

## Staffing Contingent Workers in 2020: Amending an Inequality

ANGELA R PAYNE

Keller School of Management DeVry University, Chicago, IL USA

Email: [paynelobby2@yahoo.com](mailto:paynelobby2@yahoo.com)

Tel: 17736848336

---

### Abstract

*Since World War II, the concept of staffing contingent workers has steadily gained traction. Contingent workers are temporary or part-time workers who are hired on a short-term basis. Currently, contingency agencies employ more than 2.6 million workers. The figure denotes a significant increase since 1991, when 1.5 million workers were in contingent occupations. For a nominal wage, contingent workers have become a commodity, plausibly interposing the status quo. This paper presents a critical evaluation of the concept of contingent workers: its conceptualization after World War II, its role in the current staffing industry, and its impact on staffing strategies. It is argued that the lack of statutory constraints perpetuates the exploitation of contingent workers in the staffing industry. This paper questions whether statutory context will diminish the exploitation of contingent workers.*

**Key Words:** *Contingent Workers, Staffing Industry, Temporary Employment.*

---

### Introduction

The concept of contingent workers emerged after World War II, predominately in industrialized regions. The industrialized regions were North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, Minnesota, Iowa, Missouri, Wisconsin, Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, and Ohio. By the end of the 1940s, the categorization of contingent workers was urbanized. During this period, the demographics in urbanized regions were predominately-white middle-class coteries. Consequently, contingency agencies would target domiciliary, white middle-class women in the coteries.

In a row, contingency agencies launched subterfuges intended for domiciliary, white middle-class females as efforts were made to fill provisional occupations for emolument. The Kelly Agency, contingency workers model designer, launched its commercial archetype in the Michigan market. Until the late 1990s, the Kelly Agency exclusively employed domiciliary white middle-class female, to fill part-time secretarial positions at a nominal wage. These white, middle-class female, contingent workers, became, known as the Kelly Girls. The Kelly Girls who never said no became the intonation of the time. Even so, Kelly companies' archetypes were ingenious because they subjugated the cultural contradictions, for domiciliary white middle-class females to work outside the home was not the trend (Hatton, 2013).

Similarly, in the region of Wisconsin, an analogous partnership was established, as a result Manpower Inc. materialized. Manpower, Inc. propelled Kelly Girls archetype to another level by luring young, white, middle-class women as ways and means to expand its corporate mission and to fill interim office jobs. Both, the Kelly Girl Services and Manpower Inc. were the definitive exploiters of a population of naïve females. Accordingly, the population of naïve domiciliary white, middle-class females became rock stars of the time. Printed media referred to the rock stars as "White Glove Girls, Western Girls, Cowgirls, and

the American Girls of American Girl Services.<sup>1</sup>” The exploitation and depictions of contingent workers caused irreparable harm. In this paper, it is argued that the lack of statutory constraints perpetuate the exploitation of contingent workers in the staffing industry.

Throughout this period, equally inexperienced Kelly Services and Manpower, Inc., agencies were inescapable norms. Ingeniously, Kelly Services and Manpower, Inc. launched multiple public relations ads to divert adverse public sentimentalities towards contingency agencies and services that they delivered. By this means, all ads were used to interchange perceptions of contingency agencies’ deliverables in lieu of male, dominate, middle-class, union jobs (e.g., maritime, railroad, coal, oil, auto, electrical, telephone, and steel industries) as a maneuver to manipulate a period of unionization. Disguised by auspicious, statutory context gender biases, contingency agencies conjured a new fragmental, fee-based, nominal wage in addition to unpredictable work schedules beneath influential labor unions’ sensors.

Despite that, contingency agencies touted their services as an epitome of the “never-never girls,” meaning they were on loan for nominal wages and never took vacations, holiday’s, or requested time off. The “never-never girls” were the iconic staffer-worker of the 1950s. By the end of 1960s, more obvious catchphrases were adapted recited, “when the workload dropped, you dropped the never-never girl.” On the face of it, corporate social responsibility was of no concern to contingency agencies. Seemingly, exploitation of irrevocable harm to females, impending labor laws, enactment of fees, and fee- splitting for gainful employment was less significant to contingency agencies and commercial allies who used provisional help. Consider this, since the 1940s, the never-never girls were never allowed, in modern vernacular, to “Just say no.” Rhetorically, for a fee the never-never girl always aimed to please, presumably females were exploited routinely without any legal recourse. The word “no” came with severe consequences (e.g., unemployment, isolation, humiliation, depression). On the face of it, any infraction, trivial or significant, resulted in the loss of income. A bombastic expression of provocation resulted in irrevocable harm to naïve contingent worker. This paper, examines unions and community-based organizations reform efforts to regulate some of the most exploitative contingency agency practices (Freeman and Gonos, 2005). For the reason that there was no significant statutory context to prohibit the exploitation of contingency workers from fee-splitting, the marketplace has continued to witness contingency agencies enticement of clients use of contingency workers by endorsing nominal emoluments, but not limited to social security, workers compensation, health insurance, administrative expense of withholding, and fringe benefits.<sup>2</sup>

## Fees for Hire

By the 1990s, classified ads were the primary source for finding employment. Applicants reading classified ads placed by contingency agencies would read: “Fee for hire,” “No fees,” “Not an agency –Never a fee,” “Never a fee to the job seeker,” “Fee-splitting available,” “All fees company paid,” and “A fee-paid service” (Gonos, 2001). Although, contingency agencies contend workers never incurred fees for employment,<sup>3</sup> evidence has shown that State statutory contexts have allowed contingency agencies to conceal their fees, thereby hiding the amount they garner from a worker’s labor.<sup>4</sup> In a clear as crystal practice of dubious legality, agencies, forbid contingent workers from discussing and/or inquiring about the salaries of other workers or about the agencies billing rate.

In addition, contingent workers were required prior to working to sign a covenant that reads, I hereby acknowledge that all matters relative to salaries and rates are confidential, and to engage in discussions about salaries and rates with clients or a contingent worker may end in termination.<sup>5</sup> Certainly, the

<sup>1</sup> Adopted from Erin Hatton, The Rise of the Permanent Temp Economy, Opinionator, New York Times.com, January 26, 2013, [opinionator.blogs.nytimes.com/2013/01/26/the-rise-of-the-permanent-temp-economy/available](http://opinionator.blogs.nytimes.com/2013/01/26/the-rise-of-the-permanent-temp-economy/available) at

<sup>2</sup> *Id.* DOL

<sup>3</sup> Edward A. Lenz, “Apples and Oranges: Some Key Operational and Legal Differences Between Temporary Help and Other Services,” *Contemporary Times* (Fall 1990): 15.

<sup>4</sup> Joseph B. Darby, “The Untouchable Topic: Agencies Explain Why They Charge Fees and What is Reasonable,” *Contract Professional* ( July – August 1998), 37

<sup>5</sup> Adopted from the “employees’ agreement” signed by workers sent out by Career Blazers, quoted in William Lewis and Nancy Schuman, *The Temp Worker’s Handbook: How to Make Temporary Employment Work for You* (New York: American Management Association), 1988, 62

covenant has kept contingent workers ignorant of concealed fees borne at their expense and rates borne to clients who use them for help. Contentiously, the covenant impedes negotiating and the operation of a free labor market (p. 590). In contrast, the acceptance of contingent workers instructions, the focus on fees and fee splitting, and the used of provisos constraints has profoundly made the staffing industries the fastest growing domestic commerce in the United States (Gonos, 2001).

With the decline of unionism, contingency agencies have re-introduced norms for the workplace in the United States.<sup>6</sup> Part of this change has been the resurgence of unregulated contingency agencies.<sup>7</sup> Overall, periods of high labor flexibility in the United States have provided the opportunity for private contingency agencies to place a surcharge on the use of contingent workers and the clients who use them for help.<sup>8</sup> With that said, contingent workers have always borne a fee for employment, and the prevalent return of agency fees and plausible new fee splitting, the workplace in 2013, is reminiscent of the clandestine rates and allowances of a historic era of agency-contingent relations.<sup>9</sup> Filling the organizational needs left by the untying of the agency-contingent relationship, the contingent industry has served as a catalyst for the secondary workplace burgeoning with companies and industries and a medium for the rising redistribution of profits from contingent workers to contingency agencies (Gonos, 2001).

### The Labor Management Relations ACT (LMRA)

The reverberation of World War II brought forward the amalgamation of untrained labor unions into the fray of wartime melees.<sup>10</sup> Labor unions are legal units acknowledged as agents of the labor force in many industries in the United States for negotiating doles and members in disputes with management over violations of contract provisions.<sup>11</sup> The admission of labor force activities, compelled business sectors to find the middle ground with unions for an official period of consolidation of union power;<sup>12</sup> consecutively by means of government control, the enactment of Taft-Hartley Act, universally referred to as the Labor Management Relations Act (LMRA), was established as evidenced by the eruption of public-sector unionism in the early 1960s.<sup>13</sup> The Labor Management Relations Act (LMRA) facilitates two key purposes:

- To lessen industrial disputes;
- To place employers in a more equal position with the unions in bargaining and labor relations procedures;

The Labor Management Relations Act (LMRA) statutory context has evolved from civic protection for the rights of the workforce to statutory constructs that include more restrictions on labor unions despite the fact that, federal laws assures definite liberties and mien to labor unions and the workforce. The purpose and policy of the LMRA is as follows (LMRA):<sup>14</sup>

- To prescribe the legitimate rights of both employees and employers in their relations affecting commerce
- To provide orderly and peaceful procedures for preventing employees and employers from interfering with each other's legitimate rights
- 

<sup>6</sup> Louis Adamik, *Dynamite: The Story of Class Violence in America* (New York: Vintage, 1958 [1931]), 23.

<sup>7</sup> Louis Adamik, *Dynamite: The Story of Class Violence in America* (New York: Vintage, 1958 [1931]), 23.

<sup>8</sup> See Robert Tillman and Michael Indergaard, "Field of Schemes: Health Insurance Fraud in the Small Business Sector," *Social Problems* 46, 4, (1999), 572-590.

<sup>9</sup> Michael Burawoy, *Manufacturing Consent: Changes in the Labor Process Under Monopoly Capitalism* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1979)

<sup>10</sup> *Id.*

<sup>11</sup> Adopted from Labor Unions in the United States Available at [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Labor\\_unions\\_in\\_the\\_United\\_States](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Labor_unions_in_the_United_States)

<sup>12</sup> *Id.*

<sup>13</sup> *Id.*

<sup>14</sup> *Id.*

- To protect the rights of individual employees in their relations with labor organizations whose activities affect commerce
- To define and proscribe the labor and management practices that affect commerce
- To protect the public's rights in connection with labor disputes affecting commerce

Legislative bodies revised the National Labor Relations Act (NLRA), also known as the Wagner Act, in 1947 with the section of the LMRA. Technical hitches with the NLRA included (a) ferocious movements and corraling, (b) tributary work stoppages that incapacitated third persons, (c) the NLRB's manner of determining suitable bargaining units, (d) Union corruption, and (e) recurrent work-assignment difference of opinion among unions<sup>15</sup>

### Contingent worker and the Union Hiring Halls

The enactment of the Labor Management Relations Act (LMRA) used to protect civic rights of workers' does not address contingent workers in the legislative text and it has not provided an effective regulatory system to govern the operation of existing contingency agencies or other profit-driven labor market intermediaries (LMIs).<sup>16</sup>

In spite of legal discoveries to construct alternatives, non-exploitative agencies contest unindustrialized Labor Ready and Manpower maneuvers so far, lawmakers have not provided a lawful context that would improve unionization and fair treatment to contingent workers deployed in the workplace by exploitive profit-driven LMIs.<sup>17</sup> The Labor market intermediaries (LMIs) are similar to union hiring halls and contingency agencies (Wilborn, 1997). The purpose of the labor market intermediaries archetype provides meaningful employment pursuits with both employment and benefit plans; such plans would be unavailable to them as contingent workers if not for the archetype.<sup>18</sup> Together, union hiring halls and profitable contingency agencies are frequently the contractually selected concierges that provide means by which contingent workers acquire right of entry into industries or with clients who uses them for help (Van and Dorice, 2000).<sup>19</sup>

### Issues

Researchers have shown that LMIs are contributors of workforce exploitation of contingent workers. Consequently, this contributing behavior calls to question, -the impact of contingent strategies in the workforce and subversive governance to diminish the exploitation of contingent workers. The issue is LMIs (e.g., contingent agencies) have taken over the contingent labor market, while their highly regulated counterparts, union hiring halls, and its compensatory insignificant role as a provider of labor.<sup>20</sup>

Finally, the differences between unions' hiring halls and the contingency staffing industry is a parameter established in federal labor laws; on the other hand, the contingency staffing industry is unimpeded at both the state and federal levels. For these issues, an individual as a contingent worker will endure exploitation, extortion, and pervert fee-charging practices, and sent to fictional jobs. Contingency agencies and clients who use contingent workers for help are colluded to bilk the labor force by intentionally promoting high turnover, hiring and quickly dismissing workers referred by the agency to maximize the number of fees collected (Gonos, 2000-2001).

<sup>15</sup> *Id.*

<sup>16</sup> The United States Department of Labor officially versed the name from temporary help to contingent workers within the staffing industry in the 1994, in this paper, contingent workers used interchangeably.

<sup>17</sup> *Id.*

<sup>18</sup> *Id.*

<sup>19</sup> 29 U.S.C. Section 159(a); *Breining v. Sheet Metal Workers Intl. Assoc. Local Union No. 6*, 493 U.S. 67, 87 (1989).

<sup>20</sup> *Id.*

## Contingent Labor Market Statistics

In 2011, the Staffing Industry Analysts conducted studies on 100 agencies, their results showed of the 100 contingency agencies, \$100 million in staffing profits were realized; collectively these agencies' revenue totals \$61.8 billion in the United States contingency industry, market share of 52.7%. In Appendix A, Table 1 shows the 2012 list of the largest U.S. contingency agencies ranked by 2011 market share in the United States.

The market share list makes available the approximation of all contingency agencies within the United States. The agencies profit has been divided by and registered in two equally shared amounts in 2011 totaling \$117.2 billion. Finally, it is estimated that by 2014, the contingency industry revenue will increase 6 percent annually to \$139.4 billion; based on an April 9, 2013 study conducted by Mountain View, California based Staffing Industry Analysts.<sup>21</sup>

## Staffing Trends<sup>22</sup>

Trend 1: The staffing industry is the fastest growing industry in the United States. The request for contingent workers has grown exponentially, as provisional work arrangement, schedules continue to increase, and industries make their hiring designs more responsive to market changes.

Trend 2: The staffing industry sector has hired 35% of all contingent workers making it the primary agent of contingent workers. As the request for a flexible industrialized labor force remains constant, the probability of clients who use contingent workers for help will continue to proliferate.

Trend 3: As joblessness rises, eventually the proportions of the labor force increases resulting in a labor force to meet provisional needs for contingency agencies; Consequentially, companies are less reluctant to add full-time positions, necessitating solutions that are more contingent.

Trend 4: By 2020, staffing arrangements will become 33 to 37--workweek arrangements because (1) retirees will enter the labor force, (2) factors leading to the proliferation in the morality rate, and (3) generation X (1946-1964) job seekers looking for contingent arrangements.

Trend 5: By 2020, staffing arrangements will change based on demographics and the demand in skilled professionals (e.g., technology, science, and communications (e.g., verbal and written). The demand for skills is bringing about changes in the way some unions and employers engage in collective bargaining.<sup>23</sup> Technology, and the skills needed to master it, is taking its rightful place in the negotiating between contingency agencies and the clients who use contingent workers for help.

Trend 6: By 2020, the United States population is expected to increase by 50 percent, and minority groups will make up nearly 1/2 the families. Immigration will account for 2/3 of the countries' families. In addition, Hispanics and Latinos will account for 1/4 of the families. Finally, 1:10 Americans will be either Asian or Pacific families.<sup>24</sup>

Trend 7: By 2020, the workforce in the United States will include more minorities, Generation X, women, and people with physical challenges, resulting in probable economic growth by the entry of new human capital resources.<sup>25</sup>

<sup>21</sup> Adopted from Temporary workers nearing U.S. record makes Kelly Services a winner, Crain's Detroit Business Available at <http://www.craigslist.com/print/article/20130510/NEWS01/130519996temporary-workers-nearing-u-s-record-makes-kelly-services-a-winner>

<sup>22</sup> Adopted from Staffing Industry Trends, Available at <http://www.linkfranchising.com/staffing-industry-trends>

<sup>23</sup> Adopted from the United States Department of Labor Office of Secretary Available at <http://www.dol.gov/oasam/programs/history/herman/reports/futurework/execsum.htm>

<sup>24</sup> *Id.*

<sup>25</sup> *Id.*

## Staffing Model

Staffing agencies joined with clients who use contingent workers for help will have greater requirements for qualified contingent workers to lessen legal problems in recruitment practices. Contingency agency intermediaries linked to clients often encounter legal problems.<sup>26</sup> Contingency agencies intermediaries are the future of staffing models for 2020; this process will require that their clients become more aware of laws that govern the facilitation of provisional assignments. As organizations increase the use of externalized work distribution, which may vary by industry, intermediaries' support contingency agencies, and indenture organizations supplement contingent workers wages for a period or exclusively perform activities, such as monitoring administrative mechanisms over contingent workers (Kalleberg and Marsden, 2005). The staffing models in 2020 will include the following:

One: Human resources professionals will become frontrunners and allies of contingency agencies to procure and to ensure a more value-based methodology to the recruitment practices and a performance-based methodology to talent management.<sup>27</sup>

Two: Staffing industrialized integrated systems relative to data and common language processes in critical planning, to integrate information, will require managers to standardize staffing efforts to decrease cycle times and to allow for resources sharing across all aspects of an organization.<sup>28</sup>

Three: Planning and organizing the workforce, as a critical process will demand senior level leaders' involvement in organizational activities (e.g., employee engagement, staffing acquisitions, and strategies, increases in retention, cultural and value acknowledgement, performance management, and ensuring EEO/AA plans).<sup>29</sup>

Four: Contingency agencies and clients who use contingent workers for help will collaborate more to provide dynamic onboarding processes to foster engagement, to ensure flexible arrangements, and to support corporate objectives are met (e.g., logistical skills, soft skills, and interpersonal skills).<sup>30</sup>

Five: The cost to retain the workforce will prove to be less significant than recruitment, employee engagement, and training the workforce up to full productivity. Together, the cost to replace a contingent worker may be less significant than replacing tenured members of staff, relative to the cost to sustain an unproductive workforce.<sup>31</sup>

## Recommendations

Contingent workers are covered under the anti-discrimination statutes that prohibit the clients to whom they are assigned from committing discriminatory infractions against contingent workers based on race, color, religion, sex, national origin, age, or disability. Even though contingent workers are protected against discrimination based on race, color, religion, sex, national origin, age, or disability, the Labor Management Relations Act (LMRA) does not address contingent workers in statutory context,<sup>32</sup> for that reason, the list below provides recommendations regarding contingent workers in three parts:

---

<sup>26</sup> Samantha Kemp, Legal Issues Regarding Staffing Companies Available at <http://smallbusiness.chron.com/legal-issues-regarding-staffing-companies-42176.html>

<sup>27</sup> Adopted from Staffing Industry Analysts: Leveraging the 21<sup>st</sup> Century Workforce, June 5, 2013 Available at <http://www.staffingindustry.com/Research-Publications/Publications/CWS-3.0/June-5-2013/Leveraging-the-21st-Century-Workforce>

<sup>28</sup> *Id.*

<sup>29</sup> *Id.*

<sup>30</sup> *Id.*

<sup>31</sup> *Id.*

<sup>32</sup> *Id.*

- The description of contingent workers, workers' engagement, contingency agencies, and tax statutes must be amended to remove antiquated fragmented dominant statures verses servant statutes.
- The characterization of contingent workers needs to address pecuniary conditions to fortify relationships between the contingent workers, agencies, and the parties benefiting from the workers services.
- The legislative body must eradicate incentives used to entice firms to exploit contingent workers, and statutory context.<sup>33</sup>

## Conclusion

Political pragmatism in the United States labor laws is impervious to contingent workers. The Federal and State Courts have been averse to providing an expansive judicial interpretation<sup>34</sup> of public or private workplace laws, while workforce's requirements have provided less relief to contingent workers. The point is, without judicial interpretation for public or private workplace laws, contingency agencies and clients who use contingent workers for help will perpetuate behaviors of exploitation, exhortation, and deprived workers who use contingent staffing agencies for employment.

Finally, the most plausible solution to "amending the inequality" of staffing contingent workers in 2020, is comparative approaches in value-based methodology to recruitment practices and a performance-based methodology to talent management. These approaches seem to be the utmost in contributing practice to ensure integrity for the contingent workers who interchangeably fit into the established unionization systems with harm, to end the obnoxious behavior from the agencies and labor market intermediaries that exploit them.

## References

Electronic reference by Michael J. Hely, The Impact of Sturgis on Bargaining Power for Contingent Workers in the U.S. Labor Market, 11 Wash. U. J. L. & Policy 295 Retrieved on July 13, 2013 from <http://digitalcommons.law.wustl.edu/wujlp/vol11/iss1/12>

Electronic reference by Labor Management Relations Act: What was the Purpose of the Labor Management Relations Act? Retrieved on July 15, 2013 from <http://www.shrm.org/TemplatesTools/hrqa/Pages/LMRArequirements.aspx>

Electronic reference by The United States Equal Employment Opportunity Commission Retrieved on July 13, 2013 from <http://www.eeoc.gov/policy/doc/conting.html>

Gonos, G., (2001). Fee-splitting revisited: Concealing surplus value in the temporary employment relationship, *Politics & Society*, (29) 4, December 2001, 598-611

Harris, F. and Gonos, G., (2005). Regulating the employment sharks: The commercial tem agency, *Working USA: The Journal of Labor and Society*, 1089-7011 8, 293-314.

<sup>33</sup> Adopted from the United States Department of Labor Office of the Secretary v. Contingent Workers Available at [http://www.dol.gov/\\_sec/media/reports/Dunlop/section5.htm](http://www.dol.gov/_sec/media/reports/Dunlop/section5.htm)

<sup>34</sup> *Id.*

Kelleberg, A., and Marsden, P. (2005). Externalizing organizational activities: Where and how US establishments use employment intermediaries, Oxford University Press and the Society for the Advancement of Socio-Economics Review, 3(3), 389-416

Van, J, and Dorice, D. (2000). Nascent organizing initiatives among high-skilled contingent workers: The Microsoft-Washtech/CWA case. Master's thesis. Ithaca: Cornell University

Wilborn, S. L., (1997). Leased workers: Vulnerability and the need for special legislation. Comparative Labor Law & Policy Journal 19, 85-95

**Appendix A**

Table 1, 2012 list of largest U.S. staffing firms

Ranked	Company	2011 U.S. Staffing Revenue (\$million)	Market Share	Top industry segment(s)
1	Allegis Group	7,063	6.0%	IT, Industrial
2	Adecco	4,485	3.8%	Industrial, Office/clerical
3	Randstad Holding <sup>1</sup>	4,188	3.6%	Office/clerical, Industrial
4	Manpower Group	4,094	3.5%	Industrial, IT
5	Kelly Services	3,149	2.7%	Industrial, Office/clerical
6	Robert Half International	2,343	2.0%	Finance/accounting, Office/clerical
7	Recruit Co. Ltd. <sup>2</sup>	2,255	1.9%	Industrial, Office/clerical
8	Express Employment Professionals	2,029	1.7%	Industrial, Office/clerical
9	Insperty	1,976	1.7%	PEO
10	The Select Family of Staffing Companies	1,778	1.5%	Industrial, Office/clerical
11	Volt Information Sciences	1,724	1.5%	IT, Engineering
12	Automatic Data Processing	1,648	1.4%	PEO
13	TrueBlue	1,266	1.1%	Industrial
14	Kforce	1,111	0.9%	IT, Finance/accounting
15	AMN Healthcare Services	887	0.8%	Travel nursing, locum tenens
16	Act-1 Group	730	0.6%	Industrial, Office/clerical
17	Apex Systems	705	0.6%	IT
18	CHG Healthcare Services	620	0.5%	Locum tenens, allied healthcare
19	CDI Corporation	597	0.5%	IT, Engineering
20	Insight Global	551	0.5%	IT
21	EmployBridge	534	0.5%	Industrial
22	On Assignment	529	0.5%	IT, Clinical/scientific
23	Yoh	496	0.4%	IT, Engineering
24	Cross Country Healthcare	475	0.4%	Travel nursing, locum tenens
25	Resources Connection	426	0.4%	Finance/accounting, IT
26	Oasis Outsourcing	420	0.4%	PEO
27	Jackson Healthcare Staff Management	417	0.4%	Locum tenens, allied healthcare
28	(SeatonCorp)	402	0.3%	Industrial
29	PDS Tech	397	0.3%	Engineering, Industrial
30	Superior Group	384	0.3%	Engineering, Finance/Accounting
31	Collabera	379	0.3%	IT
32	SOS Staffing Services	369	0.3%	Industrial, Office/clerical

33	Korn/Ferry International Corporate Resource	364	0.3%	Retained search
34	Services, Inc.	345	0.3%	Industrial, Office/clerical
35	Rose International Artech Information	340	0.3%	IT, Office/Clerical
36	Systems	337	0.3%	IT
37	Belcan	332	0.3%	Engineering, Industrial
38	Barrett Business Services Maxim Healthcare	315	0.3%	PEO, Industrial
39	Services	315	0.3%	Per diem nursing, travel nursing
40	SOI Holding	311	0.3%	PEO
41	Medical Staffing Network	302	0.3%	Per diem nursing, allied nursing
42	System One	300	0.3%	Engineering
43	Alphastaff	289	0.2%	PEO
44	Elwood Staffing	278	0.2%	Industrial
45	Impellam Group	272	0.2%	Industrial
46	Integrity Staffing Solutions	266	0.2%	Industrial
47	The Judge Group Heidrick & Struggles	250	0.2%	IT
48	International	248	0.2%	Retained search
49	Snelling Staffing Services	246	0.0%	Industrial, Office/clerical
50	Roth Staffing Companies	246	0.2%	Office/clerical, Industrial
51	Ambrose Employer Group Digital Intelligence	245	0.2%	PEO
52	Systems	239	0.2%	IT
53	Labor Finders	235	0.2%	Industrial
54	Employment Plus	231	0.2%	Industrial
55	Genesis10	219	0.2%	IT
56	Veritude Strategic Staffing	218	0.2%	IT, Other professional
57	Solutions	216	0.2%	IT
58	Nesco Resource	215	0.2%	Engineering, Industrial
59	Team Health Pinnacle Technical	210	0.2%	Locum tenens, allied healthcare
60	Resources	207	0.2%	IT
61	Computer Task Group	207	0.2%	IT
62	CoWorx Staffing Services	202	0.2%	Office/clerical, Industrial
63	Hudson Global	190	0.2%	Legal, IT
64	Supplemental Healthcare	189	0.2%	Allied healthcare, Per diem nursing
65	Trinet Atterro Human Capital	185	0.2%	PEO
66	Group The Eastridge Group of	182	0.2%	Industrial, Office/clerical
67	Staffing Companies	181	0.2%	Industrial, IT
68	TRC Staffing	176	0.2%	Industrial, Office/clerical
69	SCI Companies Russell Reynolds	173	0.2%	PEO
70	Associates	170	0.2%	Retained search
71	Comforce	170	0.1%	IT, Engineering , Allied Healthcare
72	Paychex	168	0.1%	PEO
73	C&A Industries	158	0.1%	Allied healthcare, travel nursing

74	Spencer Stuart	156	0.1%	Retained search
75	Eliassen Group	154	0.1%	IT
76	American Cyber Systems	152	0.1%	PEO, IT
77	The Bartech Group	151	0.1%	Engineering, Office/clerical
78	Mitchell Martin	150	0.1%	IT, Allied healthcare
79	Matrix Resources	150	0.1%	IT
80	Signature consultants	147	0.1%	IT
81	SNI Companies	146	0.1%	Office/clerical, Finance/accounting
82	InVentiv Health	145	0.1%	Clinical/scientific
83	Princeton Information	145	0.1%	IT
84	Aquent	132	0.1%	Marketing/creative
85	Peoplelink Staffing	130	0.1%	Industrial
86	Tekmark Global Solutions	129	0.1%	IT
87	VisionIT	129	0.1%	IT
88	Pyramid Consulting	120	0.1%	IT
89	Solomon Page	119	0.1%	Office/clerical, IT
90	QPS Employment Group	114	0.1%	Industrial
91	Acro Service	112	0.1%	IT, Engineering
92	Amerit Family of Companies	110	0.1%	Office/clerical, other professional
93	AtWork Group	110	0.1%	Office/clerical
94	Axelon Services Corporation	107	0.1%	IT, Industrial
95	Beacon Hill Staffing Group	107	0.1%	IT, Legal
96	Southeast Personnel Leasing	106	0.1%	PEO
97	The Sedona Group	106	0.1%	Industrial, Office/clerical
98	DHR International	104	0.1%	Retained search
99	ICONMA	103	0.1%	IT
100	Joule	102	0.1%	Engineering, Clinical/scientific
	<b>Total</b>	<b>61,805</b>	<b>52.7%</b>	

Source: Staffing Industry Analysts<sup>35</sup>

1. Includes revenue from the acquired company SFN Group
2. Includes revenue from the acquired companies Advantage Resourcing and Staff-mark

<sup>35</sup> Adopted from Staffing Industry Analysts, 2012 list of Largest U.S. Staffing Firms – July 9, 2012  
Available at [http://www.peoplelinkstaffing.com/25\\_years/files/US%20Largest.pdf](http://www.peoplelinkstaffing.com/25_years/files/US%20Largest.pdf)