

Accommodation as a Career Strategy:

Implications for the Realm of Work

Lotte Bailyn

Sloan School of Management, M.I.T.

August 1974

728-74

The research reported in this paper was financed in part by a grant from the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education.

Accommodation as a Career Strategy: Implications for the Realm of Work

by Lotte Bailyn

The two major socialization tasks facing the educated adult are those that involve his career on the one hand and his family on the other. Much study has been devoted to each of these problem areas separately, especially to men's career development and to women's role in the family. But since occupational and family roles often have conflicting requirements, such separation ignores the crucial problem: the process by which these two areas are jointly handled and integrated within a person's life.

The way an individual copes with this double set of requirements is determined, most generally, by his values. Traditionally, the guiding hierarchy of values has been more culturally imposed than individually developed: in industrial societies, men have been expected to subordinate family needs to the requirements of their careers, women to be primarily concerned with their family roles. But traditional patterns are changing. And as stereotyped and culturally prescribed hierarchies break down, strategies for reconciling the requirements of career and family become more individualized. It therefore becomes important to evaluate the consequences such strategies have and the contribution they make to a person's satisfaction and effectiveness in what he does.

A number of studies have dealt with such conflict and its resolution among educated women (e.g. Rossi, 1965; Astin, 1969; Hall, 1972), but very little work has been done on men's strategies for reconciling career and family demands. What there

---

\*-Revised version of a paper originally read at the meetings of the Eastern Psychological Association, April 16, 1971, New York City. The author is grateful to Sandra Tangri, discussant of that session, for her thoughtful comments on the original paper.

is (e.g. Rapoport and Rapoport, 1969; Bailyn, 1970) concentrates mainly on the effect of men's family-career orientations on their marriages and the quality of their family life, and not on the implications of such strategies for the professional part of men's lives. The present paper, based on data from an alumni survey of MIT graduates in the classes of 1951, 1955, and 1959, deals with the latter problem.

In order to tackle this task, it was necessary to classify the married respondents in the survey according to the extent to which they value their career and their families. At one extreme would be the people for whom career success is of major importance and for whom family considerations are clearly secondary to these aspirations. At the other extreme would be those respondents for whom family considerations are primary and whose occupational decisions are guided by a hierarchy of values that places family needs ahead of those of career. We may think of these as end points of a scale measuring the degree to which career demands are accommodated to family requirements. One extreme is the position of non-accommodation, the attitude of extreme achievement orientation traditionally associated with men's roles in industrial societies. The opposite extreme, in contrast, is fully accommodative; it is associated with a career pattern in which the demands of work are subordinated to those of the family.

The accommodative career, thus, represents a strategy designed to ease the conflict between these two areas by placing family needs ahead of those of career in a person's hierarchy of values. It represents a strategy that is particularly important to study because it parallels new social developments. It has been deemed a necessary precondition for true equality in occupational opportunity between the sexes (cf. the report of the Swedish Government to the United Nations on The Status of Women in Sweden, 1968), and in its shift of emphasis away from success and achievement as the major motivating forces in life it reflects both the new values of the "youth" culture (Yankelovich, 1972) and of the years surrounding the "mid-career" crisis (Beckhard,

1972; Tarnowieski, 1973).

### Earlier Findings

In previous work we have investigated the role of accommodation in the career strategies of professional women--indeed, the accommodative career has traditionally been deemed the only "natural" one for them--and have considered the effects on families of such a strategy on the part of men.

We found that about a third of the small number of married women who graduated from MIT in the classes of 1951, 1955, and 1959 were accommodators in the sense of having restricted their career involvements in some way in order to make an easier adjustment to their family roles.<sup>1</sup> (The rest were about equally divided between those with full career involvement and those with none at all.) These women employed various tactics for their accommodative ways of coping: some worked only part time, but in their central fields; others restricted the scope of their possibilities (for example, the "architectural designer" who never got her certification as a registered architect); or worked in a "lesser" job than one for which they were trained (for example, the "crystallographer" who worked as a physics research editor whose task was to "verify facts in physical sciences").

The accommodation of these women was a direct response to family demands. This pattern occurred in the MIT sample only in women who had two or more children; those with only one, or with no children (as well as those who were single) all had full career involvement. Also, it seemed to be a response to early dislocation: all of those who ended up adopting an accommodative strategy left their first jobs to follow their husbands to another location. And, though these accommodating MIT alumnae enjoyed their work (their satisfaction with their jobs, as a matter of fact, was the highest of any group), they were less professional--in the sense of participation in professional affairs aside from the job--than their counterparts with full career

involvement.

They also were distinguished by certain attitudes. In contrast to the women with full career involvement, who gave many examples of how they were hurt in their careers by being women, none of those with an accommodative career described any such problems, an ease which was not even true of the group that had no involvement with work at all. And the only two women in this group who were vociferous in their condemnation of the women's liberation movement both had accommodative careers. It would seem, then, that underlying accommodation as a career strategy for women is a rather conventional view of sex roles--though it is not conventional in the traditional sense of viewing women's roles as centering solely on "Kinder, Küche, Kirche" since it is based on an affirmation of the right of women to have some kind of occupational commitment of their own. It is conventional (perhaps neo-conventional would be a better term) in that it is based on the belief that the requirements of a married woman's career must be clearly secondary to those of her husband's. In another context--in a study of family and career patterns of a sample of English university graduates of 1960<sup>2</sup>--we have termed such an attitude secondary commitment, and, indeed, results from that study serve to elucidate the psychological meaning of accommodation for women further.

Married women in the English university graduates group divide about fifty-fifty into those who felt that they should be allowed to pursue long-range occupational commitments and those who felt they should not. About one third of the former group felt very strongly that such a commitment is all right only as long as it does not interfere with their husbands' career plans; the requirements of their occupational life, in other words, must clearly be secondary to those of their husbands'. For them, work was important for its own sake, as a source of immediate gratification and not as a step in the process of the development of a career pattern. Here, too,

we saw the interrelation of this pattern with the experiences of family life. Women with such secondary occupational commitment who had not yet had children had no plans to work when children might arrive. But those with children seemingly needed the satisfactions of outside work and planned to work more or less continuously at least on a part time basis, or, if they interrupted while children were very young, they planned to resume work at a later time. Thus data on the sample of English women graduates, too, suggest that accommodation is the career strategy of women with traditional views of sex roles but whose temperaments are not fully congruent with the requirements of the traditional feminine role.

Obviously the same strategy when used by men will have a different psychological meaning. They come to it, if at all, from the completely opposite assumption that men in our society--especially those with higher education--will organize their lives around their work and careers. But when they deviate from this pattern the nature of their family relations is affected.

In the English study already mentioned, we found that the wives of career-oriented men are more likely to be working outside the home, while more of the wives of family-oriented men are at home, playing traditional feminine roles.<sup>3</sup> But more important than this distinction is the fact that the wives of family-oriented men react differently to their role, whatever it may be. When they are not working, most of them are satisfied with their traditional roles, whereas more than half of the non-working wives of career-oriented men express some dissatisfaction with their non-working status. Also, there is a difference in the attitudes of the working wives of these two types of men. A majority of the working wives of career-oriented men say that they are not in favor of married women having careers at all, even if these are clearly secondary to their husbands'. To work in the face of such an attitude can only be considered a dissatisfaction--or at best a lack of full satisfaction--with the role of the working wife. In contrast, the bulk of the working wives of family-oriented men exhibit the

attitude we have termed secondary commitment: they favor careers for married women, though they feel they must be secondary to their husbands'.

Thus these data show that the wife of the family-oriented man is more satisfied with whatever role she chooses, traditional or working. The presence of such a facilitative effect is further supported by the finding that marriages of family-oriented men to women trying to combine careers with family life are much happier than marriages of such women to men more oriented to their careers (Bailyn, 1970). And though family orientation is only one element of accommodation, these data seem to indicate that accommodation in men has positive consequences for their families.

#### The Measure of Accommodation in the MIT Sample

In the work cited above, we classified the men in the sample according to whether career or family relationships contributed more to their satisfactions in life. This same question was included as one part of the measure of accommodation used in the present paper. But we wanted also to tap the extent to which our respondents were oriented to success. As indicated above, we envisioned the extreme accommodative position as being accompanied by a rejection, at least to some extent, of the traditional pressure on men toward achievement and career success. We therefore included two items to cover this aspect of accommodation: one concerning the importance of success and the other dealing with career aspirations. We consider men as more accommodative if they do not put very great importance on being successful in their work and if they do not have very high aspirations for their career. Finally, we wanted to get beyond attitudes, if possible, and to get an indication of the extent to which family considerations are taken into account in making career decisions. The closest our data allowed us to get was to see how important each respondent would rate "job which leaves sufficient time for family and personal life" in a long list of job characteristics whose importance "with regard to your present and future jobs" he was asked to rate on a 5-point scale.

All in all, 1,155 married men in our sample answered these four questions. Their responses to each one were grouped into 4 categories, from least to most accommodative, and combined into a simple additive index ranging from 0 (extreme non-accommodation) to 12 (extreme accommodation). For most of the analysis, the resulting distribution was trichotomized into the accommodators, the top 20% of the distribution; the non-accommodators, the bottom 20%; and the 60% in the middle range.

The distributions of responses to the individual items and to the total index, which are given in Appendix A, show that the sample we deal with is more non-accommodative than accommodative. The mean of the accommodation scale is 4.5, and the lowest fifth has scores of 0, 1, or 2, while the scores of the highest fifth range from 7 to 12. In particular, it is the items dealing with the importance of success and the extent of career aspirations that are most skewed in their distribution toward the non-accommodative end, indicating that success aspirations are quite high in this sample.

Still, the differences between the accommodative and non-accommodative groups are considerable. In terms of their responses to the four defining items they may be characterized in the following way. The accommodators rated family relationships as among the most important sources of their main satisfactions in life; they rated importance of time for family and personal life as at least 4 on a 5-point scale; they did not rate themselves as possessing career aspirations to a "great extent"; and they did not feel that success at work was "very important" for them. The non-accommodators, in contrast, rated their careers as among the main sources of their life satisfactions; rated time for family 3 or less on a 5-point scale of importance; indicated that they possess high career aspirations to a "great extent"; and viewed success at work as "very important" to them. The middle group, obviously, consists of a variety of patterns: it includes those very active people for whom both family considerations and success aspirations are very important and those more withdrawn

respondents who do not indicate great concern with either area, as well as those who are moderate on both. In Appendix B we will look at some of these patterns separately, but in the main analysis of this paper, we emphasize the distinction between the extremes of the distribution: between the accommodators and the non-accommodators.

#### Work Correlates of Accommodation

In the absence of developmental data, it is not easy to say what determines the extent to which a person is willing to accommodate career needs to family requirements. Nor is it easy to ascertain whether we are dealing with a relatively enduring tendency or one that is sensitively responsive to a person's particular current situation, either the characteristics of his job or particular family circumstances. Our guess is that we are dealing with an interactive process between attitudes and values on the one hand and external circumstances on the other. Nor are external circumstances and personal attitudes likely to be independent of each other. On the contrary, we assume that an individual's attitudes and values both change in response to experiences and, partially, determine those experiences. Thus we view accommodation as measured at a given time in a person's life as indicative of a syndrome of attitudes, values, and expectations surrounding work and family whose broad outlines developed initially in response to experiences with one's parental family, whose details were filled in during the period of early career decisions and marriage choices, and whose contours are continuously modified as a result of particular jobs held or changing circumstances within the family.

We make no attempt to unravel these influences here. Though we have some evidence that certain background characteristics are related to accommodation<sup>4</sup>, we will not investigate such "determinants." Our concern, rather, is with the work-related "correlates" of accommodation--the orientations to work and the circumstances of career that accompany it.

Accommodation is embedded in a person's assessment of his current work situation (Table I). Accommodators are not only much less likely to be work oriented or to have a personal involvement in their fields but also less certain that they have chosen the right career and less satisfied with their present jobs; they also feel less competent in their chosen field, and they rate their current success in their work lower and have somewhat smaller professional incomes. In other words, accommodation goes along with less involvement with work, less satisfaction with jobs<sup>5</sup> (just the opposite of what was found for the women), and less professional success.

Accommodation also has implications for the way in which a person functions cognitively (Table II). When asked to evaluate themselves with respect to certain abilities and traits, the accommodators have in many respects a more negative self-image than is true of the non-accommodators. Some of the elements of this less favorable image are not surprising in view of the context of accommodation: accommodators feel less able to identify and to solve problems and less able to think creatively. But they also consider themselves to have considerably less overall self-confidence: only 14% of the accommodators feel that they possess self-confidence "to a great extent"; almost half of the non-accommodators give this positive self-assessment.

Tangri (personal communication) suggests that this negative self-image results from behavior not commensurate with the American male sex-role ideal. She feels that perceiving oneself as poor in problem-solving and lacking in self-confidence (whether or not these perceptions are "accurate") may be part of the attributional process: "I am not the 'go-getter' this society extolls, therefore, there must be something wrong with me."

The fact that the accommodators view themselves as more tolerant "of other people and their points of view" than do the non-accommodators and are more concerned with doing work that is relevant to social problems and makes a contribution to society, is some corroboration for this point of view. These positive aspects of the accommodator's self-image--which probably help explain the good effects of this strategy for

a man's family--are less stereotypically sex-linked. But the occupational roles of this sample<sup>6</sup> would seem to require cognitive skills, and lack of cognitive assurance is, therefore, likely to be problematic.

Accommodation is also related to the professional roles a person is likely to play (Table III). Wherever we tap the professional role we find the accommodators more passive. They are less likely to be active in professional affairs--to publish or present papers at meetings, or even to belong to a professional society; they are less likely to be entrepreneurs--to have founded a business or established a professional office or firm. Their concerns about their jobs center on the external conditions of work. Almost by definition they are not particularly interested in advancement, high earnings, or other signs of power; but they are also less interested in the intrinsic character of the work they do--whether or not it is challenging or gives them a sense of accomplishment. They differ in their perceptions of their leadership ability. The accommodators are less likely than the non-accommodators to see themselves as good leaders. And, even if they think they have leadership ability, they have less desire to use it, in contrast to the non-accommodators whose leadership desire is great even if their ability is not.<sup>7</sup>

Further, there is evidence that this professional passivity is self-perpetuating. The accommodators are much less likely than the non-accommodators to feel that they possess the "ability to continue to learn new things" to any great extent or to have a very "positive attitude toward further education." Even where their own jobs are concerned, the passivity is apparent. Each respondent was asked how long he thinks he will remain with the organization he is currently working for. A little more than half the sample gave a noncommittal answer to this question, but about a fifth indicated that they definitely planned to stay for the rest of their working lives, and a fourth indicated that they were considering leaving their present positions (5% had already made definite plans to leave their present position or organization). Since,

obviously, these plans are very dependent on the person's satisfaction with his current job, we must look at their relation to accommodation separately for those who are very satisfied with their jobs and for those whose satisfaction is not great.

	Satisfaction with Present Job			
	Very Great (5)		Not Great (1-3)	
	Accommodation			
<u>Permanence in Present Job:</u>	High (N=30)	Low (N=106)	High (N=111)	Low (N=43)
percentage who				
are noncommittal	70%	51%	48%	44%
DEFINITELY plan to stay for the rest of their working lives	23%	37%	21%	7%
indicate feelings of transience	7%	12%	31%	49%
[have definite plans to leave]	[3%]	[0]	[7%]	[23%]

More of the non-accommodators who are very satisfied with their present job indicate a definite desire to stay in it than do the accommodators. The accommodators who share this degree of satisfaction are mainly noncommittal about their job permanence. Among those whose job satisfaction is not great, just the reverse pattern exists. More than one fifth of the accommodators in this group say they nonetheless plan to stay in the job indefinitely (as opposed to 7% of the non-accommodators); and only 7% of them have any definite plans to leave the job, despite their lack of satisfaction with it, as compared to the non-accommodators of whom almost one fourth have such definite plans.<sup>8</sup>

Looked at in another way, what this means is that the definite plans of the accommodators to stay in their current job or to leave it, show hardly any relation to the

extent of their satisfaction with that job. Perhaps these people have responded to the unsatisfactory job situation by accommodation--by withdrawing from the realm of work and emphasizing their orientation toward their families--rather than by attempting to improve the work situation itself.

It seems, therefore, that accommodation has very definite work implications. Accommodators are less committed to their work and more passive in their professional roles. Whether this is a result of the fact that they find themselves in occupations that do not allow their tolerance and concern for other people to be advantageously expressed, we do not know. We must conclude, however, that in this sample accommodation is associated with cognitive characteristics that appear to decrease a person's effectiveness in his work.

#### Accommodation and Organizational Role<sup>9</sup>

The occupations of the respondents in this survey form, as has been mentioned before, a relatively circumscribed set. First and foremost, they are all technically based: they have emerged in a line of career development that started with a Bachelor of Science in an institute of technology and are occupied by people whose earliest career choices (as evidenced by their decision to come to MIT) centered on science and technology. But many of the jobs of our respondents also share one other characteristic, they take place in industrial organizations.<sup>10</sup> This organizational component is important because, until recently, it has been almost a cliché of our society that such occupational roles preclude the kind of accommodation with which we deal.

In order to investigate this relation in our sample, we have concentrated on those employees in the private sector who fit three organizational levels: top management (major executive officers above the functional level); technical management (heads of a technical division, e.g. director of research and development); and

technical staff (scientists and engineers with no management responsibility except, perhaps, as first level supervisors of a project or team). These three, obviously, differ not only in the responsibilities and range of tasks required of them but also in the power and prestige that accompany them. And, as is evident below, these three organizational roles show very different degrees of accommodation.

	<u>Organizational Role</u>		
	Top Management (N=140)	Technical Management (N=184)	Technical Staff (N=237)
Percentage whose ACCOMMODATION is:			
HIGH	10%	16%	37%
MEDIUM	49%	63%	56%
LOW	41%	21%	8%

By far the greatest degree of accommodation is found among those in technical staff positions: over one third of them are accommodative and scarcely any are in the non-accommodating group. At the opposite extreme are the top managers, of whom hardly any are accommodators and almost half are non-accommodators. In between are the technical managers whose distribution is very similar to that of the total sample: a little under two thirds are in the middle group, and the rest are more or less evenly divided between accommodators and non-accommodators.<sup>11</sup>

What we don't know, of course, and what our data cannot tell us, is whether accommodation is the result of being in certain organizational roles,<sup>12</sup> or whether only those with non-accommodating orientations get promoted into the top organizational positions. The finding in our data that the difference in accommodation between managers and staff is greater among the older alumni (Class of 1951) than among the

younger (Class of 1959) is consistent with both interpretations. And, as indicated before, we assume that in fact both directions of influence do occur--that, in other words, we are dealing with an interactive process between career events and orientations.<sup>13</sup>

More importantly, we also do not know whether the close relation between top management positions and non-accommodation is a necessary requirement of fulfilling these roles adequately, or results, merely, from shared assumptions of organizations and their employees. This is obviously a crucial question in the current debate on the larger values of the society and their relation to its component parts.

Our guess is that no universal prescription will hold. There will always be top administrative tasks, as well as some creative and scholarly endeavors, that are best filled by people dedicated solely to these pursuits. And there will, presumably, continue to be people who, because of special gifts or special circumstances, are most fulfilled by applying themselves almost exclusively to their work. Obviously, the matching of such positions with such people would in no way depend on a person's sex, and we would hope that non-accommodation would become a possible career strategy that could be chosen by women as well as men.

But the positions that actually require non-accommodation are probably less prevalent than is usually assumed, and, as cultural pressures toward one particular mode decrease, we may find that fewer people fit the non-accommodative pattern. Further, we must recognize its possible costs for areas outside of work and the inequities that may arise when non-accommodators and accommodators compete for the same positions. The proper balancing of these contrary forces is a challenge for the future; it will depend on wide tolerance for individual choice as well as a rethinking of occupational requirements.

Table I

Accommodation and Assessment of Current Work Situation

Percentage who:	ACCOMMODATION			
	HIGH (N=242) <sup>a</sup>	MEDIUM (N=681) <sup>a</sup>	LOW (N=232) <sup>a</sup>	D (%LOW-%HIGH)
1. have great personal involvement in their field <sup>b</sup>	9%	36%	64%	55
2. have HIGH work orientation <sup>c</sup>	4%	24%	55%	51
3. have great certainty that they have chosen the right career <sup>b</sup>	17%	34%	57%	40
4. are very satisfied with their present job <sup>d</sup>	13%	27%	46%	33
5. feel they have real competence in their chosen field <sup>b</sup>	15%	31%	41%	26
6. feel that at this point in their professional life they are very successful in their work <sup>e</sup>	8%	14%	32%	24
7. have total professional incomes over \$30,000	5%	15%	29%	24

a. For any given item in the table these N's are reduced by those who did not answer the particular question under consideration.

b. A number of the items in the table stem from a general question: "Below is a list of abilities and traits that people possess to varying degrees. Please indicate the degree to which you now possess each of the listed factors. Rate yourself by circling the number from 0 to 4 that best describes the extent to which you now possess each ability or trait."

do not possess		possess to a		
at all		great extent		
0	1	2	3	4

The particular items used are:

- Personal involvement in your field
- Certainty that you have chosen the right career
- Real competence in your chosen field

The response category given in the table is 4.

c. Based on an additive index of the following four items:

I like to think about my work, even when off the job.

My only interest in my job is to get enough money to do other things that I want to do.  
(REVERSE scoring)

I wish I were in a completely different occupation. (REVERSE scoring)

My main satisfactions in life come from the work I do.

Strongly disagree					Strongly agree	
1	2	3	4	5		

Percentages given in the table correspond to total scores of 18 or more (out of a possible maximum of 20 for those answering all four items with a 5).

d. Based on the following question:

How satisfied are you with your present job?

Very dissatisfied					Very satisfied	
1	2	3	4	5		

The response category given in the table is 5.

e. Based on the following question:

At this point in your professional life, how successful do you think you are in your work?

Unsuccessful					Very successful	
1	2	3	4	5		

The response category given in the table is 5.

Table II

Accommodation and Cognitive Functioning

Percentage who:	ACCOMMODATION			D (%LOW-%HIGH)
	HIGH (N=242) <sup>a</sup>	MEDIUM (N=681) <sup>a</sup>	LOW (N=232) <sup>a</sup>	
1. have great overall self-confidence <sup>b</sup>	14%	29%	45%	31
2. have great ability to think creatively <sup>b</sup>	21%	34%	47%	26
3. have great ability to identify and solve problems <sup>c</sup>	21%	33%	45%	24
4. have great tolerance of other people and their points of view <sup>b</sup>	40%	31%	25%	-15
5. have great concern about social problems <sup>d</sup>	38%	35%	28%	-10

a. For any given item in the table these N's are reduced by those who did not answer the particular question under consideration.

b. Items from the question listed in Table I, note b:

- Overall self-confidence
- Ability to think creatively
- Tolerance of other people and their points of view

The percentages in the table correspond to those people who feel they possess the trait to a great extent. (Response category 4.)

c. Based on a combination of two items from this same question:

- Ability to identify problems
- Ability to analyze and solve problems

The percentages in the table correspond to those people who feel they possess BOTH the ability to identify and the ability to solve problems to a great extent. (Response category 4.)

d. Based on the following question: "The list below shows a number of characteristics of a job. Please circle the appropriate number to show how important you feel each characteristic is to you with regard to your present and future jobs."

- |                         |   |   |   |                   |
|-------------------------|---|---|---|-------------------|
| not at all<br>important |   |   |   | very<br>important |
| 1                       | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5                 |

On the basis of the intercorrelations of these items, certain scales were isolated and scored. The present scale (Concern with Social Problems) is based on the following items:

- Work that is relevant to social problems
- Job which allows me to make a contribution to society

Scales were categorized into 3 approximately equal groups. The percentages in the table represent the top third of the distribution, those whose average response is 3.5 or more.

Table III

Accommodation and Professional Role Behavior

Percentage who:	ACCOMMODATION			D (%LOW-%HIGH)
	HIGH (N=242) <sup>a</sup>	MEDIUM (N=681) <sup>a</sup>	LOW (N=232) <sup>a</sup>	
1. have great concern about Power <sup>b</sup>	24%	39%	59%	35
2. have great concern about Achievement <sup>b</sup>	23%	38%	50%	27
3. participate in all professional activities <sup>c</sup>	24%	35%	45%	21
4. have entrepreneurship <sup>d</sup>	8%	14%	22%	14
-----				
5.a) possess great ability to continue to learn <sup>e</sup>	20%	38%	48%	28
b) have a positive attitude to further education <sup>e</sup>	18%	30%	43%	25
6.a) have great ability to induce change in others and in organizations <sup>e</sup>	10%	16%	30%	20
b) are HIGH on leadership <sup>f</sup>	6%	15%	25%	19

a. For any given item in the table these N's are reduced by those who did not answer the particular question under consideration.

b. Based on scales from the question mentioned in Table II, note d. The Power scale is based on the following four items:

- Opportunity for advancement
- Job which allows me to make a real contribution to the success of the organization
- Opportunity for high earnings
- Opportunity to exercise leadership

The Achievement scale is based on the following three items:

- Challenging work to do
- Work from which I could get a personal sense of accomplishment
- Considerable freedom to adopt my own approach to the job--to be creative and original

Percentages in the table represent the top third of the distribution: average scores of 4.5 or more for Power; average scores of 5.0 for Achievement.

- c. Based on the following questions:

Do you presently belong to a professional society?  
Have you ever read a paper at a meeting of a professional society?  
Have you ever published any professional articles, papers, or books?

Percentages in the table correspond to those who answered YES to all three questions.

- d. Includes all people who are currently in professional offices, firms, or businesses of which they were the founder or co-founder, as well as a small number (3%) who were entrepreneurs in the past but are now employed by others.
- e. Items from the question listed in Table I, note b:

Ability to continue to learn new things  
Positive attitude toward further education  
Ability to induce change in others and in organizations

The percentages in the table correspond to those people who feel they possess the trait to a great extent. (Response category 4).

- f. Based on a combination of two items from this same question:

Leadership ability  
Leadership desire

The percentages in the table correspond to those people who feel they possess BOTH leadership ability and desire to a great extent. (Response category 4).

NOTES

<sup>1</sup>The material on the women graduates is taken from Bailyn, Women Respondents, unpublished research memorandum, September, 1970.

<sup>2</sup>This study, which was sponsored by The Leverhulme Trust in a grant to Political and Economic Planning (PEP) under the direction of Michael Fogarty and Rhona Rapoport (PEP) and Robert Rapoport (Tavistock Institute), London, is reported in full in Fogarty, Rapoport, and Rapoport, (1970). Material in the present paper on the total sample comes particularly from chapters 6 and 7 of the full report. Material based on a sub-segment of the whole--the couples sample--stems from Bailyn, Career Commitment, unpublished research memorandum, June, 1969; and Bailyn, Career and Family Orientation of Husbands, unpublished research memorandum, June, 1969.

<sup>3</sup>The married men in the English sample were divided by a question dealing with one element of accommodation, viz., the relative importance of career as opposed to family relationships as the source of one's greatest satisfaction in life. Those who put career first were considered career-oriented, and those who put family first were considered family-oriented.

About three fifths of the married men in the English sample--University graduates from the year 1960--were family-oriented in this sense. The same question was asked in the MIT alumni survey and in the closely equivalent class there (1959) 50% of the married men were family oriented by the same criterion. This difference may reflect some national differences: in a study on the brain drain done by A. D. Little for Britain's National Economic Development Office, certain differences in the treatment of technologists in the two countries were found which the researchers attributed to "'a more aggressive attitude' by an American recruited for a job, which stems from what is believed to be a greater emphasis placed on the job as a proportion of the

total satisfaction from life. To an American, apparently, his job is of paramount importance. To an Englishman it is not. The American lives to work. The Englishman works to live." (Reported in the Boston Globe, Monday, January 11, 1971, p. 15.) But the difference probably also reflects a difference in the questionnaires, the one more centered on careers, the other more on family. In a study by Brooks (1971) of Sloan Fellows at MIT ("exceptionally able young executives" in their thirties), which used an even more family-centered questionnaire in which both husbands and wives were asked to reply, almost three quarters gave family oriented responses to this question. It should be mentioned, however, that almost all of these listed their careers as the source of their next greatest satisfaction: only 12% of the Sloan Fellows did not mention career at all, as compared to 16% of the married MIT alumni from '59, and 24% of the married men in the English sample.

Further, though the samples differ in the extent to which their wives are working, they all show that career-oriented men are more likely than their family-oriented counterparts to have working wives:

% whose wives are working:	Men's Orientation	
	CAREER	FAMILY
SAMPLE		
English Couples Sample	57% (N=69)	39% (N=135)
English Married University Graduates	42% (N=103)	25% (N=193)
MIT Married Alumni	25% (N=181)	13% (N=193)
Sloan Fellows	18% (N=11)	13% (N=30)

% with HIGH accommodation

1. Highest degree attained:

Bachelors	25% (N=472)
Masters	21% (N=396)
Doctorate	14% (N=287)

2. Undergraduate grade average:\*

C or less**	31% (N=177)
C+	20% (N=250)
B	18% (N=443)
A	22% (N=36)

\* N's do not add up because many people did not answer this question.

\*\* Fully 45% of the 29 people whose grade averages were in the D's are HIGH on accommodation.

3. Father's socio-economic status:\*

Top professional or managerial	15% (N=280)
Lesser professional or managerial	19% (N=471)
Lower white collar	25% (N=205)
Blue collar	28% (N=173)

\* This index is based primarily on father's occupation but is modified by father's education. Those for whom there was insufficient information for classification, were excluded.

It should be mentioned that these differences do not account for the correlates discussed: that is, even when these background characteristics are held constant, the relations discussed in the text persist.

<sup>5</sup> We have some indication that accommodation is at least in part a response to an unsatisfactory job situation. The evidence comes from looking at the relation between Job Satisfaction and Accommodation for each class separately:

Percentage whose ACCOMMODATION is High:	JOB SATISFACTION			
	High	Medium	Low	D (Low-High)
of the Class of 1951	10%	22%	43%	33
1955	9%	16%	36%	27
1959	9%	19%	24%	15

We note, first, that the relation between Accommodation and Job Satisfaction is considerably greater among the oldest alumni (Class of 1951) than among the youngest (Class of 1959).

of 1959). In particular, we see a sizeable increase in Accommodation in the oldest group among those with little satisfaction with their jobs--almost half of this group are accommodators. We still do not know, however, whether dissatisfaction with the job is leading to the increase in accommodation or vice versa. We use our 3 classes as approximations for data on the same people at different career stages:

Job Satisfaction	Accommodation	1951		1955		1959	
		(N=473)*	%	(N=307)*	%	(N=362)*	%
High	Low	50	10.6	28	9.1	28	7.7
High	High	14	3.0	8	2.6	8	2.2
Low	Low	15	3.2	8	2.6	20	5.5
Low	High	56	11.8	29	9.4	27	7.5

\*--Excludes people who did not answer the Job Satisfaction question.

The increases in the top and bottom lines with time (that is, from the youngest class to the oldest) indicate what we already know, that Job Satisfaction and Accommodation are becoming more closely related. But now we see something else, that the main source of extreme incongruence in the youngest class is the combination of LOW Job Satisfaction and LOW Accommodation. If we knew what happened to this combination we could answer the question of direction of influence. We approximate this knowledge by noting that the congruent pattern of LOW Job Satisfaction and HIGH Accommodation is increasing more than the opposite congruent pattern of HIGH Job Satisfaction and LOW Accommodation. We infer, therefore, that the LOW-LOW incongruent pattern is resolving into the LOW-HIGH congruent one, and that accommodation is a response (with time) to an unsatisfactory job situation.

<sup>6</sup>In less technically oriented occupations--in the helping professions, for instance--these conclusions might be very different.

7

ACCOMMODATION

	HIGH (N=240) *	MEDIUM (N=676) *	LOW (N=231) *
<u>Leadership ability and desire are equal</u>			
Both are:			
very great (4) **	6%	15%	25%
medium (3)	25%	31%	21%
not great (0-2)	19%	11%	6%
<u>Leadership ability and desire are NOT equal</u>			
desire > ability	20%	25%	37%
desire < ability	30%	18%	11%

\* --Includes only those who answered the leadership questions.

\*\* --Based on the questions referred to in Table III, note f. Numbers in parentheses indicate the response category corresponding to the verbal description.

<sup>8</sup> These differences almost disappear in the youngest class in the sample. In particular, among those of the Class of 1959 who are very satisfied with their jobs, there is no relation at all between accommodation and the feeling of permanence in that job.

<sup>9</sup> This section is based on a different analysis than that of the original paper.

<sup>10</sup> 74% of the sample is employed in the private sector; 19% are employed by non-profit institutions such as universities; and 7% are government employees.

<sup>11</sup> Since these roles also differ greatly in some of the factors that we have

identified as correlates of accommodation, the question arises whether occupational differences account for some of those relations. The data indicate that this happens in only one case: entrepreneurship. Only the top managers include a sizeable number of entrepreneurs and they are as likely to be in the accommodating as the non-accommodating group. In other cases, such as income, for instance, the occupational homogeneity accentuates the extent of relationship: almost three fifths (59%) of the non-accommodating top managers have incomes over \$30,000 as opposed to a mere quarter (25%) of top managers whose accommodation scores are High.

<sup>12</sup>Technical staff roles have often been found to be "alienating"; see, e.g., Ritti (1971), Perucci and Gerstl (1969), Bailyn (1974).

<sup>13</sup>Evans (1974), studying a group of marketing managers (on an organizational level similar to our technical managers), concludes that accommodation to home life is the response of middle managers whose career aspirations have declined, as a result, usually, of some "failure" on the part of the manager to get a promotion or other formal recognition of success.

References

- Astin, H.S., 1969. The Woman Doctorate in America: Origins, Career, and Family, New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Bailyn, L., 1970. Career and Family Orientations of Husbands and Wives in Relation to Marital Happiness, Human Relations, 23, 97-113.
- , 1974. Engineering Based Careers: A Study of the Relation to Work at Mid-Career, Sloan School of Management Working Paper, 715-74, MIT.
- Beckhard, R., 1972. The Executive You're Counting On May Be Ready to Mutiny, Innovation, 31, 1-9.
- Brooks, K.R., 1971. Relative Priorities in the Job-Family Relationship, Unpublished Masters Thesis, Sloan School of Management, MIT.
- Evans, P.A.L., 1974. The Price of Success: Accommodation to Conflicting Needs in Managerial Careers, Unpublished Doctoral Thesis, Sloan School of Management, MIT.
- Fogarty, M.P., R. Rapoport, and R.N. Rapoport, 1970. Sex, Career and Family, London: Allen & Unwin.
- Hall, D.T., 1972. A Model of Coping with Role Conflict: The Role Behavior of College Educated Women, ASQ, 17, 471-486.
- Perucci, R. and J.E. Gerstl, 1969. Profession Without Community: Engineers in American Society, New York: Random House.
- Rapoport, R., and R.N. Rapoport, 1969. The Dual Career Family: A Variant Pattern and Social Change, Human Relations, 22, 3-30.
- Ritti, R.R., 1971. The Engineer in the Industrial Corporation, New York: Columbia University Press.
- Rossi, A.S., 1965. Barriers to the Career Choice of Engineering, Medicine, or Science among American Women, in J.A. Mattfeld and C.G. Van Aken (eds.), Women and the Scientific Professions: The MIT Symposium on American Women in Science and Engineering, Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 51-127.
- The Status of Women in Sweden: Report to the United Nations, 1968. Reprinted in E. Dahlstrom (ed.), The Changing Roles of Men and Women, Boston: Beacon Press, 1971.
- Tarnowieski, D., 1973. The Changing Success Ethic: An AMA Survey Report, New York, Amacom.
- Yankelovich, D., 1972. The Changing Values on Campus: Political and Personal Attitudes of Today's College Students, New York: Pocket Books.



3. Below is a list of abilities and traits that people possess to varying degrees. Please indicate the degree to which you NOW possess each of the listed factors. Rate yourself by circling the number from 0 to 4 that best describes the extent to which you now possess each ability or trait.

High aspirations for your career

Do not possess at all			Possess to a great extent			
0	1	2	3	4		
Response					SCORE	All Married Respondents (N=1229)
				4	0	43%
				3	1	35%
				2	2	16%
				0,1	3	4%
				no answer	excluded	2%

4. How important is it to you to be successful in your work?

Unimportant			Very important			
1	2	3	4	5		
Response					SCORE	All Married Respondents (N=1229)
				5	0	43%
				4	1	43%
				3	2	11%
				1,2	3	2%
				no answer	excluded	1%

The accommodation score consisted of the total of these individual scores. Its distribution for the MIT sample is given in Table A1.

Table A1

Distribution of Accommodation Scores

<u>Score</u>		<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
0		15	1%
1	Low	85	7%
2		132	11%
<hr/>			
3		182	15%
4	Medium	185	15%
5		184	15%
6		130	11%
<hr/>			
7		114	9%
8		58	5%
9	High	38	3%
10		22	2%
11		7	1%
12		3	*
<hr/>			
No answer to 1 or more		74	6%
<hr/>			
TOTAL		1229	101%

\*--Less than 1/2%

Of those with scores: (N=1155) 100%

% whose accommodation scores are:

Low (0-2)	232	20%
Medium (3-6)	681	59%
High (7-12)	242	21%

Table A2 gives the distribution of accommodation scores separately for each class and for married and non-married respondents. As the table shows, unmarried respondents, of which there are very few, are very unlikely to have high accommodation scores, a finding that corroborates our understanding of accommodation as concerning the relation between a person's career and his family of procreation. It is for this reason that the analysis in this paper is limited to those respondents who are married. Further, as is indicated at the bottom of Table A2, there is not much difference between classes. What difference there is, indicates that among married respondents the younger classes are less accommodative (though this difference is slightly reduced when the comparison is limited to married respondents with children). Most likely this trend signifies the stage in the career development: the younger classes, who are at a less developed stage of their careers, are at a time where they have to pay more attention to it. Among the single respondents, in contrast, accommodation is higher in the younger classes than in the oldest. It may well be that this latter tendency is the beginning of the trend toward more equalitarian tendencies seen in today's college graduates, but without data from more recent classes at an equivalent stage of career development, this hunch cannot be tested.

Table A2

Accommodation by Class and Marital Status

Accommodation Score	1951		1955		1959		
	Married N=505	Not Married N=29	Married N=336	Not Married N=35	Married N=388	Not Married N=57	
0	1%	7%	1%	3%	1%	9%	
1	7%	3%	8%	9%	6%	16%	Low
2	10%	17%	10%	9%	11%	12%	
3	15%	24%	15%	20%	15%	7%	
4	14%	14%	15%	14%	16%	18%	Medium
5	13%	7%	16%	11%	17%	10%	
6	10%	10%	11%	9%	12%	4%	
7	12%	3%	8%	11%	8%	2%	
8	5%	-	4%	3%	5%	9%	
9	3%	-	3%	-	3%	2%	High
10	2%	-	2%	-	2%	-	
11	1%	-	*	3%	*	-	
12	*	-	1%	-	-	-	
No answer	6%	14%	7%	9%	5%	12%	

\*--Less than 1/2%

% With HIGH Accommodation Scores

Of those who are:	1951	1955	1959
Married	25% (N=476)*	19% (N=311)*	18% (N=368)*
[Married with children]	[24% (N=454)]	[19% (N=295)]	[20% (N=311)]
Not Married	4% (N=25)	19% (N=32)	14% (N=50)

\* No answers are eliminated.

APPENDIX B

The Components of Accommodation

It will be remembered that the measure of accommodation consists of two elements: an orientation toward a person's family and a lack of success aspiration in work. It becomes of interest, therefore, to see whether the correlates of accommodation (Tables I to III) are equally related to both of these elements. In order to investigate this question we summed the scores on the two family items separately from those on the two success aspiration ones, dichotomized the resulting distributions, and combined them into the following four groups:

Family Orientation:	Success Aspiration		TOTAL
	Low (scores 2-6)	High (scores 0-1)	
High (scores 4-6)	Group 1 N=275	Group 3 N=197	472
Low (scores 0-3)	Group 2 N=269	Group 4 N=414	683
TOTAL	544	611	1155

As can be seen, Group 1 corresponds to accommodators, group 4 corresponds to non-accommodators, and groups 2 and 3 divide the middle levels of accommodation into what one might call an active group (group 3), oriented to BOTH family and work, and a more passive one (group 2) whose orientation is not very high to either.\*

---

\*--Because of the way the distributions were formed, the correspondence between these groups and accommodation scores is not exact:

	% whose ACCOMMODATION scores are:			
	HIGH	MEDIUM	LOW	Total
Group 1 (accommodators)	77%	23%	0	100% (N=275)
Group 2 (passive)	6%	90%	4%	100% (N=269)
Group 3 (active)	7%	93%	0	100% (N=197)
Group 4 (non-accommodators)	0	46%	54%	100% (N=414)

Table B1

Correlates of Accommodation Related to its Components

Family Orientation: Group #:	LOW Success Aspiration		HIGH Success Aspiration	
	HIGH	LOW	HIGH	LOW
	1 (accommodators) N=275*	2 (passive) N=269*	3 (active) N=197*	4 (non-accommodators) N=414*
<u>Current Work Situation (I)</u>				
Percentage who:				
1. are involved in their field	8%	20%	50%	58%
2. have HIGH work orientation	5%	22%	20%	45%
3. have great career certainty	16%	20%	45%	50%
4. are satisfied with their jobs	16%	16%	33%	42%
5. feel competent in their fields	16%	20%	39%	41%
6. feel successful in work	7%	6%	24%	26%
7. have incomes over \$30,000	7%	7%	19%	26%
<u>Cognitive Functioning (II)</u>				
Percentage who:				
1. have great self-confidence	12%	15%	44%	43%
2. can think creatively	19%	26%	39%	47%
3. can identify and solve problems	20%	25%	40%	43%
4. have great tolerance	39%	25%	38%	27%
5. are concerned with social problems	40%	24%	47%	31%
<u>Professional Role Behavior (III)</u>				
Percentage who:				
1. are concerned with power	27%	19%	56%	55%
2. are concerned with achievement	24%	23%	47%	51%
3. do professional activities	27%	34%	32%	43%
4. have entrepreneurship	9%	10%	18%	18%
5.a) can continue to learn	18%	27%	48%	49%
b) are pro further education	19%	17%	39%	39%
6.a) can induce change in others	8%	7%	24%	28%
b) are HIGH on leadership**	4%	5%	25%	24%

\* --These numbers are reduced, where necessary, by the No Answer's to any given item.

\*\* --Percentages for whom:

desire > ability	21%	22%	24%	34%
desire < ability	27%	20%	19%	13%

As Table B1 shows, the relation of accommodation to a person's assessment of his current work situation (I) is mainly due to its relation to his Success Aspiration. As a matter of fact, for all the items in that part of the table except one, Success Aspiration is considerably more relevant than Family Orientation; indeed, for feelings of career certainty, competence in one's field, and present success (items 3, 5, 6), Family Orientation makes hardly any difference. The one exception is work orientation (item 2) with which Success Aspiration and Family Orientation are both related and to about the same degree. And, in the case of a person's involvement with his field (item 1), the table shows that in the absence of concern with success, Family Orientation does make a difference: men without great concern about the success of their careers who are oriented to their families (accommodators) are less likely to be very involved in their fields than their counterparts whose orientation to their families is less (passive).

With regard to cognitive functioning (II), we see a decided split between the items referring to abilities and those concerned with attitudes. Differences in ability (items 1, 2, 3) are almost entirely due to differences in Success Aspiration (though item 2--the ability to think creatively--also responds somewhat to differences in Family Orientation). Attitudes (items 4, 5), in contrast, are related mainly to Family Orientation. In the case of concern for social problems (item 5), as a matter of fact, it is the active group (with concern for both success and family) that is the highest, and the passive group (with little concern for either) that is lowest.

Finally, professional role behavior (III) is more responsive to the Success Aspiration part of accommodation than to its Family Orientation component. Only for participation in professional activities (item 3) and for forced leadership (note <sup>\*\*</sup>)--where leadership desire lags behind ability--is Family Orientation as decisive as Success Aspiration. (Though Family Orientation does have some effect on a person's assessment of his ability to continue to learn when his Success Aspiration is Low.) The opposite leadership

pattern (the frustrated one, where desire is greater than ability) results almost entirely from one particular combination of the two components of accommodation: only non-accommodation (the combination of High Success Aspiration and Low Family Orientation) increases the proportion of frustrated leaders (who have more leadership desire than ability) to any appreciable extent.

One other point of interest emerges from this part of the table: the group least likely to be concerned with power is the passive group, those who are not very concerned with success and who are not strongly oriented to their families.

Table B2 shows the distribution of these groups for the three organizational roles analyzed in the paper. It shows, of course, that top managers tend to be most non-accommodative, that technical managers reflect the over all distribution, and that those in technical staff positions are the most accommodative. What is new, however, is the division of the medium level of accommodation into active and passive for each of these groups. The table shows that the greatest relative representation in the active group comes from the top managers, and the greatest in the passive group from those in technical staff positions. Since the active group is accommodative on Family Orientation but not on Success Aspiration, and the passive group is just the reverse--accommodative on Success Aspiration but not on Family Orientation--the correspondence between the active group and the non-accommodating top managers, and the passive group with the accommodators in technical staff positions, indicates that the relation between occupation and accommodation is mediated more by Success Aspiration than by Family Orientation. This finding corroborates the general conclusion from Table B1 that as far as the implications of accommodation for the realm of work are concerned, the Success Aspiration component is the most important.

Table B2  
Components of Accommodation and Occupation

Percentage who are in:	Top Managers (N=140)	Technical Managers (N=184)	Technical Staff (N=237)	TOTAL (N=1155)
Group 1 (accommodators)	11%	23%	40%	24%
Group 2 (passive)	14%	23%	29%	23%
Group 3 (active)	19%	16%	13%	17%
Group 4 (non-accommodators)	56%	38%	18%	36%
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%	100%

It seems likely (from logic, from results of previous research as presented in the paper, and from the items in Table B1 that do not support this conclusion) that the beneficial effects of accommodation in the family realm are due to the other component. It becomes of interest, therefore, to assess the work implications of the active group-- those who combine High Family Orientation with High Success Aspiration. Except for the fact that it is a relatively unlikely combination,\* Table B1 shows that adding an orientation toward one's family to a concern with success affects the realm of work in only a few respects; it is, however, associated with less work orientation, somewhat less job satisfaction and total income, a little less perceived creative ability and less participation in professional affairs. But, it should be added, members of this group seem most likely to try to exert control over their work situation: these active people are the least likely to be noncommittal concerning their permanence in their present jobs; when their satisfaction with their present jobs is very great they are most likely to have definite plans to stay; when their job satisfaction is not great they are most likely to have plans to change.

---

\*--Further, data from the three classes separately indicates that it is even less frequent among the older alumni (Class of 1951):

Percentage who are in:	Succ. Fam.		Class of 1951 (N=476)	Class of 1955 (N=311)	Class of 1959 (N=368)
	Asp.	Or.			
Group 1 (accommodators)	Low	High	26%	24%	21%
Group 2 (passive)	Low	Low	26%	19%	23%
Group 3 (active)	High	High	13%	21%	19%
Group 4 (non-accommod.)	High	Low	35%	37%	36%

And, since the accommodators (Group 1) show more increase than the non-accommodators (Group 4), it looks as if what happens to the active group with time is that Family Orientation remains High but Success Aspiration diminishes (if, indeed, they do not both diminish to the passive position).