

SOCIAL SUPPORT AND THE NON-STANDARD WORKER

Tui McKeown

*Working Paper 7/05
March 2005*

**DEPARTMENT OF MANAGEMENT
WORKING PAPER SERIES
ISSN 1327-5216**



Abstract

The advent of globalization and decreasing government labour market within the Western World have wreaked havoc with the concept of what has been thought of as traditional employment. As work becomes increasingly casual, part-time and temporary it also results in a workforce with increasing challenges to manage. This paper further investigates access to and use of social support as one of the challenges faced within the professional contractor workforce (a working relationship that typifies the growing number falling outside that of the traditional and ongoing employer/employee relationship). The notion of the wider community involvement in the workplace reinforces the extent to which work is interrelated with all aspects of an individual's life though the use of support networks. It also most directly captures the changing industrial relations focus in Australia in terms of the move from employer to individual responsibility.

SOCIAL SUPPORT AND THE NON-STANDARD WORKER

INTRODUCTION

This paper presents the third and final stage of analysis of the findings from a survey of the professional contractor workforce. Two previous papers have dealt with the concepts of commitment (McKeown, 2003 & 2005) and precariousness. Utilising Sarason and Sarason's (1987) Social Support Questionnaire to investigate the role of social support in sustaining the contracting lifestyle in combination with the notion of push and pull forces into contracting provides the basis for a hypothesis which states -

The level of Social Support is positively related to the initial 'pull' factors associated with the move into contracting and subsequently, assists in enabling the individual to maintain working as a contractor.

The hypotheses is dealt with within the structure provided by the Push/Pull Matrix (refer to McKeown, 2005 for detailed explanation of this structure); to facilitate comparison between the profiles of profession, age and gender that emerged in earlier papers. The implications of each are then synthesised into a general discussion of the findings within the context of the professional contractor as part of the larger non-standard workforce and the more general changes occurring at the level of labour and the community.

THE ROLE OF SOCIAL SUPPORT

The issue of social support is investigated from both an historical and a contemporary perspective to establish both the role of others in assisting with the initial move into contracting and then, how others may assist in sustaining the individual in contracting.

Based on the six item short version of Sarason and Sarason's (1987) Social Support Questionnaire (the SSQ), this section of the 4-part to be integrated into the overall design of the Survey of the professional contractor workforce. The analysis of the results thus initially separates the discussion on the size and type of network an individual has from the level of satisfaction with each support source. The general discussion then combines these two factors to provide an overall perspective of the role of social support.

Social Support in the Initial Move into Contracting

The first stage of analysis examines social support from the sources individuals accessed and how these individual sources then group together to provide a support network. Gender difference, a common theme of research in this area, is included in the results portrayed in Table 1. Overall, the results show that on average, nearly three (2.7) sources of support are accessed. Analysing the results in terms of gender reveals that males had an average of 2.4 sources while females had 3.6. This result concurs with general studies on social support and on self-employment which found that females have significantly larger social support network than males ($p \leq 0.05$ in the case of the current investigation). There were also important gender differences in the types of people accessed for support. While males dominate the 'No Support Person' option, female support patterns cover a broad spectrum, from those close to them, such as 'Spouse', 'Family' and 'Friends', to a more distant group of 'Former Employers' and 'Professional Services'. Extending this notion of close too increasingly more distant relationships, the three groups which show no significant gender difference are those which are the most removed.

Table 1: Initial Sources of Social Support as a Network

Sources of Support	No. Responses	Responses		% Total responses	Overall Rank
		Male	Female		
No support person	31	29*	2	4.74	9
Spouse or partner	143	99	44*	21.87	1
Family	51	23	28**	7.80	6
Friends	80	46	34**	12.23	4
Former employer	35	15	20**	5.35	7
Work Mates	73	57	16	11.16	5
Work Contacts	114	84	30	17.43	2
Accountant	33	21	12	5.05	8
Other Professional Services	94	62	32**	14.37	3
	654	436	218	100%	

**Results significant at the $p < .001$ level *Results significant at the $p < .05$ level

The gender differences in Table 1 are more pronounced when the results are placed into the matrix framework. Presented in Table 2, these results are in direct contrast to results of earlier papers where males have dominated the Pull and related sectors. Table 2 instead reveals that females generally dominate the Pull and related sectors. Closer examination reveals the strong role that the family plays for females in all of the sectors, while the lack of any supportive ‘others’ is a feature of disadvantage associated with males in the No Choice and Delayed Entry sectors.

Table 2: The Push/Pull Matrix & Initial Social Support Networks by Gender

	Left Prior Work Arrangement To Become a Contractor	Left Prior Work Arrangement & Later Became a Contractor	Totals
Contractor By Choice	PULL Family- N=6 Females* Former Employer - N=4 Females** Work Mates -N=33 Males*** Work Contacts -N=36 Males*** Accountant -N=12 Males* & 6 Females*	DEFAULT 1 Family -N= 9 Female*** Friends -N= 7 Females* Prof. Services -N=16 males**	BY CHOICE Family -N=18 Females Friends -N=23 Females Former Employer -N=9 Female)* Work Mates -N= 37 Males* Work Contacts -N=55 Males***
Contractor Not by Choice	DEFAULT 2	PUSH Family -N= 8 Females*** Friends -N= 7 Female*** Work Mates -N=10 Females*** Work Contacts -N=10 females Accountant -N=5 Female**	NO CHOICE No One -N=15 Males* Spouse-N=17 Females*** Family -N=10 Females** Friends-N=11 Females*** Former Employer -N=6 Females* WorkContacts-N=15 Females** Prof.Services -N=25 Males*
Totals	DIRECT ENTRY Family -N=17 Females* WorkMates -N=42 Male)*** WorkContacts -N= 47 Males Accountant -N=7 Females*	DELAYED ENTRY No One -N=12 Males* Spouse -N=19 Females*** Family -N=17 Females*** Friends -N=14 Females*** Work Contacts -N=19 Females*** Prof.Services -N=41 Males***	

***Denotes Results significant at the $p < .001$ ** $p < .005$ and * $p < .05$ level

In terms of viewing social support from the perspective of a network, females access both a significantly larger number and a greater range of 'others' when they consider the move into contracting. Both of these dimensions of the support network increase as we move across the matrix sectors to the delayed and lack of choice options. These are increasingly associated with the features of disadvantage, such as lower pay, decreased independence and reduced satisfaction with work – all themes familiar in the wider literature on non-standard employment.

A more familiar picture emerges when the results are examined in terms of occupation and age, presented in Table 3. The occupations of engineering, business/management and architect/draughtsman are once again identified as dominant in the Pull sector. This sector is also significantly male dominated although the age range for the various sources is wider than generally featured in this sector. Overall, the importance of work based networks emerges clearly for these three dominant occupations of advantage and this is also the case for the by choice and direct entry sectors within Table 3. A similar reliance on work based on networks is also seen in the Push sector but this time it is associated with females in Health & Welfare. By contrast the males in this sector are significantly associated with seeking support from 'Professional Services.' This result corresponds with the Push forces of involuntary redundancy identified earlier as a feature of the 55-59 year old group.

The inclusion of results from earlier sections in the interpretation of the information presented in Table 3 reveals some areas of further interest. The important financial role of the spouse in the Default 1 sector is paralleled but is not evident in the Push sector, where spouses were identified as a key source of financial support. This result would appear to offer further evidence of the marginal nature of professional contracting work for these individuals. As Morris (1995) suggests, they may in fact be providing the social support role for their working partners rather than the other way around. Instead, Table 3 shows that respondents represented in this section elicit social support from relatively distant sources such as 'Professional Services' and 'Accountants'. While 'Accountants' are a common source for males' aged 35-39 throughout the Matrix, accessing 'Professional Services' is concentrated in the Push and Delayed Entry sectors.

This result again corresponds with involuntary redundancy and may well be associated with the outplacement services typically offered as part of severance 'packages' to professional and managerial groups. Overall, these results give an insight into the types of 'others' sought when individual professionals move into contracting. This result again corresponds with involuntary redundancy and may well be associated with the outplacement services typically offered as part of severance 'packages' to professional and managerial groups. Overall, these results give an insight into the types of 'others' sought when individual professionals move into contracting.

Table 3: The Push/Pull Matrix and Initial Social Support Networks

	Left Prior Work Arrangement To Become a Contractor	Left Prior Work Arrangement & Later Became a Contractor	Totals
Contractor By Choice	<p style="text-align: center;">PULL</p> <p>Family - 5 Bus/Mgrs* Spouse - 11 Engineers* WorkMates (N = 38)*** -9 Engineers***, 6 Architects** & 5 Bus/Mgrs*** -4 Males aged 25-29, 4 aged 30-34 & 4 aged 35-39* WorkContacts (N = 41)** -13 Engineers* & 6 Architects** -5 Males aged 35- 39** & 22 aged 40-44*** Accountant - 5 Males aged 35-39***</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">DEFAULT 1</p> <p>Spouse (N = 33)*** -14 Bus/Mgrs* & 5 Males aged 25-29*** Family- 5 Females aged 40-44** Friends - 8 IT* and 5 Males aged 25-29*** WorkContacts - 5 Males aged 25-29* -5 Females aged 40-44* & 6 Males 55-59** Professional Services (N = 22)*** -7 Males aged 40-44***</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">BY CHOICE</p> <p>Spouse - 9 Males aged 50-54* & 22 at 40-44* Friends (N = 53) 22 IT* & 6 Males aged 25-29** WorkMates (N = 48)** - 9 Bus/Mgrs** & 6 Architects* - 6 Males aged 35-39* WorkContacts (N = 69)* - 7 Architects* - 7 Males aged 35-39* Accountant - 5 Males aged 35-39**</p>
Contractor Not by Choice	<p style="text-align: center;">DEFAULT 2</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">PUSH</p> <p>Family (N=15)* WorkMates- 5 Females in Health & Welfare* WorkContacts- 5 Females in Health & Welfare* & 5 Males aged 35-39** ,22 aged 40-44*** Accountants - 5 Males aged 35-39*** Professi Services (N = 26)*** 8 Males aged 55-59***</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">NO CHOICE</p> <p>No One (N = 15)* Professional Services (N = 33)* WorkContacts- 8 Females in Health & Welfare*** & 6 Females aged 35-39* Accountants - 4 IT**</p>
Totals	<p style="text-align: center;">DIRECT ENTRY</p> <p>Family - 5 Bus/Mgrs* & 4 Males aged 55-59*** Friends (N = 41)* 20 Males aged 40-44* WorkMates (N = 49)*** -24 Engineers* 7 Architects* - 6 males aged 30-34***, 6 at 35-39* & 4 at 40-44* WorkContacts - 21 Engineers** - 7 Males aged 35-39* Accountant (N = 20)* -5 Males aged 35-39**</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">DELAYED ENTRY</p> <p>Spouse (N = 66)* -28 Bus/Mgrs* & 8 Males aged 25-29** Family (N = 27)* 4 Males aged 30-34*** & 5 Females aged 35-39* & 5 Females aged 40-44* WorkContacts - 17 Bus/Mgrs* 5 Health & Welfare* 6 Females aged 40-44** ,12 Males 50-59*** Professional Services (N = 55)*** -10 IT*** 5 Females 35-39* & 9 aged 40-44*** & 6 males aged 45-49**</p>	

*** Denotes results significant at the $p < .001$ ** $p < .005$ and * $p < .05$

The analysis of the results now moves to the second aspect of social support, the strength, in terms of importance, of the support seen to be available from the networks. This aspect is presented in Table 4 and shows that Spouse/Partners are clearly the most important source of support. Overall, the results for strength of networks mirror the results for network size illustrated previously in Table 1.

Table 4: Frequency & Strength of Initial Social Support

	1- Not at all	2- A Bit	3- Some- what	4- Quite	5- Moder- ate	6- Very	7- Extremely	Mean Score	Rank
No Support (N=31)	10	9	4	-	-	4	2	0.325	9
Spouse/Partner (N=143)	-	3	1	12	22	42	63	3.583	1
Family (N=51)	-	1	-	3	6	16	25	1.313	6
Friends (N=80)	-	4	6	4	18	28	20	1.833	4
Former Employer(N=35)	-	2	1	3	-	8	21	0.892	7
WorkMates (N=73)	-	3	3	13	15	22	17	1.638	5
WorkContacts (N=114)	-	3	4	15	19	31	42	2.721	2
Accountant (N=33)	-	1	5	2	4	14	7	0.742	8
Professional Services (N=94)	-	3	4	8	11	24	43	2.292	3

Again, based on the rating scale where 7 equals 'extremely important' through to 1 being 'not at all important', Table 5 shows that the various sources accessed by those in the Pull sector are all less than 'quite important'. For respondents in the Default 1 sector the support sources are at least of 'quite important'. As with previous sections, key aspects of the results emerge when they interpreted in terms of the matrix framework. Table 5 shows, for males in the Push sector, the role of workmates is negligible, and for females in this sector professional services are 'moderately important'.

Table 5: The Push/Pull Matrix & Initial Strength of Social Support Networks by Gender

	Left Prior Work Arrangement To Become a Contractor	Left Prior Work Arrangement & Later Became a Contractor	Totals
Contractor By Choice	PULL WorkMates - Males ($\pi = 3.296$)* ** WorkContacts - Males ($\pi = 3.74$)*** Accountant - Females ($\pi = 3$)* Prof. Services - Females ($\pi = 1.75$)*	DEFAULT 1 Spouse - Females ($\pi = 6.4$)* Family - Females ($\pi = 5.3$)*** WorkContacts - Females ($\pi = 4.5$)*** Prof.Services - Females ($\pi = 3.6$)***	BY CHOICE Spouse - Females ($\pi = 4.1$)*** Friends - Females ($\pi = 4.4$)** WorkMates - Males ($\pi = 2.2$)** WorkContacts - Males ($\pi = 3.4$)***
Contractor Not by Choice	DEFAULT 2	PUSH WorkMates - Males ($\pi = .56$)* Professional Services - Females ($\pi = 5.3$)*	NO CHOICE No One - Males ($\pi = 1$)*** WorkMates - Females ($\pi = 1.5$)*** Prof. Services - Females ($\pi = 4.2$)***
Totals	DIRECT ENTRY Former Employer - Females ($\pi = 1.3$)*** WorkMates - Males ($\pi = 2.7$)* Prof. Services - Females ($\pi = 1.8$)*	DELAYED ENTRY Friends - Females ($\pi = 4$)*** WorkMates - Females ($\pi = 1.1$)* Prof. Services - Females ($\pi = 4.2$)*	

***Results significant at the $p < .001$ ** $p < .005$ and * $p < .05$ level

Overall, Tables 2 and 5 provide evidence that females not only access larger social support networks when initially moving into contracting, but these networks played a much greater role in assisting with the move. The combined results from Table 2 and 6 clearly support the notion that gender is the key source of difference in relation to the construct of social support. It also provides some general support for the contention of the first part of the Hypothesis, that the level of social support will be positively related to the initial pull factors associated with the move into contracting.

While the size of the support networks is similar in both the Pull and Push quadrants, the strength of the level of support accessed by individuals in the Push sector overall is significantly higher. The overall average strength of support accessed by respondents in the Pull sector generally rather modest, a result that accords with previous findings of advantaged labour market position, security of ongoing contracts and higher income associated with the Pull sector, which have been identified through earlier items of the survey. These positive features appear to outweigh or mitigate the need for high levels of social support for these individuals. Correspondingly, the features of disadvantage associated with the Push and related sectors appear to produce the need for both more support sources and higher levels of support. These are examined in more detail within the context of the role social support plays in maintaining professionals in contracting arrangements.

SOCIAL SUPPORT AND MAINTAINING THE PROFESSIONAL IN CONTRACTING

The role social support currently plays in the life of the professional contractor is examined through the Social Support Questionnaire (SSQ) developed by Sarason and Sarason in 1987. As with the previous section which dealt with initial sources of support identified by Item A5 of the survey, the SSQ results in this section will establish both the sources of support as a network structure and the strength of this support. This time however, there are no pre-set choices for individuals to choose from and they were free to use their own terms for their support sources. These were coded into the standard options previously offered, then expanded to deal with the wider range identified by

this self-selection method. They fell into 12 major categories and 1 miscellaneous area but the previous distinction between workmates and workcontacts was difficult so they were amalgamated into a new variable of workcontacts.

The six aspects of social support covered by the six items of the SSQ deal with those people an individual feels:

- 1- that they can depend on;
- 2- that help them relax;
- 3- accepts them totally;
- 4- cares about them
- 5- helps them when they feel 'down in the dumps'
- 6- helps them when they need to be consoled.

The results of these six aspects are summarised and aggregated in Table 6 to produce a profile which is different from that in the previous section on initial support sources. While 'spouse/partners' still provide the most common source of support, members of the 'Family' are now the second key area of ongoing support while 'prior employers' disappear from the results altogether.

As with the prior section on initial sources of support, the primary sources accessed as ongoing support structures are more immediately accessible individuals such as a partner or family member. As they become more removed they reduce in importance. Examining the sources of support by gender reveals few significant differences.

Table 6: Results of the Six Aspects of Current Social Support

	Depend	Relax	Accept	Care	Dumps	Console	Total	Rank
No One	9	34	34	16	27	22	142	5
Spouse	186	142	140	177	166	176	987	1
Family	133	88	122	140	116	98	697	2
Friends	118	96	62	82	101	87	546	3
Employer	2	-	-	-	-	2	4	12
Work contacts	70	41	36	39	55	51	292	4
Self	17	21	19	14	11	8	90	6
Accountant	17	1	-	-	-	-	18	11=
CA Rep.*	22	3	1	3	3	-	32	10
Medical specialist	11	20	-	1	8	6	46	9
Business partner	17	13	15	13	12	12	82	7
Childcare provider	4	4	-	2	4	4	18	11=
Animals/miscell.	3	11	10	9	10	10	53	8
	609	474	439	493	513	476	3007	

* CA Rep. = Contracting Agency Representative

Table 7 shows that significantly more males than females access 'accountants', while females' reliance on 'spouse/partner' support is no longer statistically significant as it was in the initial moves into contracting. They still do significantly rely on the 'family' and 'friends'.

Table 7: Significant Sources of Current Social Support by Gender

	Males	Females
Family		N = 60 mean = 4.89**
Friends		N = 45 mean = 3.33**
Work contacts		N = 33 mean = 1.62*
Accountant	N = 17 mean = 9.5*	
Childcare provider		N = 4 mean = 0.3*
Total	1 source	4 sources

** Significant at $p < .001$ * Significant at $p < .05$ level

Added to the female network is a group titled 'childcare providers' which comprises the nannies, crèches and other terms used to categorise a range of individuals and services. While much smaller in terms of totals numbers than any other support sources for females, this identified only by female respondents. Once again, the view from the raw data changes quite dramatically when translated into the Matrix framework.

Summarised in terms of occupation and age as well as gender as well as gender, Table 8 reveals a larger social support network being utilised than was evident in the initial move into contracting. This is true except for individuals in the Default 1 sector where the number of sources has actually decreased (refer back to Table 3 for comparison). Females actively make the greatest use of 'family' and 'friends' sources in every sector of the matrix. Bearing in mind that the Health & Welfare industry is almost totally female, the dominance of 'work contacts' continues in all but the Pull sector and produces an overall view that women build extensive networks.

In contrast, 'spouses' as a support source feature in the Contractor by Choice sectors, where they provide support for males and engineers in particular. Once again, males have indicated that they rely on 'no one' to support them and this factor is statistically significant for males aged 55-59. As with the results of the initial move into contracting for the Push sector, this age range is significantly associated with males in Business/Management and reflects earlier findings that this group was particularly affected by involuntary redundancy. It seems that individuals in this group focus and rely on themselves to both start up in contracting and to continue in this arrangement. One consequence of this lack of social support may be the marginalisation and vulnerability in terms of overall income, income variation and fluctuation. By contrast, the female dominated group of Health and Welfare, which more commonly emerged within the Push Sector in other areas of analysis, has expanded their social support network from the initial one of 'workmates' and 'workcontacts' in section 1 above, to include the closer sources of 'friends' and 'family.' These later inclusions accord with studies of self-employment that some women initially move into alternative work arrangements due to economic necessity and without close consultation and support of those closest to them. However, as the viability of the arrangement is either established requires more immediate forms of support, a more elaborate and developed network structures develops (Morris, 1995).

Males also appear to add to their initial support structures to sustain working as a contractor. Table 8 identifies the importance of 'business partners' in the Pull/Direct Entry sectors, particularly for men aged 40-44. 'Medical specialists' also feature in the Delayed Entry option for 55-59 year olds – already characterised contracting due to involuntary redundancy. The self-selection of medical specialists as an ongoing support implies possible monitoring of a medical condition, - further reinforcing the vulnerability and marginalisation of this group. Finally, male reliance on social support from a specialist 'other' is also seen via CA representatives play for 50-54 year old males in the Push/Delayed Entry sectors.

The picture emerging is of females increasing and building upon initial networks though added sources characterised as closer social relationships of family and friends. Males also extend their networks but these remain smaller than women's and they tend to be work-focussed such as business partners, and socially distant such as CA representatives and medical specialists.

SUMMARY OF SOCIAL SUPPORT

In summary, the information generated provides strong evidence of the important role social support plays in the initial move into contracting and later, in sustaining the contractor. Women generally have more extensive social networks than men. In the initial stages, the strength of these networks is important for women and they continue to access a much wider range of sources to support their working. Men, however, appear to concentrate on increasing the strength of the bonds established within the smaller network structures accessed during the initial move into contracting, and making stronger, closer networks. Thus, while the number of support sources for men does not generally increase, the strength of the general network does. This gender difference in network structures is common to studies of social support (see for example House, 1981 Lim, 1996). More recent work by Mallon (1999) and Legge (2001) suggests the differences indicate quite different approaches to work and that the more diverse but closer, looser networks generally created by women are particularly appropriate for sustaining work arrangements such as contracting. A key feature of this suitability for women is the ability to balance work and non-work roles and to deal with the absence of a long-term individual work-based identity commonly associated with the lack of attachment to one employer. This lack of attachment between contractor and employer has important implications for the meaning work now has for an individual and could logically be expected to be reflected in the traditional forms of work related performance measures – such as loyalty and commitment. The wider implications for the community are also important as workers increasingly forced to develop their own repertoire of resources to maintain and sustain a working life.

Table 8: Summary of the Matrix & Current Sources of Social Support

	Left Prior Work Arrangement To Become a Contractor	Left Prior Work Arrangement & Later Became a Contractor	Totals
Contract or By Choice	PULL WorkContacts (N = 37)** & 13 Engineers*** Miscellaneous (N = 6)* Spouse – 15 Engineers** Family – 12 Females*** & 8 Bus/Mgrs* Friends – 9 Females** & 8 Males/Females aged 35-39** Business Partner – 5 Males aged 40-44*	DEFAULT 1 Family – 11 Females** Friends – 11 Females** & 5 males aged 25-29* Work Contacts – 10 Females*** with 5 aged 40-44* Spouse – 5 Males aged 25-29*	By Choice Friends (N = 89)*** & 28 Females***, 10 Males aged 25-29** & 21 Males & Females aged 35-39* Work contacts (N = 68)*** with 19 Engineers*** & 22 Females* & 34 Males aged 40-44** Family – 30 Females*** with 13 Males/Females aged 30-34* & 21 aged 35-39* No One – 15 Males* & 10 aged 55-59**
Contract or Not by Choice	DEFAULT 2	PUSH Medical Specialist (N=11)* No One – 29 Males** with 7 aged 55-59* & 17 Bus/Mgrs* Family – 10 females*** with & 5 Health & Welfare***, 10 Bus/Mgrs * & 10 Males/ Females aged 45-49*** Friends - 4 Health & Welfare** WorkContacts - 4 Health & Welfare* Self – 4 Educ/Teaching** CA Rep. – 6 Males aged 50-54***	No Choice Child’s Caregiver (N = 4)** No One – 36 Males* & 21 Bus/Mgrs** Family – 20 Females*** with 9 Health & Welfare*** 12 Males/Females aged 45-49*** Friends – 15 Females*** & 8 in Health & Welfare*** 20 Males/Females aged 35-39*** WorkContacts – 8 Health & Welfare*
Totals	Direct Entry Business Partner (N = 14)*7 Males 40-44*** Miscellaneous (N = 8)* Spouse – 27 Engineers** Family – 18 Females*** & 9 Engineers** WorkContacts – 19 Engineers*** Friends 12 Males/Females aged 3-34 & 12 aged 35-39* No One – 7 Males aged 55-59* Accountant – 4 Males aged 35-39*	Delayed Entry Medical Specialist (N=15)*8 Males aged 55-59*** No One – 40 Males*** with 12 aged 55-59*** Family – 22 Females*** 15 Males/Females 45-49*** Friends –17 Females** 13 Males aged 25-29* WorkContacts – 15 Females*** 18 Males/Females aged 40-44** Spouse – 11 Males aged 25-29* CA rep – 6 Males aged 50-54*** Business Partner – 4 Males aged 25-29***	

*** Significant at $p < .001$ ** Significant at $p < .005$ *Significant at $p < .05$

REFERENCES

- House, R. (1981). *Work, Stress and Social Support*. Reading, MA, Addison-Wesley.
- Legge, K. (2001) *Keynote Address: AIRAANZ 2001 Wollongong*: University of Wollongong.
- Lim, V. (1996) "Job Insecurity and Its Outcomes : *Human Relation* **49**(2): 171 - 194.
- Mallon, M. (1999). Going "portfolio": making sense of changing careers. *Career Development International* **4**(7): 358-369.
- Morris, L. (1995). *Social Divisions: Economic Decline and Social Structural Change*. London, UCL Press.
- McKeown, T. (2003). Commitment from a contractor workforce? *International Journal of Manpower* **24**(2): 169-1
- McKeown, T. (2005 forthcoming) Non-Standard Employment - When Even the Elite are Precarious *Journal of Industrial Relations*