

Psychological determinants of portfolio workers' satisfaction with life

BACKGROUND

The objective of the study was to evaluate which psychological variables are determinants of the level of satisfaction with life in the case of workers employed in more than one workplace, called portfolio workers. In the research, the transactional model of satisfaction with life by A. Zalewska, and also the model of multiwork by A. Lipińska-Grobelny, were referred to.

PARTICIPANTS AND PROCEDURE

Two hundred and eighteen portfolio workers and 218 monoworkers participated in the research. The studied individuals completed a self-made survey. The following techniques were also applied: the Satisfaction with Life Scale (SWLS); the Rokeach Value Survey (RVS); the Formal Characteristics of Behaviour – Temperament Questionnaire (FCZ-KT); the Masculinity and Femininity Scale (SMiK); the Organisation Climate Questionnaire (KKO); and the Marital Communication Questionnaire (KKM).

RESULTS

The results indicate that satisfaction with life in the case of portfolio workers is determined by personal characteristics

(ascribing a greater significance to the sphere of 'achievements', a higher level of activity), demands at work (exercising flextime control, a positive assessment of the system of rewards in a workplace), and demands in the family (a low level of depreciation in the relationship). In turn, a high level of satisfaction with life in the case of workers employed in a single workplace depends on: ascribing lower significance to the sphere of 'achievements' and to the values of 'pleasure' and 'talented', attaching major importance to the values of 'loving', a positive assessment of the system of rewards in a workplace, the number of children and a low level of depreciation in the relationship.

CONCLUSIONS

The data referred to above constitute an important source of information about the ways of strengthening the cognitive dimension of satisfaction with life in the case of workers, with particular attention being paid to portfolio workers.

KEY WORDS

satisfaction with life; portfolio workers; personal characteristics; demands at work; demands in the family

ORGANIZATIONS – Institute of Psychology, University of Lodz, Lodz, Poland

AUTHORS' CONTRIBUTION – A: Study design · B: Data collection · C: Statistical analysis · D: Data interpretation · E: Manuscript preparation · F: Literature search · G: Funds collection

CORRESPONDING AUTHOR – Prof. Agnieszka Lipińska-Grobelny, Institute of Psychology, University of Lodz, 10/12 Smugowa Str., 91-433 Lodz, Poland, e-mail: agalg@poczta.onet.pl

TO CITE THIS ARTICLE – Lipińska-Grobelny, A. (2014). Psychological determinants of portfolio workers' satisfaction with life. *Health Psychology Report*, 2(4), 280–290. DOI: 10.5114/hpr.2014.46696

BACKGROUND

Working for more than one employer is not a new phenomenon in Poland. As early as in the 1930s, more than 50% of the economically active population worked in the agricultural sector, treating it as an additional source of income. Since that time, and throughout the last eighty years, portfolio working has undergone major changes. A portfolio worker has become an individual who is in the possession of high professional qualifications, and whose needs cannot be satisfied by the reality of the market economy. The phenomenon referred to above, constituting one of the more important transformations which have taken place in the labour market, was described by Handy (1998) with the term 'portfolio working', which Mirvis and Hall (1994) called a 'boundaryless career', whereas the periodical *The New Economy* (1996) called it 'new millennium work'. In accordance with Handy, portfolio working constitutes a combination of paid employment, and also unpaid work, which means working at home, working for charity, and also working through learning. In this research portfolio working was reduced to being involved in many kinds of paid employment simultaneously (multiwork), and an employee who works for more than one employer is referred to as a portfolio worker (a multiworker). These terms will be applied interchangeably, drawing on the tradition of studies conducted in this direction (i.e. Mallon, 1999; Raeder, 2009).

The scale of the occurrence of portfolio working is presented by the published data of the European Statistical Office of 6th February, 2013. Those data give rise to the conclusion that the largest percentage of workers employed in two workplaces is found in Sweden (8.40%) and in Denmark (also 8.40%), and that the second position is that of Poland (7.30%), followed by Holland (7.20%). The smallest percentage was recorded in Bulgaria (0.50%), in Slovakia (1.20%), in Italy (1.50%), and in Hungary (1.80%) (*Europe in figures. Eurostat yearbook 2012*, <http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu>, June 2014). Another study, this time devoted to the functioning of portfolio workers, indicates the conviction of them that they can enjoy a greater degree of diversity of work, a stronger sense of freedom, satisfaction with life, balance between personal life and career, with support from family members. Simultaneously, in the case of multiworkers, the level of involvement in work is changeable, and time pressure is observed (Cohen & Mallon, 1999), together with a moderate sense of financial security. The authors of various published works warn of negative results of working for several employers, quoting, for example, constant overexertion, frustration, irritation, and even burnout. In this context, the question of the psychological determinants of satisfaction with life in the

case of portfolio workers seems to be completely legitimate. Therefore, it was chosen as the objective of the research.

SATISFACTION WITH LIFE – REVIEW OF DEFINITIONS AND MODELS

The social sciences offer a plenitude of terms and definitions connected with satisfaction with life. Some researchers (for example, Czapiński, 1992) refer to happiness, others to the quality of life (for example, de Walden-Galuszko, 1994), and yet others use the notion of mental well-being (for example, Diener, Lucas, & Oishi, 2002), or of satisfaction with life (for example, Shin & Johnson, 1978). Argyle (1987) defines satisfaction with life in the categories of happiness which results from experiencing positive emotions, their frequency and intensiveness. Veenhoven (1991) defines satisfaction with life in reference to a general positive assessment formulated by an individual. Shin and Johnson (1978), whose ideas are referred to by Diener, Emmons, Larsen, and Griffin (1985), describe satisfaction with life as a synonym of the quality of life in a general dimension of it, based on individual criteria, as well.

This review provides a foundation for research into the two components of satisfaction with life – how good an individual human being feels about their own life (the feeling of happiness), and also, what they think about their own life, how they assess it, taking into consideration the level of fulfilling desires and satisfying aspirations (the level of satisfaction with life). In some analyses, two aspects of satisfaction with life are taken into account, but in the literature of the subject there is no consensus concerning how to research the emotional side of it (Zalewska, 2003). Finally, in this article, the measurement of satisfaction with life in reference to an assessment formulated on the basis of cognitive processes was referred to. Diener et al. (1985) express the opinion that satisfaction with life concerns a feeling of satisfaction with conditions and personal achievements, which means that it is a result of comparing one's own situation with the standards determined by oneself rather than by other people.

An important issue connected with a cognitive dimension of satisfaction with life is the analysis of its preconditions, which are described in four models of research: into environmental factors, into the traits of an individual, into the person-environment fit, and also by the transactional model of satisfaction with life. The transactional model of satisfaction with life, which is of importance in this paper, takes into consideration all three preconditions of satisfaction – the qualities of the work environment, the properties of a worker, and the adjustment of an individual to the environment (Zalewska, 2003). The quality of life

Portfolio workers' satisfaction with life

is analysed from a psychological perspective, taking into consideration both the general level, and satisfaction with its chosen areas. A foundation for the assessment of the sense of the quality of life is constituted by the processes of ascribing values to certain events and items. In the transactional model of the quality of life, it is assumed that all of its areas are included in the subsystem of the general system of the quality of life, and that the quality of life is a constituent of the system of an individual, subordinate to the broadest 'person-environment' system. All domains of the quality of life, and also assessments concerning separate spheres, are interconnected, and able to influence one another (Zalewska, 2003).

OBJECTIVES

In the research presented in this paper, the model of multiwork developed by Lipińska-Grobelny (2014), a starting point of which was the model by Clinton, Totterdell, and Wood (2006), and also the transactional model of the quality of life by Zalewska (2003), were used. Psychological determinants were divided into two chief categories: personal characteristics and situational demands. The traits of a subject are represented by: values and the spheres of motivation, the traits and structure of temperament, masculinity, femininity and the types of psychological gender, whereas situational demands are described in terms of: 1) demands at work, which means autonomy at work, flextime control and leave control, support at work, the number of working hours, the time devoted to commuting, the organisation climate, diagnosed, among others, on the basis of requirements, rewards, the style of management and the level of being organized; and also: 2) demands in the family, determined by support and depreciation in the relationship, whether a spouse is employed, and also the number and age of children. In this model, portfolio working fulfils the role of a moderator, changing the direction and intensity of dependencies among its particular determinants and consequences. The result of portfolio working, analysed in this study, is satisfaction with life.

The influence exerted by personality variables upon satisfaction with life was the subject of papers written by, among others, Argyle and Martin (1991), and by Furnham and Cheng (1999), indicating a positive influence exerted by extraversion, and also a negative one, exerted by neuroticism, upon satisfaction with life. Interesting results were also obtained by DeNeve and Cooper (1998) by conducting a meta-analysis based on 197 studies evaluating associations between 137 personality traits and mental well-being. All particular traits were divided by the above-mentioned authors into general categories from the Big Five Model. The mean correlation coefficient for 137 traits with various

indicators of satisfaction with life was .19 ($p < .001$). The strongest association was found in reference to neuroticism ($r = -.22$, $p = .010$) and conscientiousness ($r = .21$, $p = .010$), whereas the weakest one was found for openness to experiences ($r = .11$, $p = .010$). Surprisingly weak correlations were found between extraversion and mental well-being ($r = .17$, $p = .010$).

In the case of situational determinants, and, to be more precise, demands in the family, it is believed that the strongest correlate of mental well-being is marriage (Argyle, 2005). Married individuals are happier in comparison with divorced individuals, or those living in separation, and are characterized by the lowest level of satisfaction with life. That fact was interpreted as a result of the presence of social, emotional and financial support which is the greatest in the case of marriage (Argyle & Furnham, 1983). Having children exerts rather a small influence upon satisfaction with life and happiness in marriage (Argyle, 2005). That fact is confirmed as well by the research conducted by Plopa and Rostowski (2005), which gives rise to the conclusion that, among women, such an association does not occur, whereas among men, children and their number are important for the feeling of intimacy and the similarity of behaviours in the relationship. Fathers having a single child assess the level of similarity and intimacy higher in comparison with fathers having two or three children. In the case of children, an important issue is also their age. Netemeyer, Boles and McMurrian (1996) claim that for the conflict between family and career which decreases satisfaction with life the age of the oldest child is of significance. In turn, Cleveland (2008) indicated the age of the youngest child. Even before him, Walker (1977) mentioned that the periods best for marriage are the period of the honeymoon and that of the empty nest, whereas the period when children are younger than 5 years old, or when they are teenagers, contributes to a significant decrease in satisfaction with marriage and with life.

The issue which remains to be discussed is that of demands at work. The positive influence exerted by being employed upon satisfaction with life is proven by research into unemployed individuals and individuals at retirement age. Not only are unemployed individuals less happy, but they are characterized as well by higher depression, alcoholism and suicide indicators. The reason for that fact is that being employed strengthens positive affect, self-esteem, and satisfaction, including that with the financial situation as well as health and residential conditions (Argyle, 1989). Structuring free time is connected with work. Even though in the present research the ways of spending free time were not analysed, leave control and flextime control were both taken into consideration. Owing to the possibility of deciding about holiday times, and when to start and finish work, it is possible to exert a direct influence upon

the cycle of tiredness at work and rest at home, indirectly shaping the sense of autonomy and control (Ratajczak, 2007).

The objective of the present research is to evaluate which personal and situational variables, taken into consideration in the model of multiwork by Lipińska-Grobelny, determine satisfaction with life in the case of portfolio workers. In connection with that, it was decided that the following research questions should be formulated:

- P1. Which personal characteristics represented by values and the spheres of motivation, the traits of temperament, as well as masculinity and femininity, influence satisfaction with life in the case of portfolio workers?
- P2. Which demands at work relevant to autonomy at work, flexitime control and leave control, support at work, number of hours spent at work, the time devoted to commuting, and also the organisation climate, determine satisfaction with life in the case of workers employed in more than one workplace?
- P3. Which demands in the family determined by support and depreciation in the relationship, whether a spouse is employed, and also the number and age of children, determine satisfaction with life in the group referred to above?

PARTICIPANTS AND PROCEDURE

PARTICIPANTS

The research concerned 218 portfolio workers and 218 workers employed in a single workplace. An individual who was working for more than one employer, first and foremost, on a contractual basis or on the basis of a civil law contract was included into the group of portfolio workers (multiworkers). A respondent performing work for a single employer belonged to the group of monoworkers.

In accordance with the objectives of the research, a comparison of the two groups required the similarity of conditions and chosen demographic variables. All of the studied individuals were married and had children. The studied groups did not differ in terms of age, the length of service in general, the length of service in a given position, motives for taking up a job, leave control and flexitime control, or the time devoted to commuting.

The age of the portfolio workers was in the range 21-63 ($M = 41.79$, $SD = 9.59$), whereas in the case of the workers employed in a single workplace it was 24-64 ($M = 42.41$, $SD = 9.23$). The large majority of the studied individuals belonged to the group of dual-career marriages in which both spouses were engaged in paid work (88% of the portfolio workers and nearly 93% of the workers employed in a single workplace). The individuals working for more than one

employer in most cases had two children, whereas the monoworkers had one (however, that difference was not significant).

MEASURES

In order to answer particular questions, a number of the following research tools were used. For the diagnosis of personal characteristics, the following were used: the self-made survey, the Rokeach Value Survey (RVS), the Formal Characteristics of Behaviour – Temperament Questionnaire (FCZ-KT) by B. Zawadzki and J. Strelau, and the Masculinity and Femininity Scale (SMiK) by A. Lipińska-Grobelny and K. Gorczycka. For the purpose of the description of situational variables, the Organisation Climate Questionnaire (KKO) by D. A. Kolb, and the Marital Communication Questionnaire (KKM) – Partner’s Behaviours Assessment by M. Kaźmierczak and M. Plopa were applied, whereas satisfaction with life was researched with the use of the Satisfaction with Life Scale (SWLS) by E. Diener, R. A. Emmons, R. J. Larsen, and S. Griffin.

The Rokeach Value Survey (RVS) is applied for the description of the system of values of youth and adults. It is composed of 18 terminal values, and of 18 instrumental ones. The task of the studied individual is to order separate values from the most important (1) up 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 this scale – similarly to what was done in the case of its particular versions – was estimated by determining the test-retest reliability of the subscales, and also of individual values, at the intervals of 4-5 weeks ($N = 412$ individuals). Mean stability coefficients for the system of terminal values ranged from .96 to .98, whereas for the system of instrumental values ranged from .94 to .97, which means that they were very high (Brzozowski, 1989).

For the diagnosis of the traits of temperament, the Formal Characteristics of Behaviour – Temperament Questionnaire (FCZ-KT) by B. Zawadzki and J. Strelau was applied (1997). The survey contains 20 statements for each of the six scales, i.e. briskness, perseverance, sensory sensitivity, emotional reactivity, resilience, and activity. The psychometric parameters of the FCZ-KT Questionnaire, confirmed in several studies, are satisfactory. Cronbach’s α coefficients for particular scales were within the range from .73 (Sensory sensitivity) to .85 (Resilience).

The Masculinity and Femininity Scale (SMiK) by A. Lipińska-Grobelny and K. Gorczycka is a new technique for the measurement of masculinity and femininity, and also psychological gender, in the view of the sex-role patterns theory by S. L. Bem. Its final version is composed of 20 adjectives (10 describ-

ing femininity traits and 10 describing masculinity traits). The task of the studied individuals is to indicate on a five-degree scale to what extent each of the stated traits refers to this individual, with 1 meaning 'I am definitely not that kind of person', and 5 meaning 'I am definitely that kind of person'. The analysis of reliability was performed on the basis of Cronbach's α internal consistency coefficient, and also test-retest reliability (examination conducted twice with the same test at the interval of four weeks). The obtained results indicated that this tool was characterized by satisfactory reliability (Cronbach's α for Femininity = .85, and for Masculinity = .76) (Lipińska-Grobelny & Gorczycka, 2011).

The objective of the Organisation Climate Questionnaire (KKO) by D. A. Kolb is to diagnose the general properties of a workplace. A set of dimensions (responsibility, requirements, rewards, the level of being organized, the feeling of warmth and support, managing) together make up a so-called organisation climate. With the application of a ten-degree scale, the studied individual assesses the intensiveness of the particular aspects of work, including responsibility (the counterpart of autonomy), and also the feeling of warmth and support (the counterpart of social support). The reliability of the KKO, calculated by application of the formula KR 20 in the adaptation by Ferguson, was sufficient ($r_{tt} = .61$) (Chelpa, 1993).

The Marital Communication Questionnaire (KKM) is devoted to the styles of communication present in an intimate relationship. That means supporting, involved, and also depreciating communication with a partner. There are two versions of the KKM: the first is the self-assessment of the style of conversation, and the other one is the assessment of the partner's style of communication (the latter was applied in this research). The studied individual assesses, using a five-degree scale, which of the behaviours are observed in their case, and to what degree (the first version), and also in the case of their partner (the other version). The reliability of this technique was calculated with the participation of 906 of the studied individuals, and with the application of Cronbach's α coefficient (for the other version, devoted to the assessment of the partner's behaviours, the coefficient for support was .91, for involvement .80, and for depreciation .89) (Każmierczak & Plopa, 2005).

The Satisfaction with Life Scale (SWLS) in the Polish adaptation by Z. Juczyński (2001) initially contained 48 statements. After eliminating the items describing a positive and negative affect, ten, and finally five, items remained. The result of the measurement constitutes a general indicator of the sense of satisfaction with life. The studied individual, using a seven-degree scale (from 1 = 'I completely disagree' to 7 = 'I completely agree'), describes to what degree each of the statements is relevant to their life so far.

The determined Cronbach's α coefficient turned out to be satisfactory (.81) (Juczyński, 2001).

RESULTS

Searching for dependencies among personal characteristics, demands at work, demands in the family and satisfaction with life of portfolio workers, a number of hierarchical analyses of regression with an interactional component in the form of portfolio working was performed. It was assumed that it would influence the direction and/or the strength of relationships between the particular determinants of satisfaction with life. In connection with that, steps were taken, intended to prepare data for the analysis of regression with the following moderations: 1) all independent variables were centred by means of deducting the value of the arithmetic means from the value of the variable, 2) the dichotomous variables were centred, recoding their initial values to -1, and also 1, 3) an interactional component was created by means of multiplying the transformed predictor and moderator (Bedyńska & Książek, 2012). Moreover, correlations of particular variables with satisfaction with life were evaluated separately in the group of multiworkers and monoworkers.

PERSONAL DETERMINANTS OF SATISFACTION WITH LIFE OF PORTFOLIO WORKERS

In Table 1, the correlation coefficients between the personal determinants of satisfaction with life in the case of portfolio workers and monoworkers are presented. The correlations of significance in the group of multiworkers were recorded in reference to the terminal value of 'the safety of the family' and 'the world of beauty', and also four traits of temperament: activity, briskness, perseverance and emotional reactivity. In the case of portfolio workers, the higher the level of activity ($r = .30, p < .001$) and briskness ($r = .13, p = .050$), the lower the level of emotional reactivity ($r = -.18, p = .010$) and perseverance ($r = -.16, p = .020$), the greater the significance ascribed by this group to the value of 'the world of beauty' ($r = -.15, p = .030$) and smaller to 'the safety of the family' ($r = .14, p = .040$), the higher is the recorded level of satisfaction with life. In the case of monoworkers, the list of personal variables significantly correlating with satisfaction with life is longer. That list is composed of terminal values ('comfortable life' and 'pleasure'), instrumental values (of 'loving', 'independent', 'talented'), the sphere of 'achievements' and the sphere of 'safety', the traits of temperament (briskness and emotional reactivity), and also the level of masculinity. The most important correlates of satisfaction with life in the case of workers employed in a single work-

Table 1

Correlations between personal characteristics and satisfaction with life in the groups of portfolio workers ($n = 218$) and monoworkers ($n = 218$)

Portfolio workers	Personal characteristics					
	Family security	The world of beauty	Activity	Perseverance	Emotional reactivity	Briskness
Satisfaction with life	$r = .14$ $p = .040$	$r = -.15$ $p = .030$	$r = .30$ $p < .001$	$r = -.16$ $p = .020$	$r = -.18$ $p = .010$	$r = .13$ $p = .050$
Monoworkers	Personal characteristics					
	Masculinity	Comfortable life	Pleasure	Loving	Independent	Talented
Satisfaction with life	$r = .16$ $p = .020$	$r = .15$ $p = .030$	$r = .19$ $p = .006$	$r = -.24$ $p < .001$	$r = .15$ $p = .020$	$r = .18$ $p = .008$
Satisfaction with life	Sphere of achievements		Sphere of safety		Emotional reactivity	
	$r = .14$ $p = .045$		$r = -.14$ $p = .040$		$r = .23$ $p = .001$	$r = -.22$ $p = .001$

Portfolio workers' satisfaction with life

place is a high level of briskness ($r = .23, p = .001$), a lower level of emotional reactivity ($r = -.22, p = .001$), and major significance is ascribed to the value of 'loving' ($r = -.24, p < .001$) (see Table 1).

The following analyses concerned regression with moderations already. They were conducted for satisfaction with life, and also the personal characteristics, taking into consideration portfolio working and particular preconditions from this category (as the first step), and also their interaction (as the second step). In Table 2, the data describing the adjustment of the entire model, the percent of the explained variance, and also the coefficients of the level of predicting a dependent variable are presented. Portfolio working as a moderator changed the influence exerted by the following independent variables (a significant interaction effect):

1) the sphere of 'achievements'; the model is well adjusted to the data - $F(3, 432) = 2.56, p = .050$, and the interactional component ($\beta = 0.13, p = .007$) makes it possible to explain the additional 1% of changeability in the scope of satisfaction with life; the sphere of 'achievements' is the predictor of satisfaction with life in the group of portfolio workers, $F(1, 216) = 3.25, p = .050$, and of workers employed in a single workplace, $F(1, 216) = 4.05, p = .045$. The more significance portfolio workers ascribe to the sphere of 'achievements', the stronger satisfaction with life they experience ($\beta = -0.12, p = .050$), in contrast to workers employed in a single workplace, for whom greater significance of the sphere of 'achievements' decreases the intensity of satisfaction with life ($\beta = 0.14, p = .045$);

Table 2

Personal determinants of satisfaction with life in the case of the studied employees ($N = 436$)

Personal characteristics (predictors)	Dependent variable: Satisfaction with life						
	Moderator: Portfolio working						
	Interaction of a predictor and moderator		Adjusted R^2	Change R^2	p of change	$F(3, 432)$	p
β	p						
Sphere of achievements	0.13	.007	.01	.01	.007	2.56	.050
Pleasure	0.09	.050	.01	.01	.050	2.72	.040
Loving	-0.08	.070	.03	.01	.070	5.02	.002
Talented	0.11	.024	.01	.01	.024	2.72	.040
Activity	-0.11	.026	.04	.01	.026	7.16	< .001

- 2) the terminal value of 'pleasure', in the case of which the model was adjusted to the data as well, $F(3, 432) = 2.72, p = .040$, and taking into consideration the interactional component ($\beta = 0.09, p = .050$) improved the percentage of the explain variance of satisfaction with life by 1%. The value of 'pleasure' is a significant predictor in the group of workers employed in a single workplace, $F(1, 216) = 7.68, p = .006$. Greater significance is ascribed by monoworkers to the value of 'pleasure'; a lower level of satisfaction with life ($\beta = 0.19, p = .006$) is observed in their case;
- 3) the instrumental value of 'loving'; the model is well adjusted to the data - $F(3, 432) = 5.02, p = .002$, and the interactional component ($\beta = -0.08, p = .070$) makes it possible, at the level of tendency, to explain the additional 1% of changeability in the scope of satisfaction with life. The value of 'loving' is a significant predictor in the group of workers employed in a single workplace, $F(1, 216) = 12.76, p < .001$. The more significance is ascribed by monoworkers to the value of 'loving', the stronger is the satisfaction with life experienced by them ($\beta = -0.24, p < .001$);
- 4) the instrumental value of 'talented' (a significant interaction effect - $\beta = 0.11, p = .024$); the model is well adjusted to the data - $F(3, 432) = 2.72, p = .040$. Introducing the interactional component improved the percentage of the explained variance of satisfaction with life by 1%. The value of 'talented' is a significant predictor of the above-mentioned variable in the group of workers employed in a single workplace, $F(1, 216) = 7.24, p = .008$. The more significance is ascribed by monoworkers to the value of 'talented', the weaker is the satisfaction with life they experience ($\beta = 0.18, p = .008$);
- 5) the trait of temperament: 'activity' (a significant level of interaction - $\beta = -0.11, p = .026$; the model is well adjusted to the data - $F(3, 432) = 7.16, p < .001$). The introduction of the interactional component improved the percentage of the explained variance of satisfaction with life by 1%. The value is a significant predictor of satisfaction with life in the group of portfolio workers, $F(1, 216) = 21.08, p < .001$. The higher the level of activity among portfolio workers, the higher is the observed level of satisfaction with life ($\beta = 0.30, p < .001$).

SITUATIONAL DETERMINANTS OF SATISFACTION WITH LIFE OF PORTFOLIO WORKERS

The further analyses referred to a moderating influence of portfolio working upon a relationship of demands at work and demands in the family with satisfaction with life so far. In this case, an analysis of correlation of situational variables with satisfaction

with life in the case of multiworkers and monoworkers was conducted as well (see Table 3).

Among demands in the family, a particular significance for satisfaction with life in the case of portfolio workers is that of a low level of depreciation in the relationship ($r = -.38, p < .001$), and also strong support from the partner ($r = .44, p < .001$). An important role is also played by the organisation climate of a workplace ($r = .23, p = .001$), a motivating system of rewards ($r = .30, p < .001$), and also exercising flextime control ($r = .20, p = .003$) and leave control ($r = .20, p = .003$). As far as satisfaction with life in the case of monoworkers is concerned, support in the relationship ($r = .32, p < .001$) and a low level of depreciation in the relationship ($r = -.21, p = .002$) are complemented by the number of children ($r = .20, p = .003$). The most important correlate of satisfaction with life from the category of demands at work is, in turn, the level of being organized, which means a situation in which the actions of a team of workers are well planned, and their goals clearly defined ($r = .20, p = .002$).

In turn, a hierarchical analysis of regression with a dichotomous moderator revealed significant interaction effects for (see Table 4):

- 1) **flextime control** (the model is well adjusted to the data - $F(3, 432) = 3.16, p = .025$). The interactional component ($\beta = -0.08, p = .070$) makes it possible, at the level of tendency, to explain the additional 1% of changeability in the scope of satisfaction with life. Flextime control is a significant predictor of satisfaction with life in the group of portfolio workers $F(1, 216) = 9.26, p = .003$. The greater flextime control portfolio workers exercise, the more satisfaction with life they experience ($\beta = 0.20, p = .003$);
- 2) **rewards**, in the case of which the model was well adjusted to the data $F(3, 432) = 8.60, p < .001$, and taking into consideration the interactional component ($\beta = -0.08, p = .070$) improved, at the level of tendency, the percentage of the explained variance of satisfaction with life by 1%; rewards are a significant predictor in the group of portfolio workers $F(1, 216) = 21.62, p < .001$ and monoworkers, $F(1, 216) = 4.99, p = .026$. Between rewards at work and satisfaction with life, there is a positive relationship;
- 3) **the number of children** (a significant effect of interaction - $\beta = 0.12, p = .015$; the model is well adjusted to the data - $F(3, 432) = 3.37, p = .018$). The introduction of the interactional component improved the percentage of the explained variance of satisfaction with life by 1%; the number of children is a significant predictor of satisfaction with life in the group of workers employed in a single workplace, $F(1, 216) = 9.35, p = .003$. The more children monoworkers have, the stronger is the satisfaction with life they experience ($\beta = 0.20, p = .003$);

Table 3

Correlations between situational variables and satisfaction with life in the groups of portfolio workers ($n = 218$) and monoworkers ($n = 218$)

Portfolio workers		Demands at work				
	Leave control	Flextime control	Autonomy	Requirements	Rewards	Support at work
	$r = .20$ $p = .003$	$r = .20$ $p = .003$	$r = .14$ $p = .040$	$r = .15$ $p = .030$	$r = .30$ $p < .001$	$r = .15$ $p = .030$
Demands at work and demands in the family						
Satisfaction with life	Managing		Climate in a workplace		Support from the partner	Depreciation from the partner
	$r = .17$ $p = .010$		$r = .23$ $p = .001$		$r = .44$ $p < .001$	$r = -.38$ $p < .001$
Monoworkers		Demands at work				
	Requirements	Rewards	The level of being organized	Managing	Climate in the workplace	
	$r = .19$ $p = .005$	$r = .15$ $p = .030$	$r = .20$ $p = .002$	$r = .16$ $p = .020$	$r = .18$ $p = .008$	
Demands in the family						
Satisfaction with life	Number of children		Support from the partner		Depreciation from the partner	
	$r = .20$ $p = .003$		$r = .32$ $p < .001$		$r = -.21$ $p = .002$	

Portfolio workers' satisfaction with life

Table 4

Situational determinants of satisfaction with life in the case of the studied employees ($N = 436$)

Dependent variable: Satisfaction with life							
Moderator: Portfolio working							
Demands at work (predictors)	Interaction of a predictor and moderator		Adjusted R^2	Change R^2	p of change	$F(3, 432)$	p
	β	p					
Flextime control	-0.08	.070	.02	.01	.070	3.16	.025
Rewards	-0.08	.070	.01	.01	.070	8.60	< .001
Demands in the family (predictors)	Interaction of a predictor and moderator		Adjusted R^2	Change R^2	p of change	$F(3, 432)$	p
	β	p					
Number of children	0.12	.015	.02	.01	.015	3.37	.018
Depreciation from the partner	0.09	.044	.09	.01	.044	14.82	< .001

4) **depreciation from the partner** (the model is well adjusted to the data - $F(3, 432) = 14.82$, $p < .001$). The interactional element ($\beta = 0.09$, $p = .044$) makes it possible to explain the additional 1% of changeability in the scope of satis-

faction with life. Depreciation in the relationship is a significant predictor in the group of portfolio workers, $F(1, 216) = 36.92$, $p < .001$, and workers employed in a single workplace, $F(1, 216) = 9.64$, $p = .002$. The more depreciation in the relationship

is experienced by portfolio workers ($\beta = -0.38$, $p < .001$) and monoworkers ($\beta = -0.21$, $p = .002$), the lower is the level of satisfaction with life observed in their case.

DISCUSSION

The contemporary labour market constitutes a real challenge for economically active individuals. Not only does it make it necessary to improve one's qualifications all the time, to devote ever more time to work which, until recently, was free, but, as well as that, it means finding an extra job. The data of the European Statistical Office give rise to the conclusion that Poland is one of the European countries with the largest numbers of multiworkers. These figures legitimize conducting research into satisfaction with life of portfolio workers, and viewing it in the aspect of a number of psychological variables.

The correlation analyses give rise to the conclusion that satisfaction with life of multiworkers and monoworkers is associated with values and the spheres of motivation, the traits of temperament, the level of masculinity (monoworkers), demands at work, and also demands in the family. The most important role in the conducted research is played by the results of regression with moderations because they make it possible to define interactional effects. Multiwork in the role of a moderator starts to interact with the studied predictors, making relationships between personal and situational variables and satisfaction with life different as far as their effect and also direction, at various levels of the moderator, are concerned.

Finally, it can be pointed out that satisfaction with life in the case of the studied individuals is determined by the sphere of 'achievements', the terminal value of 'pleasure', the instrumental value of 'loving', the instrumental value of 'talented', and the trait of temperament of activity, flextime control, the system of rewards, the number of children and depreciation in the relationship. A high level of satisfaction with life in the case of portfolio workers is explained by means of: ascribing a greater significance to the sphere of 'achievements', which refers to the feeling that they have accomplished something, but, as well as that, to the life full of interesting experiences; a higher level of activity determined as an ability to take action and behaviours providing stimulation from the milieu; exercising flextime control, which means being able to have an influence on the time one starts and finishes work; a positive assessment of an incentive scheme in a workplace; and also, a low level of depreciation in the relationship, based on a will to dominate and control the actions of the partner. A high level of satisfaction with life in the case of workers employed in a single workplace

depends on: ascribing a smaller significance to the sphere associated with pleasure, with achievements and with high qualifications, but attaching a major importance to being loving, tender and tactful, a positive assessment of the system of rewards in a workplace, a greater number of children and a low level of depreciation in the relationship.

The obtained effects of the moderation of portfolio working either make the significance of the results confined exclusively to the group of multiworkers (this is the case, for example, in the aspect of flextime control or for the group of monoworkers, the number of children), or are found in both of the groups but differ in the strength of their effect, for example, rewards and depreciation for the part of the partner, or differ in terms of their strength and direction of the effect, for example, the sphere of 'achievements'. The above-mentioned variable, which definitely differentiates portfolio workers and monoworkers, co-occurring with a higher level of activity in the first group, brings the ample fruit of a stronger cognitive satisfaction with life in the case of multiworkers. The experimental studies show that an attitude focused on action makes it possible to cope better with failures and improves mental well-being (Czapiński, 2005; Zalewska, 2003, 2004). Reich and Zautra (1981) also confirmed that activity exerts a significant influence on the feeling of happiness, and gives better results when it is a source of diversified stimulation, in particular, in the case of individuals who experienced more stresses in the past. Portfolio workers need a lot of stimulation (a higher level of activity), and focusing on satisfying this demand may be expressed in a higher level of satisfaction with life in their case. What is worth pointing out are demands at work important for the studied satisfaction with life. Namely, it is a well-designed, just system of rewards, the role of which is emphasized both by multiworkers and monoworkers, and also flextime control, which exerts a positive influence on satisfaction with life in the case of portfolio workers. The above-mentioned flextime control, as it is revealed, reduces the intensity of the conflict between the family and work, and strengthens the positive spillover between work and family; therefore, it is so important for portfolio workers to have it (Lipińska-Grobelyny, 2014). In turn, as far as demands in the family are concerned, an important indicator of satisfaction with life in both of the groups is the level of communication depreciating the partner, high intensity of which is accompanied by a low level of satisfaction with life. An interesting result was obtained in reference not so much to age, but to the number of children. Even though Argyle (2005) wrote that having children exerts a small influence on satisfaction with life and happiness in marriage, in these analyses it was found that the number of children improves satisfaction with life in the case of monoworkers. Probably, having

a greater number of children by workers employed in a single workplace may lead to consciously giving up on excessive occupational activity for the benefit of maintaining their home and treating children as the goal and the source of one's happiness, the more so as it corresponds with the value of 'loving', which is appreciated in this group.

At the end of this article, it is worth considering that individuals satisfied with their life have a chance to live longer, earn better money and fulfil themselves in terms of their job, and moreover they can have better relationships and social contacts (Czapiński, 2005). Rostowska (2009) used an interesting analogy comparing the economy of money to the economy of satisfaction. A satisfied worker is the best recommendation of the company, and that fact is reflected in a greater interest for the part of customers, and greater profits of each of the market players. In this context, the obtained results of the research constitute a valuable source of information about the ways of strengthening satisfaction with life of multiworkers, whose presence in the market has now become a fact.

REFERENCES

- Argyle, M. (1987). *The psychology of happiness*. London: Methuen.
- Argyle, M. (1989). *The social psychology of work* (2nd ed.). London: Penguin.
- Argyle, M. (2005). Przyczyny i korelaty szczęścia [Causes and correlates of happiness]. In: J. Czapiński (ed.), *Psychologia pozytywna. Nauka o szczęściu, zdrowiu, sile i cnotach człowieka* [Positive Psychology. The science of happiness, health, strength and virtues of human] (pp. 163-203). Warszawa: PWN.
- Argyle, M., & Furnham, A. (1983). Sources of satisfaction and conflict in long-term relationship. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 45, 481-493.
- Argyle, M., & Martin, M. (1991). The psychological causes of happiness. In: F. Strack, M. Argyle, & N. Schwarz (eds.), *Subjective well-being. An interdisciplinary perspectives* (pp. 77-100). Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Bedyńska, S., & Książek, M. (2012). *Statystyczny drogowskaz 3* [The Statistical signpost 3rd]. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Akademickie Sedno.
- Brzozowski, P. (1989). *Skala Wartości Rokeacha. Polska adaptacja Value Survey M. Rokeacha. Podręcznik* [The 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 The Organisation Climate Questionnaire by Kolb]. *Przegląd Psychologiczny*, 34, 379-387.
- Cohen, L., & Mallon, M. (1999). The transition from organizational employment to portfolio working: perceptions of 'boundarylessness'. *Work, Employment and Society*, 13, 329-352.
- Cleveland, J. N. (2008). Age, work, and family: balancing unique challenges for the Twenty-First Century. In: A. Marcus-Newhall, D. F. Halpern, & S. J. Tan (eds.), *The changing realities of work and family* (pp. 108-139). Chichester, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.
- 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.
- Czapiński, J. (1992). *Psychologia szczęścia. Przegląd badań i zarys teorii cebulowej* [Psychology of happiness. Review of research and outline of the onion theory]. Warszawa: Oficyna Wydawnicza "Akademos".
- Czapiński, J. (2005). *Psychologiczne teorie szczęścia* [Psychological theories of happiness]. In: J. Czapiński (ed.), *Psychologia pozytywna. Nauka o szczęściu, zdrowiu, sile i cnotach człowieka* [Positive Psychology. The science of happiness, health, strength and virtues of human] (pp. 51-116). Warszawa: PWN.
- DeNeve, K. M., & Cooper, H. (1998). The happy personality: Emergence of the five-factor model. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 41, 417-440.
- De Walden-Gałuszko, K. (1994). *Jakość życia w chorobie nowotworowej* [Quality of life in cancer]. Gdańsk: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Gdańskiego.
- Diener, E., Emmons R. A., Larsen, R. J., & Griffin, S. (1985). The Satisfaction with Life Scale. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 49, 71-75.
- Diener, E., Lucas, R. E., & Oishi, S. (2002). Well-being: The science of happiness and life satisfaction. In: C. R. Snyder, & S. J. Lopez (eds.), *Handbook of positive psychology* (pp. 63-73). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Europe in figures. Eurostat yearbook 2012. http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/cache/ITY_OFFPUB/KS-CD-10-220/EN/KS-CD-10-220-EN.PDF, June 2014.
- Furnham, A., & Cheng, H. (1999). Personality as predictor of mental health and happiness in East and West. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 27, 395-403.
- Handy, Ch. (1998). *Wiek przewyżczonego rozumu* [The age of unreason]. Warszawa: Business Press.
- Juczyński, Z. (2001). *Narzędzia pomiaru w promocji i psychologii zdrowia* [Measurement tools in promotion and health psychology]. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo PTP.
- Każmierczak, M., & Plopa, M. (2005). Kwestionariusz Komunikacji Małżeńskiej (KKM) [The Marital Communication Questionnaire (KKM)]. In: M. Plopa (ed.), *Więzi w małżeństwie i rodzinie. Metody badań* [Relations in marriage and family. The re-

- search tools] (pp. 107-158). Kraków: Wydawnictwo Impuls.
- 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.
- Mirvis, P. H., & Hall, D. T. (1994). Psychological success and the boundaryless career. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 15, 365-380.
- Netemeyer, R. G., Boles, J. S., & McMurrian, R. A. (1996). Development and validation of work-family conflict and family-work conflict scales. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81, 400-410.
- Plopa, M., & Rostowski, J. (2005). Kwestionariusz Dobranego Małżeństwa (KDM-2). In: M. Plopa (ed.), *Więzi w małżeństwie i rodzinie. Metody badań* [Relations in marriage and family. The research tools] (pp. 51-104). Kraków: Oficyna Wydawnicza Impuls.
- Raeder, S. (2009). Psychological contracts and employment contracts of portfolio workers: a multi-level analysis. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 1-29 (in press).
- Ratajczak, Z. (2007). *Psychologia pracy i organizacji* [Psychology of work and organisation]. Łódź: Wydawnictwo UŁ.
- Reich, J. W., & Zautra, J. (1981). Life events and personal causation: Some relationships with satisfaction and distress. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 41, 1002-1012.
- Rostowska, T. (2009). *Małżeństwo, rodzina, praca a jakość życia* [Marriage, family, work and quality of life]. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Impuls.
- Shin, D. C., & Johnson, D. M. (1978). Avowed happiness as an overall assessment of the quality of life. *Social Indicators Research*, 5, 475-492.
- The New Economy*. (1996). *Career Paths Online*, 4, 1. Burnaby, BC: Youth Employment Skills Canada, <http://www.careerpathsonline.com/economy>, June 2011.
- Veenhoven, R. (1991). Questions on happiness: classical topics, modern answers, blind spots. In: F. Strack, M. Argyle, N. Schwarz (eds.), *Subjective well-being. An interdisciplinary perspectives* (pp. 7-26). Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Walker, C. (1977). Some variations in marital satisfaction. In: R. Chester, & J. Peel (eds.), *Equalities and inequalities in family life* (pp. 127-139). London: Academic Press.
- Zalewska, A. (2003). *Dwa światy. Emocjonalne i poznawcze oceny jakości życia i ich uwarunkowania u osób o wysokiej i niskiej reaktywności* [Two worlds. Emotional and cognitive evaluation of the quality of life and its determinants in individuals with high and low reactivity]. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Academica SWPS.
- Zalewska, A. (2004). Reaktywność i system wartościowania a zadowolenie z pracy w nowym miejscu pracy [Reactivity and evaluation system and job satisfaction in the new workplace]. In: H. Skłodowski (ed.), *Psychologia w zarządzaniu – dydaktyka, badania, sukcesy* [Psychology in management – teaching, research, successes] (pp. 397-413). Łódź: SWSPiZ.
- Zawadzki, B., & Strelau, J. (1997). *Formalna Charakterystyka Zachowania – Kwestionariusz Temperamentu (FCZ-KT)* [The Formal Characteristics of Behaviour – Temperament Questionnaire]. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo PTP.