PRIMENJENA PSIHOLOGIJA, 2016, Vol. 9(4), STR. 361-377

UDK: 331.103:159.9]:17.023.34
Originalni naučni rad
doi: 10.19090/pp.2016.4.361-377

Ivana Strizović[1]
Aleksandar Mratinković

Department of Psychology, Faculty of Philosophy, University of Novi Sad

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN EMPLOYED AND UNEMPLOYED PEOPLE IN SATISFACTION WITH LIFE, SUBJECTIVE HAPPINESS, AND LATENT AND MANIFEST BENEFITS OF WORK

The problem of this study was to explore differences in well-being between employed and unemployed persons in Serbia, as well as the differences between the employed and the unemployed in prediction of well-being based on manifest and latent benefits of employment. The study consisted of 237 participants from Serbia, whereby 61.6% were employed. Participants varied by gender, work status, education, place of living and socioeconomic status, but employed and unemployed participants did not differ according to socio-demographic variables. The used instruments were Satisfaction With Life Scale, Subjective Happiness Scale, and The Latent and Manifest Benefits Scale, which measured benefits of employment. Results showed that the employed people had higher satisfaction with life, more financial security, and more structured time than the unemployed. However, there was no difference in subjective happiness between the employed and unemployed participants. Using hierarchical regression analysis it was shown that the best predictor of satisfaction with life in the subsample of the employed was financial status, followed by more social contacts and better time structure and social status. The best predictor of satisfaction with life in the subsample of unemployed was latent benefit which included social contacts, and then financial status. Based on these results we could assume that, in Serbia, financial strain is more important than latent benefits in prediction of satisfaction with life, at least in the case of employed people.

Keywords: employment, satisfaction with life, subjective happiness, benefits of employment

[1] Author's address: ivana.strizovic@gmail.com.

Primljeno: 30. 06. 2016.
Primljena korekcija: 14. 09. 2016.
Primljena ponovna korekcija: 25. 10. 2016.
Prihvaćeno za štampu: 04. 11. 2016.

The fact that job is one of the most important aspects of one's life, does not seem to need special justification. Not only that job provides a main source of income, but it often defines a social role and the person's self. Considering mentioned circumstances, the fact that job loss is rated as the eighth most stressful live event does not seem surprising (Holmes & Rahe, 1967). After losing a job, a person becomes unemployed. The unemployment can be defined as a status of someone who has unwillingly lost his/her job, but is willing to work and is actively looking for one (Majstorović, 2011).

There are research which demonstrate differences between employed and unemployed persons on dimensions that reflects one's well-being: the unemployed people have reported higher level of depression (Mossakowski, 2009), lower level of psychological and physical well-being (McKee-Ryan, Song, Wanberg, & Kinicki, 2005), as well as lower level of self-esteem (Waters & Moore, 2002a). Goldsmith, Veum, and Darity (1996a) have suggested that unemployment is related to low self-esteem, low self-confidence, and symptoms of depression. The same authors (Goldsmith, Veum, & Darity, 1996b) pointed out that the longer period of unemployment can increase one's external locus of control, and thus lead to helplessness.

Justifications for the claim that job loss is considered as one of the most stressful experiences (Latack, Kinicki, & Prussia, 1995) are found in a great number of research that indicate correlation between unemployment and many negative physical, behavioral and psychological outcomes, such as physical and mental health (Paul & Moser, 2009), mortality, the use of mental health services, heart disease, heavy drinking, and the use of mental health services (Jin, Shah, & Svoboda, 1995), suicide (Blakely, Collings, & Atkinson, 2003; Laanani, Ghosn, Jougla, & Rey, 2015) and somatic symptoms (Hammarström & Janlert, 2002). Besides mentioned outcomes, a job loss is associated with reduction of general well-being (DeWitte, 1993) and increased anxiety (Westman, Etzion, & Horovitz, 2004). A research conducted on a sample of unemployed people from Serbia has indicated correlation between unemployment and psychophysical health, especially anxiety and social dysfunction (Majstorović, 2011).

However, it should be mentioned that presumption of causality between employment and well-being cannot be based on these data. There is also a possibility that unemployment is actually a consequence of negative mental and physical states. Maybe those who are more depressive and anxious, or who have health issues, are simply more likely to lose their job? Some researchers have tried to answer this question. Winkelmann and Winkelmann (1998) conducted research using panel data, and their results suggested that unemployment actually caused low well-being, and not otherwise. Other longitudinal studies confirmed a causal relationship (Creed, 1999; Winefield, Tiggemann, Winefield, & Goldney, 1993).

Although there is a consensus that unemployment has significant influence on well-being, the psychological literature suggests a widespread disagreement over which element of the job is essential for this relationship. Two opposing concepts have the same basic assumption that the influence of unemployment on

well-being can be explained by two factors, latent and manifest. However, there is a disagreement over which element is crucial. One of the first studies that examined the influence of unemployment on well-being (Eisenberg & Lazarsfeld, 1938) suggested that deprivation of labor income could not fully explain the impact that unemployment had on well-being. One of the research conducted over German population (Gerlach & Stephan, 1996) showed that unemployment reduced life satisfaction more than it would be expected from the loss of income.

A model which corresponds to these findings is Jahoda's Latent Deprivation Model (Jahoda, 1981, 1982) which states that paid work is important not only for its financial element, but that there are latent dimensions of job that are connected with one's well-being. Although the person's main motive for employment is usually of financial matter, a person unintentionally gains benefits by being employed: time structure, social contact, common goals, status and activity. After losing a job, it is the loss of these latent benefits that has the most influence on diminishing one's well-being. Of course, Jahoda does not exclude the influence of manifest (financial) dimension, considering it as the notable one. However, she states that latent dimensions are more important for understanding the effects of unemployment on psychological distress. Other studies have confirmed correlation between latent dimensions and well-being (Evans & Haworth, 1991; Miles, 1983; Miles & Haworth, 1984). We will now briefly present Jahoda's description of earlier mentioned latent benefits.

Time structure. Jahoda considers that employment is the main provider of scheduled time, and that individuals need time organization, i.e. obligations that will fulfill their time. The results of some studies suggest that the unemployed people actually have less structured time than employees (Jackson, 1999), which is associated with poorer well-being (Evans & Haworth, 1991). Also, according to Jahoda, time structure is a dimension with the biggest influence on well-being.

Collective purpose refers to the sense of purpose, usefulness and contribution to the society. Also, it can be described as being needed by other people and feeling like a part of society. Although this domain has not been studied much, there are some records that collective purpose is associated with well-being (Evans & Haworth, 1991; Haworth & Ducker, 1991).

Social contact can be characterized as a need for contact with people outside the family, which cannot be satisfied by more frequent contact with people inside family. It has been found that the unemployed people experience less social activities than those who are employed (Underlid, 1996), and that the lower scores on this subscale are correlated with higher levels of depression (Bolton & Oatley, 1987) and lower levels of well-being (Haworth & Ducker, 1991).

Social status is an essential dimension for forming a person's identity. People tend to see themselves as others see them, and one's job has a large contribution for this kind of identification. Some studies have suggested that there are correlations between social status and well-being (Evans & Haworth, 1991; Haworth & Patterson, 1995). Creed and Machin (2001) have stated that this dimension is the single best predictor of psychological well-being.

Activity. Naturally, employment implies some kind of activity. It has been found that the unemployed people have lower levels of activity than the general population (Underlid, 1996).

Each of these five latent dimensions is important for one's well-being according to Jahoda (1982), as the dimensions are associated with basic human needs, and, of course, the satisfaction of these is necessary for the psychological well-being. It should be noted that Jahoda (1982) states that latent dimension can also be satisfied by any other involvement (religion, political activity), but that the job is the only one that can significantly contribute to all dimensions. Therefore, the unemployed persons are deprived of some latent dimension which has a negative impact on their mental health.

Few studies from different countries, such as England (Haworth & Paterson, 1995), USA (Wanberg, Griffiths, & Gavin, 1997), Australia (Muller, Creed, Waters, & Machin, 2005) and Germany (Paul & Batinic, 2009) have confirmed correlation between latent dimensions and mental health. Some studies have shown significant differences between the employed and unemployed people in all of these dimensions (Creed & Reynolds, 2001; Paul & Batinic, 2009; Waters & Moore, 2002b). Yet other studies reported differences in all the dimensions except collective purpose (Miles, 1983), or only in social contact and status (Isaksson, 1989).

The second model that describes effects of employment is Agency Restriction Model (Fryer, 1986). Fryer, the author of this model, believes that Jahoda does not give enough importance to manifest dimension (i.e. financial element), which he considers to be the essential element of paid work with the biggest influence on one's well being.

Jackson (1999) found that the unemployed individuals reported greater financial strain than the ones who were employed, or were students. Other researchers have found similar results (Kokko & Pulkkinen, 1997). Association between financial strain and depression has also been demonstrated (Price, Choi, & Vinokur, 2002). Whelan (1992) demonstrated (using the Irish national database) that poverty (weather operationalized as a subjective experience or an objective material deprivation) was an essential domain which moderated the effects of unemployment on mental health. The contribution of both latent and manifest variables on explaining the variance of well-being was tested in one of the few studies, (Creed, 2001). The results revealed that the financial strain had the highest contribution to one's well-being, explaining the largest part of the variance (16.81%), while the second predictor was status (7.84%). According to some studies, manifest and latent dimensions explain approximately the same percentage of mental health variance (Paul & Batinic, 2009), with a slight advantage of latent dimensions (20% vs 26%).

The problem of this study was to explore differences in well-being between the employed and unemployed persons in Serbia, as the differences between the employed and the unemployed in prediction of well-being based on manifest and latent benefits of employment. We used satisfaction with life and subjective happiness as indicators of well-being. Based on the previous literature (DeWitte, 1993;

McKee-Ryan et al., 2005), we expected that the employed people would l have higher level of satisfaction with life and subjective happiness. Also, we wanted to explore differences between the employed and unemployed persons in manifest and latent benefits of employment. Based on previous studies (Creed & Reynolds, 2001; Isaksson, 1989; Miles, 1983; Paul & Batinic, 2009; Waters & Moore, 2002b), we expected that the employed people would have more manifest and latent benefits from employment than the unemployed people. For our last goal, we intended to explore which benefits of employment, either manifest or latent, better explained satisfaction with life in the employed and unemployed persons from our country. We assumed that the latent benefits had the significant contribution in the explanation of satisfaction with life in both employed and unemployed people.

Method

Sample and procedure

In the present study we used convenience sampling method. Participants provided information on their gender, age, place of living, level of education, professional status (employed/unemployed), duration of employment/unemployment, perception of financial situation, a number of members (and employed members) in their household, current relationship status, and a number of children. The sample consisted of 237 participants from Serbia (83 were male), with the mean age of 30.35 years old (*SD* = 7.65, age range 18–60). A number of employed participants was 146 (61.6%), while 91 were unemployed (38.4%). In the subsample of employed participants, there were 37% males. 61% of employed participants were single, 36.3% married and 2.7 % divorced. 30.1% of participants had children. The mean number of months employed was 42.41 (*SD* = 14.65). Employed participants distinguished by how much they loved their job (3.4% not at all, 5.5% a little, 16% not sure, 25.7% pretty much, and 24.1% very much). In the subsample of unemployed participants, there were 31.5% males. 72.8% of unemployed participants were single and 27.2% were married. 19.6% of participants had children. The mean number of months unemployed was 31.50 (*SD* = 34.66). The subsamples did not significantly differ by basic socio demographic variables. 90.7% of participants were living in the city, and 9.3% of them lived in the village. Respondents differed by level of education (21.3% went to middle school, 10.1% to college, 34.6% had faculty degree, and 34.2% had Master's degree or Ph.D.) and marital status (65.4% single, 32.9% married, and 1.7% divorced). Only 62 participants (26.2%) had children. Participants also differed by perception of their financial status (16% said it was good, 61.2% said it was moderate, and 22.8% said it was bad). In total sample, participants had between 1 and 9 members in their households. All of the measures were administered to participants who agreed to complete the study on a voluntary basis. In order to examine the statistical differences between the employed and unemployed participants in demographic vari-

ables, we used chi-square tests and *t*-tests for independent samples. There were no significant differences between the employed and unemployed participants in gender ($\chi^2(1, N = 237) = 0.65, p = .42$), age ($t(235) = 1.82, p = .07$) or level of education ($\chi^2(1, N = 237) = 5.79, p = .21$).

Measures

Satisfaction With Life Scale (SWLS: Diener, Emmons, Larsen, & Griffin, 1985). The SWLS scale consists of five items and is designed for measuring global life satisfaction through five statements to which participants respond on a seven point scale (1 = *strongly disagree* to 7 = *strongly agree*).

Subjective Happiness Scale (SHS: Lyubomirsky & Lepper, 1999). The scale consists of four items measuring subjective happiness. The first item is designed for characterizing oneself by using absolute ratings (1 = *a very unhappy person* to 7 = *a very happy person*). The second item characterize oneself in relation to their peers (1 = *much less happy* to 7 = *much more happy*). The third and the fourth item describe, respectively, happy and unhappy people, whereby the task of the respondents is to define happiness for themselves, and estimate to what extent each characterization describes them (1 = *not at all* to 7 = *a great deal*).

The Latent and Manifest Benefits Scale (LAMB: Muller, Creed, Waters, & Machin, 2005). The LAMB scale consists of 36 items designed for measuring five latent (time structure, collective purpose, enforced activity, status and social contact) and one manifest benefit of employment (financial strain), whereby every scale has 6 items. Participants indicate the strength of their agreement to statements using a 7-point response format (1 = *strongly disagree* to 7 = *strongly agree*). It is important to admonish here that the Time Structure subscale is invert, with items such as "I often have nothing to do.", "I often wish I had more things to do to fill up the time in my days.", which means that higher scores on this subscale mean less organized time structure and vice versa.

Results

Differences between employed and unemployed participants

The values of means, standard deviations, skewness and kurtosis for SHS, LAMB and SWLS are presented in Table 1. Based on the more lenient criteria (values between -2 and 2: Finney & DiStefano, 2006), the value of skewness and kurtosis can be considered acceptable for all scales of all of the questionnaires. Reliability of used scales is good, except for the SHS and subscale Enforced activity from the LAMB scale.

Table 1
Descriptive indicators for questionnaires SWLS, SHS, and LAMB (N = 237)

	Group	*M*	*SD*	Skewness	Kurtosis	α
SWLS	Empl.	17.06	4.53	-0.41	-0.38	.84
	Unem.	15.85	4.24			
SHS	Empl.	17.24	3.33	0.45	0.45	.68
	Unem.	16.68	2.98			
Collective Purpose	Empl.	23.26	7.23	-0.12	-0.57	.86
	Unem.	21.86	8.31			
Financial Strain	Empl.	23.35	9.20	0.21	-0.80	.92
	Unem.	19.17	8.88			
Social Contact	Empl.	28.35	7.77	-0.22	-0.48	.88
	Unem.	27.16	7.60			
Status	Empl.	34.82	5.09	-0.83	0.93	.86
	Unem.	35.01	5.22			
Time Structure	Empl.	13.65	6.39	0.78	0.01	.88
	Unem.	19.57	8.59			
Enforced Activity	Empl.	30.31	5.21	-0.26	0.36	.67
	Unem.	30.68	4.98			

The employed and uneployed participants did not differ in subjective happiness ($t(235) = 1.32$, $p = .18$, Cohen's $d = 0.18$). However there were significant differences in satisfaction with life ($t(235) = 2.03$, $p = .04$, Cohen's $d = 0.28$), with higher scores for the employed participants. Also, there were significant differences between the employed and unemployed participants in LAMB subscales ($F(6, 230) = 8.24$, $p < .01$, $\eta_p^2 = .17$). Univariate tests showed that significant differences were in financial strain ($F(1, 235) = 11.87$, $p < .01$, $\eta_p^2 = .05$) and time structure ($F(1, 235) = 36.62$, $p < .01$, $\eta_p^2 = .14$). Based on the mean values of groups, the results showed that the employed had more financial security, and better time structure (since the Time structure subscale was invert) than the unemployed persons.

Prediction of satisfaction with life based on the latent and manifest benefits of employment

For our last hypothesis, we examined which subscales of LAMB scale were the best predictors of satisfaction with life (SWLS). As stated earlier, we wanted to see whether the other benefits, besides manifest, contributed to prediction of satisfaction with life. For this hypothesis, we used hierarchical regression analysis for the employed and unemployed participants separately (see Table 2).

Table 2
Hierarchical regression analysis: Prediction of satisfaction with life based on manifest and latent benefits of employment

Predictors		Employed			Unemployed	
		β	*r*		β	*r*
R^2	.32			.12		
Financial Strain		.22**	.56**		.10*	.35**
ΔR^2	.10			.11		
Collective Purpose		.06	.25		-.016	.19
Social Contact		.12**	.40**		.19**	.41**
Status		-.16*	.08*		-.02	.17
Time Structure		-.14**	-.27**		-.06	-.18
Enforced Activity		.07	.24		.02	.14
R^2	.43			.24		

*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$.

The first step of the analysis included finances as a manifest variable of employment, which explained 32% of the variance of satisfaction with life in the employed subsample. After including latent benefits of employment in the second step of the analysis, the model explained 43% of the total variance ($F(6, 139) = 17.18$, $p < .01$). Latent benefits explained additional 10% of the variance. In the final model, the financial strain had somewhat higher contribution, followed by the status, time structure and social contacts. It could be noticed that status had negative contribution to the prediction of satisfaction with life.

For the unemployed participants, finances explained less variances of the satisfaction with life (12%), compared to the employed participants. After including latent benefits of employment, the model explained 24% of the total variance ($F(6, 84) = 4.43$, $p < .01$) in the second step. Latent benefits explained additional 11% of the variance. In the final model, only the financial strain and social contacts had a significant contribution to the explanation of satisfaction with life, whereby social contact had higher contribution.

Discussion

The main aim of this study was to examine the differences between the employed and unemployed people in Serbia in indicators of well-being, such as satisfaction with life and subjective happiness. The results showed that there were significant differences in life satisfaction between the employed and unemployed participants, but there were no differences in subjective happiness.

As demonstrated by many other research, (Feather & O'Brien, 1986; Henwood & Miles, 1987; Muller, Hicks, & Winocur, 1993), a significant difference was found between the well-being of employees and unemployed people, which once again pointed out to the importance that employment had on well-being. At first, the absence of significant differences on subjective happiness might seem surprising, but considering results of previous studies, the cause could be assumed. Some research suggest that the unemployed people report higher level of well-being in the areas in which the unemployment rate is high (Clark, 2003; Cohn, 1978; Jackson & Warr, 1987). It is the phenomenon known as a social-norm effect (Clark, Knabe, & Rätzel, 2010) which suggests that the more people are unemployed in some area, one's unemployment is considered as a smaller deviation from the norm, which thus leads to less negative effects on well-being. Since the unemployment in Serbia is very high (19% in the first quarter of 2016, according to Trading Economics[2],it is possible that people experience their unemployment less stressful, bearing in mind that a large number of people in their environment is also unemployed.

Considering the content of Subjective Happiness Scale (SHS) and Satisfaction With Life Scale (SWLS), it is evident that the first one is constructed in a way that 3 of 4 items include other people as well. Therefore, it is expected from a person to compare oneself to others in order to assess their own happiness. On the other hand, SWLS does not include other people, but focuses exclusively on the experience of respondents without reference to the surrounding in which they are found. It seems that these circumstances may explain the difference in results for SWLS and SHS.

The next aim was to examine which benefits, either manifest or latent, had higher contribution in prediction of one's well-being. First, the results showed that there were significant differences between the employed and the unemployed in financial strain, as the manifest benefit, and in time structure, as the latent benefit. The results which confirmed significant differences between employees and the unemployed in latent and manifest benefits were consistent with a large number of studies mentioned earlier (DeWitte, 1993; McKee-Ryan et al., 2005). The results showed that the employed people had higher scores on financial strain and time structure. Based on the effect sizes, it seemed that latent benefit, namely time structure, had the larger effect on differences between the employed and unemployed participants than manifest benefit. This is in line with the results of some studies that suggested that unemployed people actually had less structured time than the employees (Jackson, 1999).

Second, the results of hierarchical regression analysis showed that although the contribution of the manifest benefit was important and high, this benefit was not the only one which could explain satisfaction with life. These results were consistent with the results of the previous studies (Creed, 2001) which showed that the financial strain had the highest contribution to one's well-being, explaining the

[2] Information retrieved from http://www.tradingeconomics.com/serbia/unemployment-rate on 25.06.2016.

largest part of the variance, while the second predictor was latent benefit – status. Namely, our results showed that latent benefits contributed to explanation of satisfaction with life above manifest benefit in both the employed and the unemployed subsamples, and in almost the same percent for both subsamples. However, there were differences between the employed and unemployed participants in prediction of satisfaction with life based on manifest and latent benefits of employment. While financial strain was the best predictor of satisfaction with life of the employed, this was not the case with the unemployed people. Considering this, we can assume that, in our country, the financial security is more important than latent benefits, and presume that Fryer's (1986) model is more convenient in describing benefits of employment in our country, at least in the case of employed people. This finding can be explained with the fact that our society is in transition, that there is not enough working positions, that not everyone can find a job, and that job often is not permanent, so the financial concern is much bigger. It is possible that latent benefits become more important than finances when there are enough opportunities for people to find jobs, or when countries are financially stable. .

For the unemployed, social contacts, followed by financial strain had the biggest contribution to satisfaction with life. Findings about the role of social contacts were consistent with the previous studies that found that the lower scores on social contacts were correlated with higher levels of depression (Bolton & Oatley, 1987) and lower levels of well-being (Haworth & Ducker, 1991).

It is important to point out that the social contacts are also a significant predictor of well-being of the employed, but to a somewhat lesser extent. Besides financial security and social contact, the significant predictors of well-being of the employed were well organized time structure and lower level of social status as the latent benefits. The result that the lower level of social status predicts higher well-being of employees seems surprising. However, given the fact that this subscale is directed mainly towards friends and family, and also towards helping others ("People often rely on me for help."," I often help others.", "My friends usually value my company.", etc.), it is possible that this context can influence well-being in a way that the employees costs of helping (time, resources, etc.) become higher than benefits.

As we have already said, these results have confirmed that the manifest and (at least some) latent benefits of employment affect the well-being. Bearing in mind that the job is the one ensuring the satisfaction of manifest and latent variables (Fryer, 1986; Jahoda, 1981), the importance given to employment seems justified. However, based on our results, it could not be said that only job gives these benefits to a person. Such latent benefits can be provided by volunteering, by being a student, and so on. These kinds of responsibilities affect time structure, social contacts, etc. In order to confirm financial strain as the best predictor of one's well-being, the future research should be directed towards examining the differences in the level of these benefits between employees and people who are retired. Perhaps, the financial security in both groups can lead to a greater importance of latent benefits, and therefore bigger differences in perceiving them.

The future research could also resolve a question whether relations between well-being and the latent and manifest benefits of employment change over time. Also, the research could be directed towards examining changes over time as a person gets and loses a job. Neither Jahoda's nor Fryer's model address these circumstances. Practical contribution of these findings is in a possibility of the activities organized for the unemployed (where they can meet other people and spend quality time together) to affect the well-being of the unemployed, till the day they get a job. On the other hand, team building and organizing seminars can positively affect the employee well-being, and their productiveness at work, accordingly.

It is important to state that our research has several limitations. First, our sample was convenient, with participants having higher educational and socio-economic level. The question remains whether these variables could influence the results. Second, the sample was relatively small comparing to the population in our country. The future research should include a lager sample, with more heterogeneous socio-demographic characteristics. Also, SWLS scale is relatively short and cannot include all the aspects of well-being. The future research should include more aspects of well-being, such as general health, depression, level of stress and anxiety, loneliness, etc.

References

Blakely, T. A., Collings, S. C., & Atkinson, J. (2003). Unemployment and suicide. Evidence for a causal association? *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health, 57*, 594–600. doi:10.1136/jech.57.8.594

Bolton, W., & Oatley, K. (1987). A longitudinal study of social support and depression in unemployed men. *Psychological Medicine, 17,* 453–460. doi:10.1017/S0033291700025010

Clark, A. E. (2003). Unemployment as a social norm: Psychological evidence from panel data. *Journal of Labor Economics, 21*, 323–351. doi:10.1086/345560

Clark, A., Knabe, A., & Rätzel, S. (2010). Boon or bane? Others' unemployment, well-being, and job insecurity. *Labour Economics, 17*, 52–61. doi:10.1016/j.labeco.2009.05.007

Cohn, R. (1978). The effect of employment status change on self-attitudes. *Social Psychology, 41,* 81–93. doi:10.2307/3033568

Creed, P. A. (1999). Personality characteristics in unemployed Australian males – Implications for "drift" hypothesis in unemployment. *Psychological Reports, 84*, 477–480. doi:10.2466/pr0.1999.84.2.477

Creed, P. A. (2001). The relative effects of deprivation of the latent and manifest benefits of employment on the well-being of unemployed people. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 6,* 324–331. doi:10.1037/1076-8998.6.4.324

Creed, P. A., & Machin, M. A. (2001). The relationship between mental health and access to the latent functions of employment for unemployed and underemployed individuals. *Manuscript submitted for publication*.

Creed, P. A., & Reynolds, J. (2001). Economic deprivation, experiential deprivation, and social loneliness in unemployed and employed youth. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology, 11*, 167–178. doi:10.1002/casp.612

De Witte, H. (1993). Gevolgen van langdurige werkloosheid voor het psychisch welzijn: Overzicht van de onderzoeksliteratuur [Psychological consequences of long-term unemployment: Review of the literature]. *Psychologica Belgica, 33*, 1–35.

Diener, E. D., Emmons, R. A., Larsen, R. J., & Griffin, S. (1985). The satisfaction with life scale. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 49*, 71–75. doi:10.1207/s15327752jpa4901_13

Eisenberg, P., & Lazarsfeld, P. (1938). The psychological effects of unemployment. *Psychological Bulletin, 35,* 358–390. doi:10.1037/h0063426

Evans, S. T., & Haworth, J. T. (1991). Variations in personal activity, access to categories of experience and psychological well-being in unemployed young adults. *Leisure Studies, 10*, 249–264. doi:10.1080/02614369100390231

Feather, N. T., & O'Brien, G. E. (1986). A longitudinal study of the effects of employment and unemployment on school leavers. *Journal of Occupational Psychology, 59*, 121–144. doi:10.1111/j.2044-8325.1986.tb00219.x

Finney, S. J., & DiStefano, C. (2006). Non-normal and categorical data in structural equation modeling. In G.R. Hancock & R.O. Mueller (Eds.), *A second course in structural equation modeling* (2nd ed., pp. 439-492). Charlotte, NC: Information Age.

Fryer, D. (1986). Employment deprivation and personal agency during unemployment: A critical discussion of Jahoda's explanation of the psychological effects of unemployment. *Social Behavior, 1*, 3–23.

Gerlach, K., & Stephan, G. (1996). A paper on unhappiness and unemployment in Germany. *Economic Latters, 52*, 324–330. doi:10.1016/s0165-1765(96)00858-0

Goldsmith, A. H., Veum, J. R., & Darity, W. (1996a). The impact of labor force history on selfesteem and its component parts, anxiety, alienation, and depression. *Journal of Economic Psychology, 17*, 183–220. doi:10.1016/0167-4870(96)00003-7

Goldsmith, A. H., Veum, J. R., & Darity, W. (1996b). The psychological impact of unemployment on joblessness. *Journal of Socio-Economics, 25,* 333–358. doi:10.1016/S1053-5357(96)90009-8

Haworth, J. T., & Ducker, J. (1991). Psychological well-being and access to categories of experience in unemployed young adults. *Leisure Studies, 10*, 265–274. doi:10.1080/02614369100390241

Haworth, J. T., & Paterson, F. (1995). Access to categories of experience and mental health in a sample of managers. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 25*, 712–724. doi:10.1111/j.1559-1816.1995.tb01770.x

Hammarström, A., & Janlert, U. (2002). Early unemployment can contribute to adult health problems: Results from a longitudinal study of school leavers.

Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health, 56, 624–630. doi:10.1136/jech.56.8.624

Henwood, F., & Miles, I. (1987). The experience of unemployment and the sexual division of labour. In D. Fryer & P. Ullah (Eds.), *Unemployed people* (pp. 94–110). Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

Holmes, T. H., & Rahe, R. H. (1967). The social adjustment rating scale. *Journal of Psychosomatic Research, 11*, 213–218. doi:10.1016/0022-3999(67)90010-4

Isaksson, K. (1989). Unemployment, mental health and the psychological functions of work in male welfare clients in Stockholm. *Scandinavian Journal of Social Medicine, 17*, 165–169.

Jackson, P., & Warr, P. (1987) Mental health of unemployed men in different parts of England and Wales. *British Medical Journal, 295*, 525. doi:10.1136/bmj.295.6597.525

Jackson, T. (1999). Differences in psychosocial experiences of employed, unemployed, and student samples of young adults. *Journal of Psychology, 133,* 49–60. doi:10.1080/00223989909599721

Jahoda, M. (1981). Work, employment, and unemployment. Values, theories, and approaches in social research. *American Psychologist, 36*, 184–191. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.36.2.184

Jahoda, M. (1982). *Employment and unemployment: A social-psychological analysis.* Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Jin, R. L., Shah, C. P., & Svoboda, T. J. (1995). The impact of unemployment on health: A review of the evidence. *Canadian Medical Association Journal, 153*, 529–540.

Kokko, K., & Pulkkinen, L. (1997). Economical and psychological well-being of the unemployed. *Psykologia, 32*, 349–359.

Latack, J. C., Kinicki, A. J., & Prussia, G. E. (1995). An integrative process model of coping with job loss. *Academy of Management Review, 20*, 311–342. doi:10.5465/AMR.1995.9507312921

Laanani, M., Ghosn, W., Jougla, E., & Rey, G. (2015). Impact of unemployment variations on suicide mortality in Western European countries (2000–2010). *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health, 69*, 103–109. doi:10.1136/jech-2013-203624

Lyubomirsky, S., & Lepper, H. S. (1999). A measure of subjective happiness: Preliminary reliability and construct validation. *Social Indicators Research, 46,* 137–155. doi:10.1023/A:1006824100041

Majstorović, N. (2011). Efekti nezaposlenosti i faktori aktivizma u novom zapošljavanju [Effects of unemployment and the factors of activism in the new employment]. *Primenjena psihologija, 3*, 205–227.

McKee-Ryan, F., Song, Z., Wanberg, C. R., & Kinicki, A. J. (2005). Psychological and physical well-being during unemployment: A meta-analytic study. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 90*, 53–76. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.90.1.53

Miles, I., & Howard, J. (1984). *A study of youth employment and unemployment.* Science Policy Research Unit. Brighton: University of Sussex.

Miles, I. (1983). *Adaptation to unemployment?* (SPRU Occasional Paper Series, No. 20). Brighton, United Kingdom: University of Sussex, Science Policy Research Unit.

Mossakowski, K. N. (2009). The influence of past unemployment duration on symptoms of depression among young women and men in the United States. *American Journal of Public Health, 99*, 1826–1832. doi:10.2105/AJPH.2008.152561

Muller, J., Hicks, R., & Winocur, S. (1993). The effects of employment and unemployment on psychological well-being in Australian clerical workers: Gender differences. *Australian Journal of Psychology*, *45*(2), 103-108.

Muller, J. J., Creed, P. A., Waters, L. E., & Machin, M. A. (2005). The development and preliminary testing of a scale to measure the latent and manifest benefits of employment. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment, 21*, 191–198. doi:10.1027/1015-5759.21.3.191

Paul, K. I., & Batinic, B. (2009). The need for work: Jahoda's latent functions of employment in a representative sample of the German population. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 31*, 45–64. doi:10.1002/job.622

Paul, K. I., & Moser, K. (2009). Unemployment impairs mental health: Meta-analyses. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 74*, 264–282. doi:10.1016/j.jvb.2009.01.001

Price, R. H., Choi, J. N., & Vinokur, A. D. (2002). Links in the chain of adversity following job loss: how financial strain and loss of personal control lead to depression, impaired functioning, and poor health. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 7*, 302–312. doi:10.1037/1076-8998.7.4.302

Underlid, K. (1996). Activity during unemployment and mental health. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology, 37*, 269–281. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9450.1996.tb00659.x

Winefield, A. H., Tiggemann, M., Winefield, H. R., & Goldney, R. D. (1993). *Growing up with unemployment: A longitudinal study of its psychological impact.* London: Routedge.

Winkelmann, L., & Winkelmann, R. (1998). Why are the unemployed so unhappy? Evidence from panel data. *Economica, 65*, 115. doi:10.1111/1468-0335.00111

Whelan, C. T. (1992). The role of income, life style deprivation, and financial strain in mediating the impact of unemployment on psychological distress: Evidence from the Republic of Ireland. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 65*, 331–344. doi:10.1111/j.2044-8325.1992.tb00509.x

Wanberg, C. R., Griffiths R. F., & Gavin, M. B. (1997). Time structure and unemployment: A longitudinal investigation. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 70,* 75–95. doi:10.1111/j.2044-8325.1997.tb00632.x

Waters, L. E., & Moore, K. A. (2002a). Predicting self-esteem during unemployment: The effect of gender, financial deprivation, alternate roles, and social support. *Journal of Employment Counseling, 39(4)*, 171–189. doi:10.1002/j.2161-1920.2002.tb00848.x

Waters, L. E., & Moore, K. A. (2002b). Reducing latent deprivation during unemployment: the role of meaningful leisure activity. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 75,* 15–32. doi:10.1348/096317902167621

Westman, M., Etzion, D., & Horovitz, S. (2004). The toll of unemployment does not stop with the unemployed. *Human Relations, 57*, 823–844. doi:10.1177/0018726704045767

Ivana Strizović
Aleksandar Mratinković

Odsek za psihologiju, Filozofski fakultet, Univerzitet u Novom Sadu

RAZLIKE IZMEĐU ZAPOSLENIH I NEZAPOSLENIH U ZADOVOLJSTVU ŽIVOTOM, SUBJEKTIVNOJ SREĆI I LATENTNIM I MANIFESTNIM BENEFITIMA OD ZAPOSLENJA

Posao predstavlja jedan od najznačajnijih aspekata života osobe. On ne samo da predstavlja glavni izvor prihoda, već često definiše društvenu ulogu pojedinca, i predstavlja deo selfa. Iako su istraživači saglasni da zaposlenost ima značajan uticaj na blagostanje, u psihološkoj literaturi postoje podeljena mišljenja u vezi sa pitanjem koji element posla je značajniji za razumevanje ove povezanosti – manifestni (finansijska dobit) ili latentni (socijalni kontakti, ograniyacija vremena, socijalni status...). Prema Jahodinom modelu Latentne deprivacije naglašava se značaj latentnih benefita od zaposlenja. S druge strane, Frayerov Model ograničavanja delovanja manifestne benefite od zaposlenja smatra esencijalnim za blagostanje. U ovoj studiji želeli smo ispitati postoje li razlike između zaposlenih i nezaposlenih u Srbiji u pokazataljima blagostanja, kao što su subjektivna sreća i zadovoljstvo životom. Pored toga, interesovalo nas je postoje li razlike u izraženosti manifestnih i latentnih benefita od zaposlenja između zaposlenih i nezaposlenih, kao i šta više predviđa zadovoljstvo životom – manifestni ili latentni benefiti. U istraživanju je učestvovalo 237 ispitanika iz Srbije (146 tj. 61.6% zaposlenih). Za ispitivanje blagostanja primenjena je Skala zadovoljstva životom (Satisfaction With Life Scale – SWLS) i Skala subjektivne sreće (Subjective Happiness Scale – SHS), dok su mnifestne i latentne benefiti od zaposlenja merene Skalom latentnih i manifestnih benefita (The Latent and Manifest Benefits Scale – LAMB). Rezultati su ukazali na značajne razlike između zaposlenih i nezaposlenih u nivou zadovoljstva životom, ali ne i u nivou subjektivne sreće. Zaposleni su pokazivali veće zadovoljstvo životom u odnosu na nezaposlene. Takođe, dobijene su i značajne razlike u odnosu na finansijsku sigurnost, kao manifestne benefiti, i u odnosu na organizaciju vremena, kao latentne benefiti od zaposlenja. Pokazano je da zaposleni imaju veću materijalnu sigurnost i bolje strukturirano vreme u odnosu na nezaposlene. Hijerarhijskom regresionom analizom je pokazano da iako manifestna benefit tj. finansijska sigurnost, značajno doprinosi zadovoljstvu životom kako zaposlenih, tako i nezaposlenih, latentne benefiti takođe ostvaruju značajan efekat na zadovoljstvo životom. Na poduzorku zaposlenih pokazano je

da je finansijska sigurnost najbolji prediktor zadovoljstva životom, a potom i socijalni kontakti i organizacija vremena, dok socijalni status ostvaruje negativan doprinos predikciji. U slučaju nezaposlenih, najbolji prediktor zadovoljstva životom su socijalni kontakti, pa potom finansijska sigurnost. Na osnovu rezultata možemo pretpostaviti da je, u našoj zemlji, za zadovoljstvo životom finansijska sigurnost važnija od latentnih benefita, barem u slučaju zaposlenih, dok su kod nezaposlenih važniji socijalni kontakti.

Ključne reči: zaposlenje, zadovoljstvo životom, subjektivna sreća, benefiti of posla