ORIGINAL ARTICLE

Portfolio working – a psychological analysis of the phenomenon

Agnieszka Lipińska-Grobelny

Department of Psychology of Work and Career Guidance, Institute of Psychology, University of Lodz, Lodz, Poland

BACKGROUND
It turns out from the latest Eurostat data that Poland holds the second place in Europe in terms of the number of so-called portfolio workers, i.e. persons who work for more than one employer. From the psychological point of view, there arises the question regarding the possible determinants of the mentioned phenomenon. Therefore the general purpose of this study is to present the personal and situational indicators of portfolio working.

PARTICIPANTS AND PROCEDURE
Two hundred and eighteen portfolio workers and 218 workers employed in one workplace (i.e. monoworkers) participated in research using the following set of 'paper-pencil' techniques: a self-made survey, the Value Scale by Rokeach, the Formal Characteristics of Behaviour – Temperament Questionnaire by Zawadzki and Strelau, the Masculinity and Femininity Scale by Lipińska-Grobelny and Gorczycka, and the Organizational Climate Questionnaire by Kolb.

RESULTS
Portfolio working is mainly determined by a number of personal variables (temperamental characteristics, values and spheres of motivation, intensity of masculinity and femininity). A specific role is played by values represented by portfolio workers. The discriminant analysis conducted in groups selected on the basis of working hours indicates that the prediction of participation of the examined persons in the group of portfolio workers with the greatest accuracy appeared in the case of a workload of 48 or more hours, next in the case of a smaller workload up to 47 hours, and finally for the whole group.

CONCLUSIONS
The examination of the phenomenon of portfolio working from the psychological perspective presents an important contribution to the discussion on work and directions of its transformations.

KEY WORDS
portfolio workers; temperamental characteristics; values; spheres of motivation; intensity of masculinity and femininity; situational determinants

BACKGROUND

Taking into consideration that Poland holds a leading position in Europe in terms of the number of portfolio workers, it was decided to examine them from a new perspective – the psychological one. An important reason for carrying out such research was the lack of Polish studies on portfolio working and also the lack of Polish and foreign reports on personal and situational determinants of portfolio working (the purpose of this study). The majority of research with portfolio workers, almost exclusively foreign ones, is of a qualitative character. The data presented in this publication render it possible to formulate conclusions regarding both the character of statistical relationships and also the universality of their occurrence. Therefore the subject of this report is the analysis of the psychological determinants of this interesting phenomenon.

PORTFOLIO WORKING – THE THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

Portfolio working was first noticed by Handy (1989) and is characterized by doing a variety of work for a number of employers or clients. Handy saw the emergence of the portfolio career and the portfolio worker. He considered it as a combination of paid, unpaid and voluntary work, as well as non-work activities. So his concept shared a great deal in common with Hall's protean career (1976) or Mirvis and Hall's (1994) boundaryless career, because all these models proposed that employees should be more flexible, moving among different companies and having diverse jobs across their careers. Another definition, applied in this research, was proposed by Mallon (1999), who treated portfolio working as independence from any one employer and the packaging of one's various skills offered to different organizations. In other words, a portfolio worker is someone who holds jobs or contracts with more than one company (a multiworker). In the mentioned report, portfolio workers are people with two or more salaried positions or a combination of salaried positions and short-term engagements (Lipińska-Grobelny, 2014).

A few studies that looked at portfolio working focused mainly on a series of interviews with individuals and its consequences. Cohen and Mallon (1999) indicated several positive outcomes of being a portfolio worker, such as independence, operational control, a greater level of freedom, an increased variety of work, and a higher quality of life, as well as some negative consequences such as financial insecurity and irregular working patterns. Higher levels of autonomy, responsibility and control were additionally reported in the study of Clinton, Totterdell and Wood (2006). These authors prepared a theoretical model that describes portfolio working together with modifying factors and consequences in the form of work-life balance, work intensity and well-being. They admitted that personal and situational characteristics were also found to be influential in the experience of portfolio working. In connection with these results, it was decided to take into account psychological determinants in relation to portfolio working, suggesting that certain individuals might be better disposed to such a work arrangement.

OBJECTIVES

In this study, a model of multiwork (Lipińska-Grobelny, 2014) which was inspired by the theoretical approach by Clinton et al. (2006) was used. The above-mentioned modifying factors were limited to personal characteristics and situational demands. Personal characteristics included: characteristics and structure of temperament of portfolio workers, values and spheres of motivation, the intensity of masculinity and femininity, and the preferred type of psychological gender (Brown & Gold, 2007; Kimmel & Powell, 1999). Situational demands referred to demands at work (in this research), which were described by autonomy at work, leave control (having control over days off and vacations) and flexitime control (having control over starting and finishing times), support at work, number of hours at work, time needed to get to work, and organizational climate. Portfolio working is a moderator that changes direction and intensity of dependencies among its particular determinants and consequences: relationships between work and family, satisfaction with work, satisfaction with marriage, and satisfaction with life. In the present article the main attention was focused on modifying factors of portfolio working rather than its outcomes.

In support of the significance of psychological determinants, it was pointed out by portfolio workers that personality plays an important role in the development of their career. Clinton et al. (2006) wrote about dispositional optimism, while Wooten, Timmerman and Folger (1999) wrote about emotional stability, tough-mindedness and expedience. In turn, Fraser and Gold (2001) found that autonomy and control were higher among portfolio workers than other employees. Due to all these outcomes it was argued that this research should investigate the characteristics of the temperament of portfolio workers because of the function of effective stimulation regulation, the terminal and instrumental values because of their meaning for the motivation of this group, and the intensity of masculinity and femininity connected with these variables. Therefore it was decided to use well-known concepts, often applied in research, starting with the Regulatory Theory of Temperament by Strelau, the system of values by Rokeach and the spheres of motivation by

Schwartz and Bilsky (1987), and ending with the sex role patterns theory by Bem. Among the situational factors included are those that have proven to be important in the study of workers employed in more than one place, i.e. responsibility (the counterpart of autonomy), the feeling of warmth and support (the counterpart of social support) and control. Finally, referring to a study on portfolio working, the relationship between multiwork and workload was obtained (Lipińska-Grobelny, 2014); therefore statistical analyses were conducted additionally in two subgroups, differentiating portfolio workers. The criterion of 48 working hours per week (the maximum working week provided for by Directive 2003/88 of the European Parliament and the Council of 4 November 2003) was shown in the European Working Conditions Survey, regularly conducted since 1991 (http://www.eurofound.europa.eu/surveys/ewcs, August 2011).

Considering all findings, three questions were asked:

1. What are the psychological determinants of portfolio working?
2. What are the psychological determinants of portfolio working in the case of workers who worked for more than 48 hours a week?
3. What kind of psychological variables have an influence on portfolio working in the case of employees who worked less than 47 hours a week?

PARTICIPANTS AND PROCEDURE

In the research there participated 218 portfolio workers and 218 workers employed in one workplace. A person who was working for more than one employer, mainly on the basis of an employment or civil law contract, was included in the group of portfolio workers. A participant who was working for one employer represented the group of monoworkers.

According to the objective of the study, comparing the two groups required similarity of conditions and the selected demographic variables. Among the 218 portfolio workers there were 109 women and 109 men. The situation in the group of 218 workers with single employment was similar. All the examined persons were married and had a child or children. The examined groups did not differ according to age, total work experience, work experience at a given post, number of children, motives to start a job, leave control and flexitime control, or time needed to get to work. Among examined individuals 177 persons worked for more than 48 hours a week (125 portfolio workers), while 259 employees worked less than 47 hours (166 monoworkers).

In order to answer the particular questions, the following set of 'paper-pencil' techniques was applied. The choice of methods was based mainly on the research aim and the methods' high reliability

and validity indicators. To diagnose the personal variables there were used: a self-made survey, the Value Scale by Rokeach, the Formal Characteristics of Behaviour – Temperament Questionnaire by Zawadzki and Strelau, and the Masculinity and Femininity Scale by Lipińska-Grobelny and Gorczycka. In order to describe the situational variables, the self-made survey and the Organizational Climate Questionnaire by Kolb were implemented.

The Rokeach Value Survey (RVS) is one of the most extensively used measures of human values. The RVS is a 36-item inventory consisting of 18 terminal values and 18 instrumental values. Respondents put individual values in order of priority from 1 to the least important (18), which means that the lower the score is, the greater significance a particular value and the spheres of motivation have. The reliability of the scale was estimated by examining the internal stability for the subscales and for the individual values at intervals of 4-5 weeks ($N = 412$ persons). The average coefficients of stability for the system of terminal values range from .96 to .98, while the instrumental values system range from .94 to .97. Due however to the nature of the subject and the particular construction of the tool, the study of validity is incomplete and comes down to the accuracy of the theoretical analysis and factor analysis (Brzozowski, 1989). Based on the theory of Rokeach, Schwartz and Bilsky (1987) prepared a detailed characterization of values, using four terms: purpose, interest, kind of motivation and validity. Values are targets and may be regarded as terminal and instrumental. Moreover, they are expressions of the interests of the individual, group or personal-group. The source of motivation for the implementation of the mentioned interests may be: 1) 'public spirit', 2) 'self-restriction together with conformity', 3) 'pleasure', 4) 'achievement', 5) 'self-management', 6) 'maturity' and 7) 'security' (spheres of motivation).

The Formal Characteristics of Behaviour – Temperament Questionnaire (FCZ-KT) by Zawadzki and Strelau (1997) diagnoses temperament traits. The questionnaire consists of 120 items, with 20 items for each of the six scales, i.e. briskness, perseverance, sensory sensitivity, emotional reactivity, resilience, and activity. Psychometric parameters of the FCZ-KT Questionnaire that have been verified in numerous studies are satisfactory. Cronbach's α for particular scales is from .73 (Sensory sensitivity) to .85 (Resilience). In studies on relations between traits from the regulative theory of temperament and other dimensions it has been found that the FCZ-KT scales display high convergent and discriminative validity.

The Masculinity and Femininity Scale (SMiK) by Lipińska-Grobelny and Gorczycka (2011) is a new technique for the measurement of masculinity, femininity and types of psychological gender in terms of Bem's sex role theory. The final version consists of

20 adjectives (10 describing masculinity and 10 describing femininity). The SMiK is a paper-and-pencil self-report instrument that asks the respondent to indicate on a 5-point scale the degree to which each characteristics is "true of them". The reliability measures (test-retest reliability, Cronbach's α) and validity measures (construct, concurrent and factor analysis both confirmatory and exploratory) confirmed that the SMiK possesses good psychometric properties. Cronbach's α coefficient yields .85 for Femininity and .76 for Masculinity.

The Organizational Climate Questionnaire by Kolb is aimed at diagnosing some general characteristics of organizations of varied types and sizes. The set of dimensions – responsibility (the equivalent of autonomy), requirements, rewards, organization, perception of warmth and support (the equivalent of support at work), management – form the so-called organizational climate. Reliability of the modified version of the questionnaire (6 items, n = 100) was computed using the KR 20 formula adapted by Ferguson. The obtained value r_{tt} = .61 indicates that reliability of the discussed test is satisfactory. Validity of the questionnaire was estimated using factor analysis first for seven test items and then for six items. There was found a one-factor structure of this technique. Factor loadings of the items which form the first dimension range from .63 to .79, and they explain 48.30% of variance (Chełpa, 1993).

RESULTS

PSYCHOLOGICAL DETERMINANTS OF PORTFOLIO WORKING

The first research problem concerned the psychological determinants of working for more than one employer. It was conducted the discriminant analysis with explanatory variables (personal characteristics and demands at work) described in the model of multiwork. The discriminant analysis indicates the following conditions of portfolio working: the number of working hours ($F(1, 434)$ = 22.87, p < .001, masculinity ($F(1, 434)$ = 12.73, p < .001), the instrumental value 'clean' ($F(1, 434)$ = 9.87, p = .002), the terminal value 'social recognition' ($F(1, 434)$ = 9.72, p = .002), the sphere of 'self-restriction together with conformity' ($F(1, 434)$ = 7.10, p = .008), the terminal values 'freedom' ($F(1, 434)$ = 5.51, p = .019) and 'family security' ($F(1, 434)$ = 5.44, p = .020), the instrumental value 'responsible' ($F(1, 434)$ = 5.35, p = .021), the terminal values 'national security' $F(1, 434)$ = = 4.23, p = .040) and 'a world at peace' ($F(1, 434)$ = 3.75, p = .050), and finally femininity ($F(1, 434)$ = 3.66, p = .050) (see: Table 1).

Based on the knowledge of the extracted factors (see: Table 1), the membership of respondents to one of two groups can be predicted with an accuracy of 71%. More specifically, knowledge of personal and situational characteristics allows the correct identification of a group of portfolio workers in 71% (155 properly identified cases) and monoworkers also in 71% (including 155 correctly classified individuals) (see: Table 2). It is for the reason that the discriminant analysis derives the classification model that the mentioned analysis was chosen, not logistic regression. In conclusion, portfolio working favours a large number of working hours, a lower level of masculinity, but a higher level of femininity, the value of 'freedom' and 'responsible', and to a lesser extent such values as 'clean', 'social recognition', 'national security', 'family security', 'a world at peace' and the sphere of 'self-restriction together with conformity'. The latter value, together with masculinity, lower

Table 1

Psychological determinants of portfolio working (N = 436)

Variables	Wilks' λ	F(1, 434)	p
Number of working hours	.95	22.87	< .001
Masculinity	.97	12.73	< .001
'Clean'	.97	9.87	.002
'Social recognition'	.97	9.72	.002
The sphere of 'self-restriction together with conformity'	.98	7.10	.008
'Freedom'	.98	5.51	.019
'Family security'	.98	5.44	.020
'Responsible'	.98	5.35	.021
'National security'	.99	4.23	.040
'A world at peace'	.99	3.75	.050
Femininity	.99	3.66	.050

Table 2

Classification results based on psychological determinants (N = 436)

| | | Predicted group membership | | Total |
		Portfolio worker	Monoworker	
Original group membership	Portfolio worker	155 (71.10%)	63 (28.90%)	218 (100%)
	Monoworker	63 (28.90%)	155 (71.10%)	218 (100%)
Mean 71.10%				

workload and lower intensity of femininity, characterised monoworkers.

The percentage of individuals classified correctly (in the analysed group – 71%) is an indicator of the effectiveness of the discriminant function. Complementing this evaluation is also a comparison of variation between groups and variation within groups.

Wilks' λ = .77 with χ^2 = 105.58 with df = 61 determines the significance of such a distribution of surveyed employees due to being a portfolio worker or a monoworker. The canonical correlation coefficient yields .50, indicating that a discriminant function that is quite well associated with portfolio working was found.

PSYCHOLOGICAL DETERMINANTS OF PORTFOLIO WORKING IN THE CASE OF WORKERS WHO WORKED FOR MORE THAN 48 HOURS A WEEK

Subsequent analyses were performed taking into account the grouping variable – the workload (working for more than 48 hours a week and working less than 47 hours). Statistically significant effects of each variable discriminating portfolio working with the workload more than 48 hours occur in the case of: the terminal value 'a sense of accomplishment' ($F(1, 175)$ = 9.91, p = .002), sensory sensitivity ($F(1, 175)$ = = 6.97, p = .009), the instrumental value 'independent' ($F(1, 175)$ = 5.46, p = .021), the terminal values 'mature love' ($F(1, 175)$ = 4.78, p = .030) and 'social recogni-

tion' ($F(1, 175)$ = 4.57, p = .034), and support at work ($F(1, 175)$ = 4.11, p = .044) (see: Table 3).

Relying on the intensity of the highlighted factors (see: Table 4) is around 84% accurate in predicting the respondents' belonging to one of two groups. It turns out that from 177 employees who worked more than 48 hours a week, it was possible to correctly assign to the group of portfolio workers nearly 85% of respondents and to the group of monoworkers almost 83% of respondents (see: Table 4). Wilks' λ = .59 with χ^2 = 75.76 and df = 60 shows the significance of such a distribution of individuals with high workloads into two groups (multiworkers vs. monoworkers). The square of the canonical correlation coefficient of .41 means that the differences between these two groups explain more than 41% of the variance function.

PSYCHOLOGICAL DETERMINANTS OF PORTFOLIO WORKING IN THE CASE OF WORKERS WHO WORKED LESS THAN 47 HOURS A WEEK

Another discriminant analysis identified variables that play an important role in predicting portfolio working in the group with the workload of 47 hours or less. All of these factors in Table 5 are statistically significant at the level of $p \leq$ .050. The growing Wilks' λ value means that the degree of difference between the groups gradually decreases. With this "optimal" set of 10 variables, statistics of the discrim-

Table 3

Psychological determinants of portfolio working in the case of employees who worked more than 48 hours a week (n = 177)

Variables	*Wilks'* λ	$F(1, 175)$	p
'A sense of accomplishment'	.94	9.91	.002
Sensory sensitivity	.96	6.97	.009
'Independent'	.97	5.46	.021
'Mature love'	.97	4.78	.030
'Social recognition'	.97	4.57	.034
Support at work	.97	4.11	.044

Table 4

Classification results based on psychological determinants in the case of employees who worked more than 48 hours a week (n = 177)

		Predicted group membership		Total
		Portfolio worker	Monoworker	
Original group membership	Portfolio worker	106 (84.80%)	19 (15.20%)	125 (100%)
	Monoworker	9 (17.30%)	43 (82.70%)	52 (100%)
Mean 84.20%				

Table 5

Psychological determinants of portfolio working in the case of employees who worked less than 47 hours a week (n = 259)

Variables	*Wilks'* λ	*F*(1, 257)	*p*
Masculinity	.95	11.46	.001
The sphere of 'self-restriction together with conformity'	.96	10.52	.001
'Responsible'	.96	8.30	.004
'Family security'	.97	7.53	.006
'Clean'	.97	7.44	.007
'Obedient'	.97	6.25	.013
'A world at peace'	.98	5.03	.026
'Social recognition'	.98	5.00	.026
Femininity	.98	3.82	.050
Management	.98	3.58	.050

inant analysis were determined, as well as their relevance and importance.

The lower intensity of masculinity ($F(1, 257) = 11.46$, $p = .001$), the less importance attributed to the sphere of 'self-restriction together with conformity' $F(1, 259) = 10.52$, $p = .001$), and the values 'family security' ($F(1, 257) = 7.53$, $p = .006$), 'clean' ($F(1, 257) = 7.44$, $p = .007$), 'obedient' ($F(1, 257) = 6.25$, $p = .013$), 'a world at peace' ($F(1, 257) = 5.03$, $p = .026$), 'social recognition' ($F(1, 257) = 5.00$, $p = .026$), the lower rating of management ($F(1, 257) = 3.58$, $p = .050$), and the priority of responsibility ($F(1, 257) = 8.30$, $p = .004$), and femininity ($F(1, 257) = 3.82$, $p = .050$), allow one

nearly in 79% of cases to accurately predict the respondents' belonging to the group of portfolio workers with a workload of 47 hours. The reverse configuration of predictors allows one almost in 78% of cases to recognize the representatives of monoworkers with a lower workload (see: Table 6). The percentage of people classified correctly (in the analysed group – 78%) is an indicator of the effectiveness of the discriminant function. Wilks' λ statistic = .62 with $\chi^2 = 105.68$ with $df = 60$ determines the significance of such a distribution of workers with a lower workload due to the factor of classification (multiworkers vs. monoworkers). The canonical correlation coefficient

Table 6

Classification results based on psychological determinants in the case of employees who worked less than 47 hours a week (n = 259)

		Predicted group membership		Total
		Portfolio worker	Monoworker	
Original group membership	Portfolio worker	73 (78.50%)	20 (21.50%)	93 (100%)
	Monoworker	37 (22.30%)	129 (77.70%)	166 (100%)
Mean 78.00%				

(.61) indicates that a discriminant function is quite well associated with a grouping variable.

DISCUSSION

The analysis of the phenomenon of portfolio working from the psychological perspective presents an important contribution to the discussion on work and directions of its transformations. The canonical correlation coefficients indicate that it has been possible to find discriminant functions that are well related to portfolio working both in the whole examined group and also in the subgroups distinguished according to workload. The conducted discriminant analyses, together with the background of knowledge on the intensity level of the distinguished factors, allow one to describe the participation of the examined persons in the group of portfolio workers with the greatest accuracy in the case of a workload of 48 or more hours, next in the case of a smaller workload up to 47 hours, and finally for the whole group of examinees.

Multiworkers who worked for more than 48 hours a week are characterized by high intensity of sensory sensitivity and the high evaluation of support at work, preferring the value 'independence' and 'mature love' to 'a sense of accomplishment' and 'social recognition'. The support at work lowers the psychological costs resulting from the heavy workload. De Lange, Taris, Kompier, Houtman and Bongers (2003) obtained confirmation of the demands-control model (Karasek, 1979) and support (Johnson & Hall, 1988), in 8 out of 19 included studies. High demands, low control and low social support lead to severe stress, and vice versa – support in the workplace interacts with the freedom of decision-making, reducing the negative impact of job requirements of multiworkers.

In the case of portfolio workers with a workload less than 47 hours a week, the following psychological determinants are obtained: lower intensity of masculinity, higher intensity of femininity, greater importance of being responsible and less importance attributed to the sphere of 'self-restriction together with conformity' and to the values 'family security', 'clean', 'obedient', 'a world at peace', 'social recognition', and finally a lower assessment of management. In turn, in the entire examined group, portfolio working is accompanied first of all by working hours, lower levels of masculinity and higher levels of femininity, the value of 'freedom' and 'responsibility'. The discriminant analysis revealed two interesting results: the evaluation of management style and the role of femininity. When portfolio workers with a lower workload are disappointed with the management style of their superiors, they are willing to search for additional employment, which is not necessarily a very aggravating time. Another interesting result is the higher level of femininity, which appears

as a predictor of portfolio working in the whole group and in the subgroup working less than 47 hours. This is not "social recognition", but concern for others and a desire to help accompanying femininity lead to multiwork. Femininity, explaining the differences between portfolio employees and monoworkers, will give the best results for adaptation and self-realization of the first group, especially in the women's culture, and as such can be considered as the Polish culture (Mandal, 2000; Miluska & Boski, 1999).

The obtained results confirm the validity of the applied model of personal and situational preconditions of portfolio working, though situational determinants are decisively dominated by the personal ones. The research show that psychological analysis of working for more than one employer includes all the applied categories of personal variables (temperament characteristics, values and spheres of motivation, intensity of masculinity and femininity), but a special role is played by values represented by portfolio workers. That is why all these variables ought to be considered in the research process as well as in practical activities. Moreover, if an examined person is first and foremost aware of his/her value system and he/she perceives the choice of additional employment as consistent with this system, it may result in experiencing smaller costs of portfolio working and achieving a higher professional position and higher satisfaction with one's workplace and one's life. Moreover, the resulting data provide information about how to prepare incentive schemes for employees, including portfolio workers, but primarily provide the psychological characteristics of this group.

REFERENCES

Brown, D., & Gold, M. (2007). Academics on non-standard contracts in UK Universities: portfolio work, choice and compulsion. *Higher Education Quarterly, 61,* 439-460.

Brzozowski, P. (1989). *Skala Wartości Rokeacha. Polska adaptacja Value Survey M. Rokeacha. Podręcznik* [Rokeach Values Scale. Polish adaptation of the Value Scale by M. Rokeach. Handbook]. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Compis.

Chełpa, S. (1993). Walidacja Kwestionariusza Klimatu Organizacyjnego Kolba [Validation of Organizational Climate Questionnaire by Kolb]. *Przegląd Psychologiczny, 34,* 379-387.

Clinton, M., Totterdell, P., & Wood, S. (2006). A grounded theory of portfolio working. Experiencing the smallest of small businesses. *International Small Business Journal, 24,* 179-203.

Cohen, L., & Mallon, M. (1999). The transition from organizational employment to portfolio working: perceptions of 'boundarylessness". *Work, Employment and Society, 13,* 329-352.

de Lange, A. H., Taris, T. W., Kompier, M. A. J., Houtman, I. L. D., & Bongers, P. M. (2003). The very best of the millennium: longitudinal research and the demand-control-(support) model. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 8,* 282-305.

European Working Conditions Survey 1991, 1996, 2000, 2005, 2010. Retrieved from http://www.eurofound.europa.eu/surveys/ewcs/2010/index.htm, August 2011.

Fraser, J., & Gold, M. (2001). "Portfolio Workers": autonomy and control amongst freelance translators. *Work, Employment and Society*, *15,* 679-697.

Hall, D. T. (1976). *Careers in organizations.* Glenview, Il: Scott, Foresman.

Handy, Ch. (1989). *The age of unreason.* Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Johnson, J. V., & Hall, E. M. (1988). Job strain, work place social support, and cardiovascular disease: A cross-sectional study random sample of the Swedish working population. *American Journal of Public Health, 78,* 1336-1342.

Karasek, R. (1979). Job demands, job decision latitude, and mental strain. Implications for job redesign. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 24,* 285-307.

Kimmel, J., & Powell, L. M. (1999). Moonlighting trends and related policy issues in Canada and the United States. *Canadian Public Policy – Analyse de Politiques, 15,* 207-231.

Lipińska-Grobelny, A. (2014). *Zjawisko wielopracy. Psychologiczne uwarunkowania i konsekwencje* [Portfolio working. Psychological determinants and consequences]. Łódź: Wydawnictwo UŁ.

Lipińska-Grobelny, A., & Gorczycka, K. (2011). Rekonstrukcja narzędzia do pomiaru płci psychologicznej [The reconstruction of a technique to assess psychological gender]. *Przegląd Psychologiczny, 54,* 179-192.

Mallon, M. (1999). Going "portfolio": Making sense of changing careers. *Career Development International*, *4,* 358-369.

Mandal, E. (2000). *Podmiotowe i interpersonalne konsekwencje stereotypów związanych z płcią* [Subjective and interpersonal consequences of gender stereotypes]. Katowice: Wydawnictwo UŚ.

Miluska, J., & Boski, P. (1999). Męskość – kobiecość: zarys i poziomy analizy problematyki. In: J. Miluska & P. Boski (eds.), *Męskość – kobiecość w perspektywie indywidualnej i kulturowej* [Masculinity – Femininity in the individual and cultural context] (pp. 9-38). Warszawa: PWN.

Mirvis, P. H., & Hall, D. T. (1994). Psychological success and the boundaryless career. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 15,* 365-380.

Schwartz, S. H., & Bilsky, W. (1987). Toward a universal psychological structure of human values. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 53,* 550-562.

Wooten, K. C., Timmerman, T. A., & Folger R. (1999). The use of personality and the Five-Factor Model to predict new business ventures: from outplacement to start-up. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 54,* 82-101.

Zawadzki, B., & Strelau, J. (1997). *Formalna charakterystyka zachowania – kwestionariusz temperamentu (FCZ-KT)* [Formal Characteristics of Behaviour – Temperament Questionnaire]. Warszawa: PTP.