



SELF-REGULATION AND PERCEPTION OF JOB INSECURITY

Jasmina Knežević

High Vocational School for Teachers and Trainers, Subotica, Serbia

e-mail: jasminaknezevic@vsovsu.rs

Tatjana Krstić

Faculty of Medicine, University of Novi Sad, Serbia

e-mail: tatjana.krstic@mf.uns.ac.rs

Abstract

According to self-determination theory, the attitude toward a threat is determined by the quality of self-regulation. Job insecurity represents an intensive chronic stress, a threat without any objective signs that can undermine self-regulation. This paper investigated the relationship between self-regulation and job insecurity. More precisely, it investigated the way in which an increase in the quality of self-regulation influences the affective component of job insecurity: feelings of powerlessness and the perception of threat intensity. The study was conducted on a sample of 310 employees of both genders, working in 24 companies of different sizes, profiles, structures, and ownership. The instruments used were the Perception of Job Insecurity Scale and the Ego Functioning Questionnaire. The hypotheses that an increase in self-regulation quality is followed by a decrease in the sense of powerlessness with regard to the threat generated by job insecurity and a decrease of threat intensity caused by job insecurity were tested using multiple regression analysis. Results indicated that self-regulation is associated with threat perception and sense of powerlessness. Integrated self-regulation is related to a lower level of threat perception, whereas the impersonal one relates to higher perception of threat and sense of powerlessness. The paper confirms the role of personality dispositions vis-à-vis threat and further substantiates the value of self-determination theory in the organizational context.

Keywords: *self-regulation styles, job insecurity, self-determination theory*

1. INTRODUCTION

The term *self* is associated with a host of under-defined terms, such as self-concept, self-scheme, ego, psyche, personal or social identity, and executive organ, although all these terms point to the same dynamic and recursive process of self-organizing and integration as a means of development of a person out of a biological entity (Markus & Kitayama, 2010). Self-regulation represents one of the most important executive functions of the self (Baumeister, 2002); it consists of the ability to regulate a person's own emotional and social behavior (Ryan, Deci & Grolnick, 1995; Ryan, La Guardia,

Solky-Butzel, Chirkov, & Kim, 2005). Self-regulation entails not only being goal-driven but also being able to avoid environmental interference and to control emotional impulses which could make the progress of the individual toward preset goals more difficult.

Taking into consideration a domination of a specific self-regulation style, Hodgins and Knee (2002) described three types of self: integrated self, ego-invested self, and impersonal self. Integrated self refers to a harmonized self-system. Integrated self occurs in individuals who were able during their development to obtain the needed social support for their strivings toward the fulfill-

ment of all three basic psychological needs (the needs for relatedness, competency and autonomy). Persons with an integrated self succeed in learning how to value themselves for who they really are, in recognizing the importance of their own authentic internal impulses, and in developing unconditional self-appreciation and a good quality of self-regulation.

Ego-invested self develops in circumstances of lacking support for autonomy (Hodgins & Knee, 2002); it leads to a fake self-image, dependent on obtaining approval from others. When a person's actual experiences do not support the fake image of self that had been created, the individual attempts to preserve the existing self-image through avoidance, denial, and distortion of events and information, in order to keep a sense of self-value.

Impersonal self represents the lowest level of self-regulation. This type of self ensues during an individual's development and it entails personal experience in which the three basic psychological needs largely were unfulfilled (Hodgins & Knee, 2002). These persons display an absence of intention in behavior, they are easily excited, and often overwhelmed with information and negative thoughts and feelings; they have a sense of an inability to control things happening to them and tend to withdraw from novel experiences.

Several studies have suggested specific manifestations of the aforementioned three self-systems (Kasser & Ryan, 1993, 1996; Knee & Zuckerman, 1996, 1998). The described self-types influence stress perception, assessment of stress, and the entire process of integrating novel (especially threatening) experiences. Integrated self is characterized by the highest threshold for threat; less-pronounced defenses and the capability to integrate new and contradicting information. Impersonal self withdraws from novel experiences, turns to routines and repetitive activities and engages in social self-isolation in order to preserve its own unstable functioning (Hodgins, 2008; Hodgins & Knee, 2002). The controlled functioning of ego-invested self implies regulating conscious experience in threatening situations so as to deny or avoid events that are not congruent with the constructed reality and self-image (Deci & Ryan, 2002).

Studies indicate that self-regulation is often the key factor in the perception and assessment of stress in different life domains (Skinner & Edge, 2002; Hodgins & Knee, 2002; Hodgins, 2008). Therefore, it is important to investigate whether a similar relationship exists between this construct and stress caused by job insecurity.

Job insecurity represents a severe stress – threat, which occurs due to the fear of losing one's job (DeWitte, 2005; Landesbergis, Grzywacz, & La-Montagne, 2014). De Witte (2000) defined job insecurity in terms of a concept which includes a cognitive and an affective dimension; the affective dimension pertains to different emotions which follow the insecurity of employment continuity, whereas the cognitive dimension includes assessment and perception of the probability that the threat of losing one's job will become reality. By making a clear distinction between the affective and cognitive dimensions of job insecurity, it is evident that the affective dimension is more strongly associated with psychological pressure, whereas the cognitive dimension is linked to different work outcomes, such as dedication to the company and job satisfaction (Huang, Lee, Ashford, Chen, & Ren, 2010; Huang, Niu, Lee, & Ashford, 2012).

2. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

The theoretical framework of all studied constructs was best covered by self-determination theory, within which the theory of basic psychological needs (Ryan & Deci, 2000), deals with the development of different self-structures. According to the theory of basic psychological needs, development of self-structures and self-regulation is determined by basic psychological needs (Hodgins & Knee, 2002). The level of satisfaction thereof dictates the perceptive, cognitive, emotional, and interpersonal aspects of processing experience (Deci & Ryan, 2002). Fulfilled basic psychological needs (for autonomy, competence, and relatedness) provide vitality for optimal functioning of the self, as well as positive affectivity and optimal motivation (Baard, Deci, & Ryan, 2004; Blascovich, Mendes, Tomaka, Salomon, & Seery, 2003; Van den Broeck, Vansteenkiste, De Witte & Lens, 2008). Motivation is an important component of self-regulation

(Baumeister & Vohs, 2007). Even in the presence of significant self-regulatory resources, in the situation of job insecurity, motivation is needed for regulating the self vis-à-vis threat intensity and sense of powerlessness.

Basic psychological needs lie in the foundation of three motivational orientations: autonomous, controlled, and impersonal (Ryan & Deci, 2000). The orientation with the highest quality, autonomous motivation, is accompanied by an integrated and stable self, whereas controlled motivation involves ego-investing functioning of the self (Decy & Ryan, 1995; Kernis, Paradise, Whitaker, Wheatman, & Goldman, 2000; Ryan, 1991). The impersonal self correlates positively with the controlled and negatively with the autonomous orientation (Majstorović, Legault & Green-Demers, 2008). Legault and Inzlicht (2013) indicated the existence of neural differences associated with different types of self-regulation and believed them to be related to motivation quality and not quantity. Autonomous motivation leads to increased cognitive control, improved thought suppression (Muraven, Gagne & Rosman, 2008), increased concentration (Bernier, Carlson, & Whipple, 2010; Muraven et al., 2008), better and more accurate awareness, and more successful acceptance of negative affect and threat (Legault & Inzlicht, 2013). Therefore, autonomous motivation enhances basic self-regulation processes, whereas controlled motivation has no such neuroaffective effect (ibid). With regard to the psychological pressure exerted by continuous threat assessment and management of a sense of powerlessness, as well as the fact that fatigue, emotions (Heatheron & Baumeister, 1991), and decision-making processes use up a person's self-regulation capacities (Vohs et al., 2008), it is important to investigate the functionality of each type of self-regulation in the context of threat generated by job insecurity.

The present study

Previous studies have dealt with the relationship between self-regulation and perception of threats and confirmed the value of self-regulation in the perception of threat (Knee & Zuckerman, 1998; Skinner & Edge, 2002, Hodgins & Knee, 2002;

Hodgins, 2008; Knee, Patrick, Vietor, Nanayakkara, & Neighbors, 2002; Hodgins, Yacko, & Gottlieb, 2006; Legault & Inzlicht, 2013). This paper adds to the body of knowledge by investigating the relationship between self-regulation and the two-dimensional threat construct: threat intensity and sense of powerlessness.

Specifically, we were interested in the way in which an increase in the quality of self-regulation impacts the affective component of the perception of job insecurity: the sense of powerlessness and the perception of threat intensity. Because an integrated self-system is characterized by substantial psychological potential, we can assume that employees with this type of self-regulation will cognitively assess the situation of job insecurity more positively, and accordingly will have a less negative emotional experience thereof. In contrast, it can be expected that a nonfunctional system of impersonal self-regulation will put additional pressure on the employees, thus intensifying their negative emotional state in the context of job insecurity. Because the ego-invested self uses emotional defenses in processing threatening experiences (Deci & Ryan, 2002), we expected its role not to be significant in relation to the sense of powerlessness or intensity of threat generated by job insecurity. The formulated hypotheses reflect the aforementioned research questions:

Hypothesis 1: An increase in the quality of self-regulation of everyday behavior correlates with a decrease in the sense of powerlessness with regard to the threat generated by job insecurity.

Hypothesis 2: An increase in the quality of self-regulation of everyday behavior correlates with a decrease in the perception of threat intensity generated by job insecurity.

3. METHODOLOGY

3.1 Sample and data collection

The convenience sample consisted of employees from 24 companies of different sizes, profiles, structures, and ownership. It involved 310 employees, both genders being approximately equally represented, working in both the state and the private sectors. The sample included executives and work-

ers with different educational levels and marital and socioeconomic statuses. The participants were divided into three age categories (Table 1).

Table 1: Descriptive characteristics of the sample (N= 310)

	Category	Number	%
Gender	Male	144	46.5
	Female	166	53.5
Age	20–35 years	115	37,1
	36–45 years	93	30
	46–65 years	102	32.9
Company ownership	State	130	41.9
	Private	180	58.1
Position in the company	Employees	247	79.7
	Executives	63	20.3
Level of education	Primary school	15	4.8
	High school	186	60
	College/University	98	31.6
	Master/Doctoral degree	11	3.5
Marital status	Married	181	58.4
	Unmarried	98	31.6
	Divorced	23	7.4
	Widow(er)	8	2.6
Socioeconomic status	Below average	46	14.8
	Average	226	72.9
	Above average	38	12.3

3.2 Instruments

The Perception of Job Insecurity Scale (Knežević & Majstorović, 2013) was constructed based on similar scales (Ashford, Lee & Bobko, 1989; Isaksson, Hellgren & Pettersson, 1998). The scale measures the affective and the cognitive dimensions of job insecurity with 22 items to which the examinees respond on a five-point Likert-type scale (from 1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree). The reliability of the scale is $\alpha = 0.903$.

Principal component analysis yielded four factors whose eigenvalues exceeded 1, whereas the scree test suggested isolating three dimensions. Based on the results of the pilot study, we opted for the three-factor solution, which, rotated into the promax position, best represented the collected data and explained 55.42% of the total variance (Table 2).

Table 2: Eigenvalues of factors for the Perception of Job Insecurity Scale

Components	Initial values			After promax rotation
	Eigenvalue	% of variance explained	Cumulative % of variance explained	Eigenvalue
1	7.987	36.306	36.306	7.453
2	2.839	12.906	49.212	5.406
3	1.366	6.208	55.420	3.065
4	1.186	5.389	60.809	2.451

The obtained data matrix pointed to high loadings of most items being grouped around the isolated components, whereas two items (9 and 18) had multiple loadings, which led to a repeated factor analysis upon their exclusion. Table 3 lists the eigenvalues of factors for the Perception of Job Insecurity Scale (after the exclusion of items with multiple loadings).

Table 3: Eigenvalues of factors for the Perception of Job Insecurity Scale (after the exclusion of items with multiple loadings)

Components	Initial values			After promax rotation
	Eigenvalue	% of variance explained	Cumulative % of variance explained	Eigenvalue
1	7.244	36.219	36.219	6.951
2	2.816	14.080	50.299	2.973
3	1.326	6.630	56.929	3.825
4	1.149	5.745	62.674	2.223

This allowed the construction of three subscales with the following number of items: Threat intensity, 11 items; Job loss probability, four items; and Sense of powerlessness, five items. The reliability analysis of subscales of the Perception of Job Insecurity Scale showed that the subscale Sense of powerlessness had a somewhat lower reliability (Table 4).

Table 4: Reliability of subscales for the Perception of Job Insecurity Scale

Subscale	Cronbach's alpha coefficient (α)
Threat intensity	0.926
Sense of powerlessness	0.656

The Ego Functioning Questionnaire (EFQ) (Majstorović, Green-Demers, & Legault, 2008) is an instrument intended for the assessment of three types of self: the integrated self, the ego-invested self, and the impersonal self. The questionnaire consists of 30 items assessing different types of self (10 items for each type). All items are responded to on a seven-point Likert-type scale (from 1 = strongly disagree to 7 = strongly agree).

Factor analysis yielded eight factors whose eigenvalues were above 1, whereas the scree test suggested isolating three components. Considering the theoretical hypothesis according to which items grouped within three dimensions, the analysis was repeated with the preset three-component solution. The three isolated factors accounted for 39.58% of the total variance, with all 30 items being included in this solution (Table 5).

Table 5: Eigenvalues of factors for the EFQ scale

Components	Initial values			After rotation
	Eigenvalue	% of variance explained	Cumulative % of variance explained	Eigenvalue
1	5.013	16.709	16.709	5.013
2	4.910	16.366	33.076	4.910
3	1.951	6.502	39.577	1.951
4	1.687	5.623	45.200	1.687
5	1.471	4.904	50.105	1.471
6	1.245	4.149	54.253	1.245
7	1.037	3.456	57.710	1.037
8	1.005	3.351	61.061	1.005

This allowed all three original subscales to be kept, with 10 items each. The reliability of all scales was shown to be satisfactory (Table 6).

Table 6: Reliability of theoretically preset EFQ subscales

Subscale	Cronbach's alpha coefficient (α)
Integrated self	0.742
Ego invested self	0.773
Impersonal self	0.868

3.3 Variables

Predictor/independent variable – self-regulation styles: in this study, self-regulation styles were operationalized as total scores on three subscales of the EFQ scale: impersonal, ego-invested, and integrated. Due to the congruence of the factorial and theoretical structures of the instrument, all items of the EFQ scale were used in hypotheses testing.

Criterion/dependent variable – job insecurity perception represents a measure of subjective perception of the level of job insecurity. Two affective dimensions of job insecurity were assessed: sense of powerlessness and threat intensity. The sense of powerlessness represents an employee's subjective feeling of lack of control over losing his/her job, whereas threat intensity involves a subjective assessment of the intensity of the threatening situation. The dimensions of job insecurity perception were operationalized as scores on the Perception of Job Insecurity Scale. Items finally included in the subscales were those that, after factor analysis, had highest loadings on the isolated factors.

Variables that were used in the study are shown in Table 7.

Analysis indicated that none of the variables deviated significantly from normal distribution, except the value of kurtosis for the variable of Threat intensity, which was close to the critical point. Reliability below the lower confidence limit was found for the subscale of Sense of powerlessness. The reliability indexes of the other subscales used were satisfying.

4. RESULTS

Our first hypothesis expected that with an increase in self-regulation quality of everyday behavior, the sense of powerlessness in the face of a threat generated by job insecurity decreases. To test

Table 7: Descriptive measures of variables explored in the study (the number of items in each scale is given in parentheses)

Variables	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	SD	α	Skewness	Kurtosis
Threat intensity (11)	1.09	5.00	3.063	1.038	0.926	-0.107	-1.039
Sense of powerlessness (5)	1.00	5.00	3.322	0.892	0.656	-0.469	-0.143
Integrated self (10)	2.50	7.00	4.935	0.894	0.742	-0.283	-0.303
Ego-invested self (10)	2.00	7.00	4.653	1.009	0.773	-0.236	-0.290
Impersonal self (10)	1.00	6.30	2.823	1.174	0.868	0.706	-0.041

this hypothesis, a multiple regression analysis was conducted with three types of self-regulation as predictors and the sense of powerlessness as the criterion. A statistically significant model was obtained in the prediction of the sense of powerlessness [$F(3, 227) = 8.42, p < 0.001$] (Table 8). The impersonal self was singled out as a significant positive predictor ($\beta = 0.26, p < 0.001$). With an increase in the use of impersonal self-regulation, the sense of powerlessness also increased, whereas integrated and ego-invested self-regulation had no influence on the prediction of the sense of powerlessness, therefore our hypothesis can be rejected.

Table 8: Significance of the model and partial contributions of predictors (three types of self-regulation) in predicting the sense of powerlessness

Model	Predictors	β	t	p
R2 = 0.10; F = 8.42; p < 0.001	Integrated self	0.020	0.287	0.774
	Ego-invested self	0.135	1.921	0.056
	Impersonal self	0.261	3.945	0.000

In testing the second hypothesis, which expected that with an increase in quality of self-regulation of everyday behavior, the perception of threat intensity due to job insecurity decreases, a multiple regression analysis was conducted with the three types of self-regulation as predictors and the threat intensity as the criterion. We obtained a statistically significant model for the prediction of perception of threat intensity [$F(3, 227) = 13.99, p < 0.001$] (Table 9). The integrated self was isolated as a significant

negative predictor ($\beta = -0.16, p < 0.05$), whereas the impersonal self was shown to be a significant positive predictor ($\beta = 0.32, p < 0.001$). With an increase in the quality of self-regulation, the perception of threat intensity decreases; therefore the postulated hypothesis was supported.

Table 9: Significance of the model and partial contributions of predictors (three types of self-regulation) in the prediction of the perception of threat intensity

Model	Predictors	β	t	p
R2 = 0.16; F = 13.99; p < 0.001	Integrated self	-0.157	-2.328	0.021
	Ego-invested self	0.123	1.811	0.071
	Impersonal self	0.316	4.937	0.000

5. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

This paper addressed the way in which an increase in the quality of self-regulation influences the affective component of job insecurity perception: the sense of powerlessness and the perception of threat intensity. Analyzing the relationship between self-regulation and the perception of job insecurity indicated that an increase in self-regulation correlates with a decrease in the perception of threat intensity. The use of impersonal self-regulation increases both the perception of threat intensity and the sense of powerlessness in the face of a threat. This finding is explained by the developmental capacities of the integrated self, which include an increased level of tolerance of threat and decreased vulnerability, leading to a decrease in the

perception of threat intensity. This type of self-regulation is characterized by a highly efficient self – a well-developed capability of the self to plan and to manage specific areas of psychological functioning, thus being a significant coping resource which moderates stress, i.e., threat intensity inherent to job insecurity.

In a stressful transaction with job insecurity, impersonal self-regulation uses up a large amount of psychological energy and instigates physiological arousal and dysfunctional cognitive functioning. It can be surmised that employees with impersonal self-regulation will be preoccupied with worry and threat in the situation of job insecurity, and they will have low self-confidence and be overwhelmed with negative emotions, which will interfere with their cognitive functioning.

In an attempt to overcome the situations of job insecurity, an ego-invested self is prone to mental and behavioral distancing from stressors, which explains the lack of significance of this type of self-regulation in our study. Employees with ego-invested self-regulation approach the situation of job insecurity intently, with direction toward self and psychological processes that maintain the stability of the personality, rather than being directed toward the stressor itself (Knežević & Mitrić Aćimović, 2017).

Our results are in line with the results of previous studies of the relationship between the quality of self-structures and the perception of the level of threat (Hodgins, 2008; Hodgins & Knee, 2002). An integrated self develops high self-confidence that decreases the negative assessment of stressors and level of threat (Lee-Flynn, Pomaki, DeLongis, Biesanz & Puterman, 2011). A positive self-concept facilitates the adjustability of employees to organizational changes (Judge, Thoresen, Pucik & Welbourne, 1999), and superior self-evaluations lead to better capabilities of coping with transitions in the organizational context (Kammeyer-Mueller, Judge, & Scott, 2009).

Impersonal self-regulation accentuates a high level of defense against a currently experienced event, which diminishes and limits perception and therefore excludes potentially beneficial information (Balcetis & Dunning, 2006). In addition, negative arousal generated in response to threat

weakens the coping capacity and exhausts the individual's cognitive resources (Blascovich & Tomaka, 1996). Empirical data suggest that impersonal self-regulation is associated with social anxiety, self-derogatory behavior, and an external locus of control (Deci & Ryan, 1985). This type of self-regulation potentiates neuroticism as a personality trait, and the literature contains an abundance of studies pointing to the connection between neuroticism and negative assessments of a stressful situation (Deary et al., 1996; Lee-Flynn, Pomaki, DeLongis, Biesanz, & Puterman, 2011), as well as its relationship with using maladaptive coping (McCrae & Costa, 1986). Studies also demonstrated that the lack of motivation, which lies in the basis of impersonal self, does not lead to a constructive engagement of the self; rather, it provokes negative emotional experience by bringing on less-adaptive forms of coping (Doron, Stephan, Maiano, & Le Scanff, 2011) and is linked with passivity, distress, and poor adaptation (Vallerand et al., 1993).

In the context of general job insecurity, the obtained results are of great practical value. Because the quality of self-regulation is associated with the psychological pressure induced by job insecurity, the quality of self-regulation can be a significant element in the selection of job applicants, but also is a field in which organizational psychologists can be engaged.

The results of this study provide a basis for creating organizational interventions aimed at strengthening resilience against stress caused by the perception of job insecurity. Namely, although the quality of self-regulation is a matter of personality disposition, self-regulation can be practiced and perfected. The role of managers and organizational psychologists in this process is paramount, and it concerns primarily the verbalization of an employee's success associated with self-regulation of emotions, thoughts, and behavior: effective regulation of anxiety, successful mastering of new forms of working behavior, etc.

An important organizational intervention to promote employees' self-regulation consists of establishing goals – behavior or an outcome (emotional, social, etc.) which a person wittingly tries to perform or achieve. In the circumstances of job

insecurity, goals can be significant because they maintain an active relationship with stress: by helping to focus the attention on the task at hand – maintaining the focus of attention and eliminating distractors, encouraging making a greater effort, enhancing perseverance, and instigating the use of new strategies when old ones are no longer successful – goals enhance motivation to use novel strategies if those strategies used so far have been inefficient in accomplishing goals (Locke & Latham, 1990).

This study is the first conducted of job insecurity perception in Serbia, and as such it has significant implications for both the theory and praxis in the field of organizational stress and wellbeing of employees in Serbia. The limitations of this study primarily concern the cross-sectional study design, as well as the fact that all variables were assessed by the same source, self-evaluation by employees, which can lead to inflation of correlations between phenomena. A way to overcome these limitations would be to apply a longitudinal research design in the study or to combine different data sources: self-evaluations and observations made by managers, for example.

Low reliability of the scale for sense of powerlessness is a further limitation of this study.

Future studies should include more variables to gain better understanding of individual differences in the perception of job insecurity as well as of the mechanisms at the core of this phenomenon (personality traits, basic psychological needs, and other motivational variables).

Dispositional differences originating from the developmentally achieved quality of self-regulation play a key role in the dynamic relationship between the personality and the affective perception of job insecurity. Concerning attitude toward the threat generated by job insecurity, the impersonal and integrated self-regulation stand out. Integrated self-regulation remains stable in the transaction with a threat, moderating the perception of job insecurity, whereas impersonal self-regulation is additionally undermined by job insecurity, accentuating the sense of powerlessness and threat intensity in employees. This study showed that with an increase in the quality of self-regulation, the perception of threat intensity decreases. Self-determination theory provided a valid conceptual framework for understanding the relationship between self-regulation style and perception of job insecurity.

EXTENDED SUMMARY/IZVLEČEK

Teorija samodoločenosti pravi, da je odnos do grožnje določen s kakovostjo samoregulacije. Negotovost zaposlitve predstavlja intenziven kronični stres, grožnjo brez objektivnih znakov, ki bi lahko oslabili samoregulacijo. Raziskava preučuje razmerje med samoregulacijo in negotovostjo zaposlitve. Natančneje raziskava preučuje, kako povečanje samoregulacije vpliva na čustveno komponento negotovosti zaposlitve: občutke nemoči in dožemanje intenzivnosti grožnje. Študija je bila izvedena na vzorcu 310 zaposlenih, moških in žensk, ki delajo v 24 podjetjih različnih velikosti, profilov, struktur in lastništva. Uporabljeni instrumenti so vključevali lestvico dožemanja zaposlitvene negotovosti in vprašalnik o delovanju ega. Hipoteze, da povečanju samoregulacije sledi zmanjšanje občutka nemoči in zmanjšanje intenzivnosti grožnje, ki ju povzroča negotovost zaposlitve, so bile preizkušene z multiplo regresijsko analizo. Rezultati kažejo, da je samoregulacija povezana z zmanjšanjem grožnje in občutkom nemoči. Integrirana samoregulacija je povezana z nižjo stopnjo zaznave grožnje, medtem ko je medosebna samoregulacija povezana z večjo percepcijo grožnje in občutkom nemoči. V članku je potrjena vloga osebnostnih dispozicij do grožnje in dodatno utemeljena vrednost teorije samodoločenosti v organizacijskem kontekstu.

Ključne besede: samoregulacija, negotovost zaposlitve, teorija samodoločenosti

REFERENCES

- Ashford, S. J., Lee, C. & Bobko, P. (1989). Content, cause and consequences of job insecurity: A theory-based measure and substantive test. *Academy of Management Journal*, 32(4), 803-829.
- Baard, P.P., Deci, E.L., & Ryan, R.M. (2004). Intrinsic need satisfaction: A motivational basis of performance and well-being in two work settings. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 34(10), 2045–2068.
- Balcetis, E., & Dunning, D. (2006). See what you want to see: Motivational influences on visual perception. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 91, 612-625.
- Baumeister, R. F. (2002). Yielding to temptation: Self-control failure, impulsive purchasing, and consumer behavior. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 28, 670- 676.
- Baumeister, R. F., & Vohs, K. D. (2007). Self-regulation, ego-depletion, and motivation. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 1(1), 115–128
- Bernier, A., Carlson, S. M., & Whipple, N. (2010). From external regulation to self-regulation: Early parenting precursors of young children’s executive functioning. *Child Development*, 81, 326–339.
- Blascovich, J., & Tomaka, J. (1996). The biopsychosocial model of arousal regulation. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 28, 1-51.
- Blascovich, J., Mendes, W.B., Tomaka, J., Salomon, K., & Seery, M. (2003). The robust nature of the Biopsychosocial Model Challenge and Threat: A reply to Wright and Kirby. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 7(3), 234–243.
- Deary, I. J., Blenkin, H., Agius, R. M., Endler, N. S., Zealley, H., & Wood, R. (1996). Models of job-related stress and personal achievement among consultant doctors. *British Journal of Psychology*, 87(1), 3-29.
- Deci, E. L. & Ryan, R. M. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior*. New York: Plenum press.
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1995). Human autonomy: The basis for true self-esteem. In M. Kernis (Ed.), *Efficacy, agency, and self-esteem* (pp. 3149). New York: Plenum.
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (Eds.). (2002). *Handbook of self-determination research*. Rochester, NY, US: University of Rochester Press.
- De Witte, H. (2005). Job insecurity: Review of the international literature on definitions, prevalence, antecedents and consequences. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 31(4), 1-6.
- De Witte, H. (2000). Labour ethics and job insecurity: measurement and consequences for well-being, satisfaction and labour input. In J.H Buitendach, S. Rothmann & H. De Witte (Eds.), *The psychometric properties of the Job Insecurity Questionnaire in South Africa*, *South African Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 31(4), 7–16.
- Doron, J., Stephan, Y., Maiano, C., & Le Scanff, C. (2011). Motivational Predictors of Coping With Academic Examination, *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 151(1), 87–104.
- Heatherston, T. F., & Baumeister, R. F. (1991). Binge eating as escape from self-awareness. *Psychological Bulletin*, 110, 86-108.
- Hodgins, H. S. (2008). Motivation, threshold for threat, and quieting the ego. In H. Wayment & J. Bauer (Eds.), *Transcending selfinterest: Psychological explorations of the quiet ego* (pp. 117-124). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Hodgins, S. H., & Knee, R. C. (2002). The integrating self and conscious experience. In E. L. Deci & R. M. Ryan (Eds.), *Handbook of Self-Determination Research* (pp. 87-100). Rochester: The University of Rochester Press.
- Hodgins, H. S., Yacko, H., & Gottlieb, E. (2006). Autonomy and nondefensiveness. *Motivation and Emotion*, 30, 283-293.
- Huang, G., Lee, C., Ashford, S., Chen, Z., Ren, X. (2010). Affective Job Insecurity. In: *International Studies of Management and Organization* 40 (1), S. 20–39.
- Huang, G.-H., Niu, X., Lee, C. & Ashford, S. (2012). Differentiating cognitive and affective job insecurity: Antecedents and outcomes, *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 33, 752– 769.
- Isaksson, K., Hellgren, J., & Pettersson, P. (1998). Strukturömsvändning inom svensk detaljhandel: Uppföljning av omorganisation och personalminskning i KF/KDAB (*Structural transformation in Swedish retail trade: Follow-up of a reorganisation and layoff in KF/KDAB*). Stockholm: Stockholm University (Reports from the Department of Psychology, No. 97/1998).
- Judge, T. A., Thoresen, C. J., Pucik, V., & Welbourne, T. M. (1999). Managerial coping with organizational change: A dispositional perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 84, 107–122.
- Kammeyer-Mueller, J. D., Judge, T. A., & Scott, B. A. (2009). The role of core self-evaluations in the coping process. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94, 177–195.
- Kasser, T., & Ryan, R. M. (1993). A dark side of the American dream: correlates of financial success as a central life aspiration. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 65(2), 410-422.
- Kasser, T., & Ryan, R. M. (1996). Further examining the American dream: Differential correlates of intrinsic and extrinsic goals. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 22(3), 280-287.
- Kernis, M. H., Paradise, A. W., Whitaker, D. J., Wheatman, S. R., & Goldman, B. N. (2000). Master of one’s psychological domain? Not likely if one’s self-esteem is unstable. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 26, 1297-1305.

- Knee, C. R., & Zuckerman, M. (1996). Causality orientations and the disappearance of the self-serving bias. *Journal of Research in Personality, 30*(1), 76-87.
- Knee, C. R., & Zuckerman, M. (1998). A nondefensive personality: Autonomy and control as moderators of defensive coping and self-handicapping. *Journal of Research in Personality, 32*(2), 115-130.
- Knee, C. R., Patrick, H., Vietor, N. A., Nanayakkara, A., & Neighbors, C. T. (2002). Self determination as growth motivation in romantic relationships. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 28*, 609-619.
- Knežević, J., & Majstorović, N. (2013). *Merenje percepcije nestabilnosti zaposlenja: konstrukcija i validacija Skale percepcije nestabilnosti zaposlenja*. Filozofski fakultet, Univerzitet u Novom Sadu, Novi Sad.
- Knežević, J. & Mitrić Aćimović, D. (2017). *Savremena organizacija u Srbiji - psihološko viđenje trendova, problema i rešenja*. Beograd: Društvo psihologa Srbije, Centar za primenjenu psihologiju, 103-104.
- Landesbergis, P. A., Grzywacz, J. G., LaMontagne, A. D. (2014). Work organization, job insecurity, and occupational health disparities. *American Journal of Industrial Medicine, 57*(5), 495-515.
- Lee-Flynn, S. C., Pomaki, G., DeLongis, A., Biesanz, J. C., & Puterman, E. (2011). Daily cognitive appraisals, daily affect, and long-term depressive symptoms: The role of self-esteem and self-concept clarity in the stress process. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 37*(2), 255-268.
- Legault, L. & Inzlicht, M. (2013). Self-determination, self-regulation, and the brain: autonomy improves performance by enhancing neuroaffective responsiveness to self-regulation failure. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 105*(1), 123-138.
- Locke, E. A. & Latham, G. P. (1990). *A theory of goal setting and task performance*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Majstorović, N. (2008). Primena teorije self-determinacije u istraživanjima radne motivacije, *Primenjena psihologija, 1*(1-2), 5-18.
- Majstorović, N., Green-Demers, I. & Legault, L. (2008). Measuring Selfhood according to Self-Determination Theory: Construction and Validation of the Ego Functioning Questionnaire (EFQ). *Psihologija, 41*(2), 213-235.
- Markus, H. R., & Kitayama, S. (2010). Cultures and selves: A cycle of mutual constitution. *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 5*(4), 420-430.
- McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T. (1986). Personality, coping, and coping effectiveness in an adult sample. *Journal of Personality, 54*(2), 385-405.
- Muraven, M., Gagné, M., & Rosman, H. (2008). Helpful self-control: Autonomy support, vitality, and depletion. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 44*, 573-585.
- Ryan, R. M. (1991). The nature of the self in autonomy and relatedness. In J. Strauss & G. R. Goethals (Eds.), *The self: Interdisciplinary approaches* (pp. 208-238). New York, NY: Springer-Verlag.
- Ryan, M.R. & Deci, E.L. (2000). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivation: classic definitions and new directions. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 25*(1), 54-67.
- Ryan, R.M., Deci, E.L. & Grolnick, W.S. (1995). Autonomy, relatedness, and the self: Their relation to development and psychopathology. In D. Cicchetti & D. J. Cohen (Eds.), *Developmental psychopathology: Theory and Methods* (pp. 618-655). New York: Wiley.
- Ryan, R., La Guardia, J., Solky-Butzel, J., Chirkov, V. & Kim, Y. (2005). On the interpersonal regulation of emotions: Emotional reliance across gender, relationships, and culture. *Personal Relationships, 12*(1), 145-163.
- Skinner, E., & Edge, K. (2002). Self-determination, coping, and development. In E. L. Deci & R. M. Ryan (Eds.), *Handbook of self-determination research* (pp. 297-337). Rochester, NY: University of Rochester Press.
- Vallerand, R. J., Pelletier, L. G., Blais, M. R., Brière, N. M., Sénécal, C., & Vallières, E. F. (1993). On the assessment of intrinsic, extrinsic, and amotivation in education: Evidence on the concurrent and construct validity of the Academic Motivation Scale. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 53*, 159-172.
- Van den Broek, A., Vansteenkiste, M., De Witte, H., & Lens, W. (2008). Explaining the relationships between job characteristics, burnout and engagement: The role of basic psychological need satisfaction. *Work & Stress, 22*, 277-294.
- Vohs, K. D., Baumeister, R. F., Schmeichel, B. J., Twenge, J. M., Nelson, N. M., Tice, D. M., & (2008). Making Choices Impairs Subsequent Self-Control: A Limited-Resource Account of Decision Making, Self-Regulation, and Active Initiative. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 2008, Vol. 94*, No. 5, 883-898.