.fr for France, brutto-netto-rechner.info for Germany).

The implication: **a €60K offer in Germany and a €52K offer at ESA in the Netherlands may result in nearly identical take-home pay.** You must compare net, not gross.

The formation principle

The parable of the workers in the vineyard (Matthew 20:1–16) is routinely misread as a story about fairness. It is actually a story about *the owner's generosity* — and the danger of measuring your worth by comparing yourself to others. The workers who came first were paid what was agreed. They were angry only because others received the same for less work.

The application to compensation: **know your worth based on the value you bring and the market you operate in — not based on what someone else earns.** Comparison is the enemy of clear negotiation. It generates resentment without generating strategy. Your compensation conversation is between you and your employer, anchored in data, not in envy.

Application: Your compensation research file

Before any negotiation, build a one-page document:

1. **Role benchmark:** The salary range for your target role in your target location, from at least three sources.
2. **Total comp estimate:** Not just base salary — pension contributions, health insurance, bonuses, allowances, equity.

3. **Net salary calculation:** Using a country-specific calculator for your specific situation.
4. **Your BATNA** (Best Alternative to a Negotiated Agreement): What is your next-best option if this negotiation fails? (See Chapter Seven.)
5. **Cost of living anchor:** What does it actually cost to live in [Darmstadt / Toulouse / Noordwijk / Munich / Harwell]? Rent, transport, food, insurance. The salary means nothing without this context.

CHAPTER SEVEN — The Negotiation

The science of asking for what you are worth

This is the chapter most people skip to. If you have done the work in Chapters 1–6, you arrive at a negotiation with identity clarity, a real network, market data, and an honest understanding of your value. The negotiation is not a trick. It is a conversation between two parties who want to reach an agreement — and the research says you can do it with complete integrity.

Why people don't negotiate — and what it costs

Research by Linda Babcock and Sara Laschever (*Women Don't Ask*, 2003) found that only 7% of women and 57% of men negotiate their first salary offer. The compound cost of not negotiating is staggering: a starting salary difference of just €5,000, compounded over a 30-year career with standard raises and promotions built on the base, can result in over €600,000 in lost lifetime earnings.

The reasons people don't negotiate are well-documented:

REASON	WHAT THE RESEARCH SAYS
"I should be grateful for the offer."	Gratitude and negotiation are not opposites. You can be genuinely grateful and still advocate for fair compensation.
"It might seem aggressive."	Research shows that negotiating — when done respectfully — does not damage the relationship. Hiring managers *expect* it. (Marks & Harold, 2011, *Journal of Organizational Behavior*)
"The salary is fixed."	Even in structured systems (public sector, agency pay scales), there are levers: starting grade, step placement, allowances, bonuses, relocation support, start date.
"I don't have leverage — especially as an international."	You have more leverage than you think. The employer has invested time and money in selecting you. They want you to accept. The cost of re-recruiting is high.
"It feels wrong."	This is the feeling the next section addresses.

Negotiation as stewardship

The discomfort most people feel about negotiation is not trivial. For many — particularly those formed in cultures that value humility, gratitude, and service — asking for more feels like a betrayal of values. It is not.

The reframe is this: **your skills, your education, your willingness to move across the world for this work — these are not accidents.** They are the product of years of investment, sacrifice, and development. The question is not whether you deserve fair compensation. The question is whether you will steward what has been entrusted to you — or bury it out of fear.

The servant who buried his talent (Matthew 25:14–30) was not being humble. He was being afraid. And fear, dressed up as humility, leads to the same outcome: a life that produces less than it could have.

Negotiating well — with honesty, preparation, and respect for the other party — is an act of faithfulness. It honours the work. It honours the employer by treating the relationship as one between adults, not between a supplicant and a benefactor. And it positions you to give more generously — because you cannot give what you do not have.

The principled negotiation framework: Fisher and Ury

Getting to Yes (Fisher & Ury, 1981) remains the most widely validated negotiation framework in the research literature. Its core insight: **negotiate interests, not positions.**

A *position* is what you say you want: "I want €55,000." An *interest* is *why* you want it: financial security, recognition of your value, the ability to live without a second job, the signal that the organisation takes you seriously. When both parties focus on positions, negotiation becomes a zero-sum contest. When both focus on interests, creative solutions emerge.

PRINCIPLE	APPLICATION
Separate the people from the problem.	You are not adversaries. You are two people trying to solve a problem: how to structure a compensation package that works for both of you.
Focus on interests, not positions.	Ask: "What matters most to them? What matters most to me? Where is there overlap?"
Invent options for mutual gain.	If base salary is constrained, what else is possible? Remote work days, professional development budget, conference attendance, relocation support, faster review cycle, signing bonus.
Insist on objective criteria.	Anchor the conversation in data — market rates, published salary scales, cost-of-living indices — not in feelings or assertions.

Calibrated questions: The Voss technique

Chris Voss, former FBI lead hostage negotiator, developed a negotiation method built on a single tool: the calibrated question. These are open-ended, "how" and "what" questions that invite the other party to solve the problem with you rather than defend against you.

INSTEAD OF...	TRY...
"I need more money."	"How can we work together to get closer to the market rate for this role?"
"That offer is too low."	"What flexibility is there in the compensation structure?"
"I can't accept that."	"How am I supposed to make that work, given [specific cost-of-living reality]?"
"Can you do better?"	"What would it take to move this closer to [your researched number]?"

The power of calibrated questions is that they *give the other party agency*. They feel like a collaborator, not an opponent. Voss's research (adapted from FBI negotiation protocols and documented in *Never Split the Difference*, 2016) shows that questions beginning with "How" and "What" produce more cooperative outcomes than statements, demands, or "Why" questions (which trigger defensiveness).

The Ackerman model: A practical structure

When the negotiation comes down to numbers, the Ackerman model provides a disciplined structure:

1. **Set your target price** (your ideal outcome based on market research).
2. **Your first offer: 65% of target.** (This sets an aggressive anchor without being absurd.)
3. **Three planned raises:** 85%, 95%, and 100% of target.
4. **Each raise is smaller than the last** — signalling that you are approaching your limit.
5. **Use empathy and calibrated questions between each offer** — don't just throw numbers.
6. **At your final number, use a precise, non-round figure** (e.g., €54,800 rather than €55,000). Research shows precise numbers are perceived as more informed and less arbitrary (Mason et al., 2013, *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*).

Important: The Ackerman model is designed for situations where you are negotiating a counteroffer. In many European employment contexts, the employer makes the first offer. In that case, your task is to *respond* with a researched counter, not to open the bidding.

Negotiating in the European context

European negotiation culture differs from American negotiation culture in ways that international professionals need to understand:

DIMENSION	EUROPEAN TENDENCY	PRACTICAL IMPLICATION
Directness	Varies by country. Germans are direct; French are more indirect; British use understatement.	Mirror the communication style of your counterpart.
Relationship first	In southern Europe especially, the relationship precedes the transaction.	Invest in rapport before raising numbers.
Collective agreements	Many employers in France, Germany, and Italy are bound by collective agreements that set salary floors and structures.	Ask: “Is there a collective agreement that applies to this position?” This is not rude — it is professional.
Works councils	In many European countries, works councils have input on employment terms.	The hiring manager may not have unilateral authority on compensation. Be patient with process.
Written offers	In most European countries, the written offer is the binding document. Verbal discussions are preliminary.	Do not celebrate — or panic — until you see it in writing.

The formation principle

The teacher who forms this guide’s method negotiated constantly — with religious authorities, with political powers, with his own followers. His method was consistent: he named reality clearly, he asked questions that opened new ground, and he never conceded on truth to gain comfort.

The principle for your negotiation is the same: **be honest about what you need, clear about what you bring, and unwilling to accept less than what the data says is fair.** This is not aggression. It is integrity. And the relationship that is worth having will not be damaged by a respectful, well-prepared negotiation. The one that would be damaged by it was not worth having.

Application: Negotiation preparation worksheet

Before any compensation conversation:

1. **My target compensation (total):** €_____ (base + benefits, based on market research)
2. **My minimum acceptable:** €_____ (the number below which I walk away)
3. **My BATNA:** What is my best alternative if this falls through? (Another offer, extended job search, return home)
4. **Their likely constraints:** What do I know about their budget, their salary structure, their flexibility?
5. **My 3 calibrated questions:**
   - “What flexibility is there in _____?”
   - “How can we work together to _____?”
   - “What would it take to _____?”
6. **My 3 non-salary levers:** What besides base salary matters to me? (Remote work, development budget, relocation support, review timeline, title)

CHAPTER EIGHT — The Whole Package

Total compensation in Europe is more complex than you think

If Chapter Six gave you the salary landscape, this chapter gives you the rest of the picture. In Europe, the “rest” is often worth 20–40% of base salary — and most international professionals leave significant value on the table because no one explained what was available.

The components of European total compensation

COMPONENT	WHAT IT IS	WHAT TO KNOW
Base salary	Your gross annual salary before deductions.	The starting point, not the whole picture.
13th/14th month salary	In many European countries (France, Italy, Spain, Germany in some sectors), employers pay a 13th month salary — effectively an extra month's pay. Some pay a 14th.	Ask during the offer stage. It may be included in the stated annual gross, or it may be additional. The difference matters.
Bonus	Performance-based or company-wide.	Varies wildly. Ask: "What was the average bonus payout last year?" Not "Is there a bonus?"
Pension / retirement	Employer contributions to retirement. In many European countries, employer pension contributions are mandatory and substantial.	This is real money, even though you can't see it now. ESA's pension scheme is particularly generous.
Health insurance	In most EU countries, basic health coverage is mandatory and employer-funded. Employers may offer top-up private insurance.	Ask what the employer provides beyond the statutory minimum. In the Netherlands and Germany, the system differs significantly from France or the UK.
Meal vouchers / restaurant tickets	Common in France (*Tickets Restaurant*), Italy, and elsewhere. Tax-advantaged.	€8–10/day × 220 working days = €1,760–2,200/year in tax-efficient benefit. Not trivial.
Transport subsidy	In France, employers must reimburse 50% of public transport costs. Other countries have similar provisions.	Ask. It may not be offered unless you request it.
Relocation package	Moving costs, temporary housing, visa support, language training.	This is the most negotiable benefit at the offer stage — and the most commonly forgotten. If you are moving countries, negotiate this explicitly.
Professional development	Conference attendance, training budget, tuition support.	Some organisations have formal budgets; others fund ad hoc. Ask: "What professional development support is available in the first two years?"
Remote work / flexibility	Post-COVID, many European space organisations offer partial remote work.	The monetary value of avoiding a daily commute and reclaiming time is real. Factor it in.
Annual leave	European statutory minimums are generous by global standards (20–30 days depending on country). Some employers offer more.	This is non-negotiable in many contexts (statutory) but in others, additional days can be negotiated.
Expatriation allowance	Some employers (particularly ESA and large primes) pay an expatriation premium for employees working outside their home country.	If you are offered this, understand the conditions. It may be time-limited or contingent on maintaining non-resident status.

The MESO technique: Negotiating the package, not the number

Victoria Medvec's research on negotiation (Kellogg School of Management) introduced the concept of MESO — Multiple Equivalent Simultaneous Offers. Instead of negotiating one item at a time (salary, then benefits, then relocation), you present two or three package options that are equally acceptable to you but structured differently:

Example:

OPTION A	OPTION B	OPTION C
Base: €52,000	Base: €48,000	Base: €50,000
Standard relocation	Enhanced relocation (€5,000)	Standard relocation
Standard review cycle	Standard review cycle	6-month early review
No signing bonus	No signing bonus	€2,000 signing bonus

The power of MESO is that it gives the employer *choice* — and choice feels like control. The employer picks the option that best fits their constraints, and you get an acceptable outcome regardless. It also signals sophistication and preparation, which itself increases their respect for you as a negotiating partner.

Benefits that are easy to miss

The following are frequently available but rarely negotiated — because candidates don't know to ask:

- **Start date flexibility:** Starting two weeks later may allow you to finish a move without stress, resolve visa paperwork, or simply arrive rested. It costs the employer very little.
- **Title:** In structured organisations, title determines future promotion paths and external credibility. If they offer "Junior Systems Engineer" and the role warrants "Systems Engineer," negotiate the title.
- **Language training:** If you are working in a non-native language environment, employer-funded language classes are a legitimate professional development request.
- **Conference attendance:** One international conference per year (IAC, Space Tech Expo, ESTEC Open Day) is a networking investment worth €1,500–3,000. Many employers will fund it if you ask.
- **Equipment and tools:** A laptop specification, a second monitor, software licenses — small items that improve your daily work and are easy for the employer to approve.

The formation principle

The feeding of the five thousand is a study in seeing what is actually available. The disciples saw scarcity: five loaves and two fish for thousands. The teacher saw sufficiency — not because the math worked, but because he understood that *what you have is enough when it is offered fully.*

The application to compensation: **most people negotiate only what they see** — the gross salary number on the offer letter. The professional who sees the whole package, who understands that relocation support and pension contributions and professional development and work flexibility are *real compensation*, negotiates from a position of abundance rather than scarcity. You are not fighting over a fixed pie. You are discovering how large the pie actually is.

Application: Total compensation calculator

For every offer you receive, complete this table:

COMPONENT	OFFERED	MARKET BENCHMARK	GAP	NEGOTIABLE?
Base salary (gross)				
Base salary (net — use country calculator)				
13th/14th month				
Bonus (expected)				
Pension (employer contribution)				
Health insurance (employer-funded portion)				
Meal vouchers / transport				
Relocation package				
Professional development budget				
Annual leave (days)				
Remote work (days/week)				
Other (expatriation, housing, language)				
Total estimated annual value				

CHAPTER NINE — The First 90 Days

Why the transition matters more than the hire

You got the job. The negotiation is complete. Now the real work begins — and the research says the first 90 days are disproportionately important.

Michael Watkins' research (*The First 90 Days*, Harvard Business School Press, 2003) identifies a consistent pattern: new hires who invest deliberately in their first 90 days reach a "breakeven point" — the point where they are contributing more value than they are consuming — significantly faster than those who wing it. In a sector where contracts are often 1–3 years, reaching breakeven early is not a nice-to-have. It is existential.

The five conversations framework

Watkins identifies five conversations every new hire should have with their manager in the first 90 days:

CONVERSATION	PURPOSE
Situation	Understand the context: Is this a startup, a turnaround, a sustaining success, or a realignment? Each requires different behaviour.
Expectations	Clarify what success looks like — in concrete, measurable terms. Do not assume you know. Ask explicitly.
Resources	What do you have to work with? Budget, people, tools, access, authority. Where are the gaps?
Style	How does your manager prefer to communicate? Written or verbal? Detailed or high-level? Scheduled or ad hoc?
Personal development	What skills does this role require that you do not yet have? What is the plan for building them?

Building trust: The competence/character matrix

Early trust research (Mayer, Davis & Schoorman, 1995, *Academy of Management Review*) identifies three factors that predict trust:

1. **Ability** — Can this person do the work? (Demonstrated through early wins and consistent delivery.)
2. **Benevolence** — Does this person care about my interests? (Demonstrated through listening, helping, and genuine concern.)
3. **Integrity** — Does this person's behaviour match their stated values? (Demonstrated through consistency over time.)

In your first 90 days, the most powerful trust-building strategy is: **deliver something small and concrete early, then help someone on a problem that isn't yours.**

The first demonstrates ability. The second demonstrates benevolence. Together, they create a foundation for the third — integrity — to be observed over time.

Continuing to negotiate: The ongoing conversation

Your first salary is not your last salary. The most important compensation decision you make in the first 90 days is not about money. It is about *setting up the conversation for later.*

- **Document your contributions from day one.** Julia Evans' concept of the "brag document" — a running log of your achievements, impact, and growth — is the single best tool for future compensation conversations. When review time comes, you will not remember what you did in month two. The document will.
- **Understand the review cycle.** When are reviews? What triggers a raise? What is the promotion path? Know this in the first month.
- **Build relationships with decision-makers.** The person who decides your next raise may not be your direct manager. Know who they are. Let them see your work.

The formation principle

The teacher who forms this guide's method did not simply call his followers. He *invested* in them — intensively, personally, over years. The first 90 days of any new role are your investment period. You are not expected to transform the organisation. You are expected to demonstrate that you are the kind of person worth investing in.

The qualities that matter most in the first 90 days are not technical brilliance (they hired you for that; they trust it). They are *character qualities:* Do you listen? Do you ask good questions? Do you follow through? Are you honest about what you don't know? Do you help others? Are you the kind of person your colleagues are glad to have on the team?

These are not soft skills. They are the hardest skills. And they are the foundation on which everything else — compensation, responsibility, influence, impact — is built.

Application: 90-day action plan

WEEK	FOCUS	ACTIONS
1–2	Listen and learn	Meet every team member 1:1. Understand current projects, priorities, pain points. Ask more than you speak.
3–4	Understand the system	Map the organisation chart (formal and informal). Identify decision-makers, gatekeepers, and allies. Understand the review and promotion process.
5–8	Deliver an early win	Identify one concrete problem you can solve or one deliverable you can complete. Execute it well. Make sure the right people see it.
9–12	Expand and invest	Begin building relationships outside your immediate team. Help someone with a problem that isn't yours. Start your brag document. Have the expectations conversation with your manager if you haven't already.

CHAPTER TEN — The Five-Year Architecture

Building a career that compounds

The frameworks in this guide only have value if they are applied over time. A single negotiation, a single networking conversation, a single good interview — these are tactics. A career is built from systems. This chapter gives you the system.

The principle is compounding. Small, consistent investments — in relationships, in skills, in reputation, in compensation — produce dramatically different outcomes over five years than episodic bursts of effort. The research on career capital (Cal Newport, *So Good They Can't Ignore You*, 2012) is clear: the professionals who build the most options are those who invest in *rare and valuable skills* consistently, not those who chase passion or wait for inspiration.

YEAR ONE — Foundation: Learn the terrain

Network: - Complete the 90-day relationship map (every colleague, key stakeholders, adjacent teams). - Schedule one informational conversation per month outside your organisation. - Join one professional community (SGAC, Women in Aerospace Europe, national space society, your university's alumni chapter). - Make one introduction per month: connect two people in your network who should know each other.

Compensation: - Understand your total compensation package in full (use the Chapter 8 calculator). - Begin your brag document on day one. - Identify the review cycle and promotion criteria. Write them down. - Set a personal compensation target for Year 2 and identify the evidence you need to support it.

Formation: - Find a mentor: someone 8–15 years ahead of you in a domain you want to understand. - After every significant professional experience, write a 10-minute debrief (Kolb's reflective observation). - Identify one area where you are operating from a fixed mindset. Work on it.

YEAR TWO — Building trust capital

Network: - Expand from your base into one adjacent domain (if you are technical, build a relationship in policy or business; if policy, connect with engineers). - Attend one industry event (conference, workshop, meetup) and follow up with every meaningful contact within 48 hours. -

Identify one structural hole in your network and build a bridge across it. - Find one person in your network you can help with something substantial.

Compensation: - Execute your first raise conversation, using the data and frameworks from Chapters 6–7. - If a raise is not possible within existing structures, negotiate a non-salary lever (title, responsibility, development budget, flexibility). - Update your compensation research file: has the market moved? Have you developed new skills that change your value?

Formation: - Actively seek feedback from people who know your blind spots. Not praise — *correction.* - Run a Tuckman audit on your team: what stage are you in? What does this stage require from you? - Begin investing in someone newer than you. Not formally — just be available. Answer questions. Share what you've learned.

YEAR THREE — Taking on real stakes

Network: - Map your professional network structurally: who bridges what? Where are you a broker? Where are you in a closed cluster? - Cultivate one relationship with someone at a senior level (department head, programme manager, VP) who can see the landscape. - Deliver one public contribution (a talk, a paper, a panel, a workshop) that establishes your voice in the community.

Compensation: - If your current trajectory is below market, begin the strategic move analysis (see below). - If your trajectory is on track, negotiate the next level: title change, expanded responsibility, team lead role. - Calculate your total compensation growth from Year 1 to Year 3. Is it compounding? If not, diagnose why.

Formation: - Accept a stretch assignment that requires you to lead something you are not fully qualified for. - Review the debrief log you have been keeping for three years. What patterns emerge? What have you learned about yourself? - Ask: Am I building something that matters — or am I just accumulating credentials?

YEAR FOUR — Multiplied impact

Network: - Identify the one structural position you uniquely occupy in the European space network. What do you connect that no one else connects? - Begin mentoring deliberately — not as a transactional arrangement, but as genuine formation of someone coming behind you. - Build one relationship outside the space sector entirely — in a field that challenges your assumptions and expands your thinking.

Compensation: - If you are still in your first organisation, you have likely reached one of two positions: on track for leadership, or approaching a ceiling. Be honest about which one. - If approaching a ceiling, begin the transition process: update your network, research targets, have informational conversations. - If on track, negotiate for the future: what role do you want in two years, and what compensation should accompany it?

Formation: - Develop a personal vision articulation. Not a career goal — a statement of the future you are building toward and why it matters. - Revisit the transition inventory from Chapter 1. How have your answers changed? - Where is your ambition directed — toward your advancement, or toward the mission? Be honest.

YEAR FIVE — Consolidation and commissioning

Network: - Conduct a full network audit: who are you connected to now who was not in your world five years ago? Has the quality of your relationships deepened, or have you just accumulated contacts? - Identify the two or three people you have formed over these five years. Are they ready for greater responsibility? - Commission them: give them an opportunity, a recommendation, a connection that opens a door. This is the mark of a mature professional — not what you build for yourself, but what you build for others.

Compensation: - Complete a five-year compensation review: total earnings, total growth, comparison to market trajectory. Did you negotiate? Did it matter? - If you have stayed in one organisation, you should now be at or above market. If you are below, the strategic move is overdue. - If you have changed organisations, assess: was each move intentional and upward, or reactive?

Formation: - Ask the question underneath the question: Over five years, what has this career been *for*? Not what has it produced — but what has it been for? - What are you building that will outlast your direct involvement? - What would faithfulness look like from here?

CHAPTER ELEVEN — The Research Foundation

Peer-reviewed sources and further reading for the serious practitioner

This guide is built on a body of research accumulated over five decades of social science, negotiation theory, and career psychology. What follows is a curated list of the most important sources for each domain covered, with brief notes on what each contributes.

Career transition and identity

- **Ibarra, H. (2003).** *Working Identity: Unconventional Strategies for Reinventing Your Career.* Harvard Business School Press. The foundational text on career transition as identity work. Essential for anyone moving into a new sector.
- **Bridges, W. (2009).** *Managing Transitions: Making the Most of Change.* 3rd ed. Da Capo Press. The three-phase transition model. Particularly valuable for the "neutral zone" concept.
- **Black, J.S., Mendenhall, M. & Oddou, G. (1991).** Toward a Comprehensive Model of International Adjustment. *Academy of Management Review*, 16(2), 291–317. The three-dimensional model of expatriate adjustment.

Networks and social capital

- **Granovetter, M.S. (1973).** The Strength of Weak Ties. *American Journal of Sociology*, 78(6), 1360–1380. The foundational paper on weak ties and job acquisition. One of the most cited papers in sociology.
- **Granovetter, M.S. (1995).** *Getting a Job: A Study of Contacts and Careers.* 2nd ed. University of Chicago Press. The empirical study that demonstrated network effects on employment.
- **Burt, R.S. (2004).** Structural Holes and Good Ideas. *American Journal of Sociology*, 110(2), 349–399. The research on brokerage and the career advantages of bridging structural holes.
- **Ibarra, H. & Hunter, M. (2007).** How Leaders Create and Use Networks. *Harvard Business Review*, January 2007. The three network types: operational, personal, strategic.
- **Casciaro, T. & Lobo, M.S. (2005).** Competent Jerks, Lovable Fools, and the Formation of Social Networks. *Harvard Business Review*, June 2005. Why social capital precedes expert capital.
- **Grant, A. (2013).** *Give and Take: A Revolutionary Approach to Success.* Weidenfeld & Nicolson. The research on giving as career strategy.

Job search and hiring

- **Schmidt, F.L. & Hunter, J.E. (1998).** The Validity and Utility of Selection Methods in Personnel Psychology. *Psychological Bulletin*, 124(2), 262–274. The definitive meta-analysis on what predicts job performance.
- **Fernandez, R.M., Castilla, E.J. & Moore, P. (2000).** Social Capital at Work: Networks and Employment at a Phone Center. *American Journal of Sociology*, 105(5), 1288–1356. The research on referral hiring.
- **Cole, M.S. et al. (2007).** Recruiters' Inferences of Applicant Personality Based on Resume Screening. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 15(2), 248–258. What signals matter in CV review.

Interview performance

- **Huffcutt, A.I. et al. (2001).** Identification of Constructs Assessed in the Employment Interview. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(5), 897–913. What interviews actually measure.
- **Janz, T. (1982).** Initial Comparisons of Patterned Behavior Description Interviews vs. Unstructured Interviews. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 67(5), 577–580. The defence of behavioural (STAR) interviewing.
- **Dickerson, S.S. & Kemeny, M.E. (2004).** Acute Stressors and Cortisol Responses: A Theoretical Integration and Synthesis of Laboratory Research. *Psychological Bulletin*, 130(3), 355–391. The neuroscience of social-evaluative threat.

Negotiation science

- **Fisher, R. & Ury, W. (1981).** *Getting to Yes: Negotiating Agreement Without Giving In.* Houghton Mifflin. The principled negotiation framework. Foundational.
- **Fisher, R. & Shapiro, D. (2005).** *Beyond Reason: Using Emotions as You Negotiate.* Viking. The five core concerns framework.

- **Voss, C. (2016).** *Never Split the Difference: Negotiating as If Your Life Depended on It.* HarperBusiness. Calibrated questions and tactical empathy from FBI negotiation.
- **Babcock, L. & Laschever, S. (2003).** *Women Don't Ask: Negotiation and the Gender Divide.* Princeton University Press. The research on negotiation avoidance and its compound cost.
- **Mason, M.F. et al. (2013).** Precise Offers Are Potent Anchors: Conciliatory Counteroffers and Attributions of Knowledge in Negotiations. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 49(4), 759–763. Why precise numbers are more effective anchors.
- **Marks, M. & Harold, C. (2011).** Who Asks and Who Receives in Salary Negotiation. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 32(3), 371–394. Evidence that negotiating does not damage relationships.
- **Kahneman, D., Sibony, O. & Sunstein, C.R. (2021).** *Noise: A Flaw in Human Judgment.* Little, Brown. Why hiring processes are noisier than we think.

Compensation and market data

- **Tversky, A. & Kahneman, D. (1974).** Judgment Under Uncertainty: Heuristics and Biases. *Science*, 185(4157), 1124–1131. The anchoring effect and its application to salary negotiation.

Motivation and mindset

- **Dweck, C.S. (2006).** *Mindset: The New Psychology of Success.* Random House. The growth/fixed mindset distinction. Essential.
- **Deci, E.L. & Ryan, R.M. (1985).** *Intrinsic Motivation and Self-Determination in Human Behavior.* Plenum. Self-Determination Theory.
- **Newport, C. (2012).** *So Good They Can't Ignore You: Why Skills Trump Passion in the Quest for Work You Love.* Grand Central Publishing. Career capital theory.

Organisational entry and the first 90 days

- **Watkins, M. (2003).** *The First 90 Days: Critical Success Strategies for New Leaders at All Levels.* Harvard Business School Press. The breakeven framework and five conversations model.
- **Mayer, R.C., Davis, J.H. & Schoorman, F.D. (1995).** An Integrative Model of Organizational Trust. *Academy of Management Review*, 20(3), 709–734. The ability/benevolence/integrity model of trust.

Influence and persuasion

- **Cialdini, R.B. (1984).** *Influence: The Psychology of Persuasion.* Collins Business. The six principles of social influence.
- **Jecker, J. & Landy, D. (1969).** Liking a Person as a Function of Doing Him a Favour. *Human Relations*, 22(4), 371–378. The Ben Franklin effect.
- **Gouldner, A.W. (1960).** The Norm of Reciprocity: A Preliminary Statement. *American Sociological Review*, 25(2), 161–178. The foundational reciprocity research.
- **Green, M.C. & Brock, T.C. (2000).** The Role of Transportation in the Persuasiveness of Public Narratives. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 79(5), 701–721. Narrative transportation theory.

Cross-cultural competence

- **Hofstede, G. (1980).** *Culture's Consequences: International Differences in Work-Related Values.* Sage. The cultural dimensions framework.
- **Wanberg, C.R., Kanfer, R. & Banas, J.T. (2000).** Predictors and Outcomes of Networking Intensity Among Unemployed Job Seekers. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85(4), 491–503. Career exploration quality as predictor of job-search success.

The space sector is not static, the research is not complete, and — most importantly — you are not finished. Bring your own experience back to these frameworks. Test them in real conditions. Note where they hold and where they break. That is the curriculum.

One final principle, borrowed from the teacher whose methods run through every chapter of this guide: the goal of formation is not to produce people who need you. It is to produce people who can go out and form others. What you build here is not just a career. It is a legacy — measured not by what you earned, but by what you gave, who you served, and whether, at the end, you were faithful with what was entrusted to you.

© Patrick Connolly 2026