

AFFECT REGULATION AND MOTIVE-INCONGRUENT GOAL ORIENTATIONS: RELATION TO WELL-BEING*

Peter GRÖPEL

Department of Psychology, University of Trnava
Homopotočná 23, 91843 Trnava, Slovak Republic
E-mail: piotro@pobox.sk

Abstract: The aim of the present study was to test the hypotheses that 1) the personality disposition of action versus state orientation (i.e., a form of affect regulation) moderates the relationship between stressful life events and building of motive-congruent goals as well as between stress and well-being, and 2) motive-incongruent goal orientations influence well-being negatively. Managers (N = 120) were sampled. The main results were: First, no significant interaction effect of action orientation and life stress on well-being or motive-incongruent goal orientations was found. This was due to a strong action orientation and a low level of stress in the sample used ($p < .001$ when compared with norm). Because of restricted variance, the moderator hypotheses could not be supported or refuted. Second, motive-incongruent goal orientations correlated with well-being only when action orientation was checked. Thus, action orientation was found to be beneficial for well-being because it suppressed the negative effect of motive-incongruent goal orientations.

Key words: well-being, affect regulation, motives, action orientation

INTRODUCTION

Achieving goals has been found to be an important predictor of subjective well-being (Brunstein, 1993; Elliot, Sheldon, Church, 1997; Emmons, 1986, 1996). Sheldon and Kasser (1998), however, report a potentially significant moderator of this relationship. In their study, participants whose goals were not self-integrated experienced little change in well-being, no matter how well they progressed in achieving their goals. The authors assumed

that this occurred because these goals did not satisfy important psychological needs. Brunstein, Schulheiss and Grässmann (1998) likewise suggested that personal goal orientations are positively correlated with well-being when they are congruent with motive dispositions, and negatively correlated when they are incongruent with motive dispositions. Motive dispositions can be defined as "intelligent needs", that is as an implicit cognitive-emotional network of possible actions (derived from autobiographical memory) that can be performed to satisfy basic social needs in a context-sensitive way across a variety of situations (Heckhausen, 1991; Kuhl, 2001; McClelland, 1980). In accordance with this definition, motives can be considered as the need-related part of the implicit self-system (Greenwald, Banaji, 1995).

* The present research was supported by a grant from the Slovak Science Foundation (VEGA Nr. 2/302023) to Imrich Ruiseľ.

I gratefully acknowledge the assistance of Werner Henseler, the leader of the Institute of Personality and Motivation Development (IMPART GmbH), for his help in collecting data from participants, and Nicola Baumann for her helpful comments.

Sometimes people fail to select self- and motive-congruent goals (Brunstein, 2001) and are liable to introject self-alien goals (Kuhl, Kazén, 1994). The typical finding that implicit and explicit motive measures are not correlated (McClelland, Koestner, Weinberger, 1989) illustrates that such motive-incongruent goal orientations, that is discrepancies between unconscious needs and conscious goals, are not a rare phenomenon. Congruence of explicit goal orientations with implicit motives has been identified as an important predictor of well-being, health, and personal growth (Brunstein et al., 1998; Sheldon, Elliot, 1999; Sheldon, Kasser, 1995). Incongruence, on the other hand, was associated with symptom formation and low well-being (Baumann, Kaschel, Kuhl, 2005; Kehr, 2004).

What conditions promote incongruence between explicit goal orientations and implicit motives? Baumann et al. (2005) found stressful life events to have a negative impact on building congruent goal orientations. They discussed their findings on the basis of the Personality Systems Interaction theory (PSI-theory; Kuhl, 2001), which assumes that explicit goal orientations and implicit motives are associated with two different cognitive systems: Goal orientations are associated with the explicit, verbal representation format of *intention memory* that is supported by sequential-analytical operations (thinking and planning) and left-hemispherical processing. In contrast, implicit motives are associated with implicit representations in *extension memory*, an extended semantic network operating according to connectionist principles and supported by intuitive-holistic processes of the right hemisphere.

According to the theory, congruence between explicit goal orientations and

implicit motives is expected to occur when information in the two hemispheres can be exchanged. For this purpose, both intention and extension memory should be equally activated. Affects modulate the activation of intention and extension memory: When the positive affect is low, intention memory is activated. When the negative affect is low, extension memory is activated. However, stressful life events increase negative affect and/or reduce positive affect (Kuhl, 2001). An asymmetric activation of intention memory and/or an inhibition of extension memory are often the result. In consequence, the communication process between intention and extension memory is disturbed.

Thus, stress inhibits positive affect and/or increases negative affect, which leads to the asymmetric activation of intention memory and/or the inhibition of extension memory, and, in turn, impairs the building of motive-congruent goal orientation. However, in Baumann et al.'s study (2005), stress impaired the congruency between explicit goal orientations and implicit motives only when a person was not able to cope with the stress. The above authors found the personality disposition of *action orientation*¹ - an ability to self-regulate affective states under stress (Kuhl, 1994a) - to be a significant moderator. Those high in state orientation (i.e., those who were not able to self-regulate affective states) were prone to showing

¹ There are two forms of action orientation (Kuhl, 1994a): *decision-related action orientation* (AOD) is the ability to self-generate positive affect in the face of difficulties and problems, whereas *failure-related action orientation* (AOF) is the ability to reduce (downregulate) negative affect after negative events. In contrast, *decision-related state orientation* (SOD) is the inability to self-generate positive affect under stress, whereas *failure-related state orientation* (SOF) is the inability to volitionally control negative affect.

motive-incongruent goal orientation and scored lower on the level of well-being when experiencing high stress. In contrast, individuals high in action orientation (i.e., those who regulated their affective states) showed less motive-incongruent achievement orientations and were able to maintain a relatively constant level of well-being when experiencing high stress.

The aim of the present study is to replicate and extend Baumann et al.'s (2005) findings. There is one major difference in this study: Baumann et al. only investigated the incongruence in achievement domain. Three main social needs have, however, been studied extensively in motivation research: achievement, affiliation, and power (McClelland, 1985). Therefore, apart from the achievement motive, affiliation and power motives will be analyzed as well. Three hypotheses will be tested:

- 1) Action orientation will play a moderator role in the relationship between stress and well-being.
- 2) Action orientation will play a moderator role in the relationship between stress and building motive-congruent goal orientations.
- 3) Incongruence between explicit goal orientations and implicit motives will be negatively related to emotional well-being.

METHOD

Participants

One hundred and twenty managers (14 women and 106 men) completed the questionnaire packet about their motives, affect regulation, life-stress and well-being. Their mean age was 39.1 years (range 27 to 61 years).

Measures

Explicit goal orientations were assessed by 12 items (four items for each motivational domain) taken from the Motive Enactment Test (*MUT*; Kuhl, 1999). Sample items on the affiliation motive are: "I like to speak to nice people about all possible things", "Human closeness is more important to me than achievement". Sample items on the achievement motive are: "When I have solved a difficult problem I enjoy looking for the next challenge right away", "I often engage spontaneously in activities in which I can test my abilities". Sample items on the power motive are: "I often play a hero in my daydreams", "I like to get other people interested in the things I want to do". Participants responded to each item using a 4-point Likert-type scale from *completely disagree* (0) to *completely agree* (3). In the present study, internal consistencies were $\alpha = .69$ for affiliation, $\alpha = .65$ for achievement and $\alpha = .60$ for power.

The Operant Motive Test (*OMT*; Kuhl, Scheffer, 1999) was administered to assess the *implicit needs* of affiliation, achievement and power. Using a modified TAT technique (Murray, 1943), participants were confronted with 15 pictures and asked to invent a story and give their spontaneous associations to the following questions (without having to write down the story): 1) "What is important for the person in this situation and what is the person doing?", 2) "How does the person feel?", 3) "Why does the person feel this way?", and 4) "How does the story end?". The *OMT* differentiates approach and avoidance components for each motive. In accordance with previous research (Baumann et al., 2005), we used the approach components of each motive as an index of implicit

it affiliation, achievement, and power. Scoring was carried out by well-trained assistants. Evidence confirming the validity of the operant motive test has been reported elsewhere (Kuhl, Scheffer, 1999; Scheffer, 2001).

The Action Control Scale (*ACS-90*; Kuhl, 1994b) was administered to assess the *action vs. state orientation*. Both dimensions of action orientation were measured with 12 items. Each of the items describes a stressful situation and an action- versus state-oriented way of coping with the situation. For each item, participants were asked to select the response that best described their own reaction to the situation. Action-oriented choices were coded as 1 and state-oriented choices were coded as 0 and summed for the entire subscale. A sample item on the decision-related dimension is: "When I know I must finish something soon: a) I have to push myself to get started, or b) I find it easy to get it over and done with". Option *a* reflects the SOD and option *b* the AOD response alternative. A sample item on the failure-related dimension is: "When I am told that my work has been completely unsatisfactory: a) I don't let it bother me for too long, or b) I feel paralyzed". Option *a* reflects the AOF and option *b* the SOF response alternative. The ACS has sufficient reliability (Cronbach's alphas $> .70$) and adequate construct validity (Kuhl, Beckmann, 1994). The factorial structure of the ACS-90 confirms the theoretical distinction made between the AOD and AOF components of action orientation (Dieffendorf, Hall, Lord, Streat, 2000; Kuhl, Beckmann, 1994). In the present study, AOD and AOF scales have internal consistencies of $\alpha = .78$ and $\alpha = .77$, respectively.

The *Life-Stress Scale* adopted from the Volitional Components Inventory (*VCI*; Kuhl, Fuhrmann, 1998) was administered

with two subscales (demands and threats) consisting of four items each. Sample items from the demands scale are: "My current life circumstances are very tough", and "I must cope with a lot of difficulties". Sample items from the threats scale are: "I have many painful experiences to cope with", and "I have felt a lot of conflicts and hostility between myself and others lately". These two types of stressors load on orthogonal factors and show the theoretically expected correlations with low positive affect (the demands scale) and high negative affect for the threats scale (cf. Kuhl, 2001, p. 243). Participants responded to each item using a 4-point Likert-type scale from *completely disagree* (0) to *completely agree* (3). In the present study, internal consistencies were $\alpha = .70$ for demands and $\alpha = .71$ for threats.

To assess *well-being*, participants filled out a Mood Adjective Checklist (*BEF*; Kuhl, Kazén, in prep.), which is an extended version of the PANAS scale (Watson, Tellegen, Clark, 1988). Whereas the PANAS items are restricted to arousal and activation, the BEF scale contains additional items related to positive and negative mood as indicators of well-being. Positive mood was assessed with nine adjectives (e.g., happy, active, pleased, joyful), negative mood with 12 adjectives (e.g., helpless, nervous, annoyed, tense, irritable). Participants indicated the extent to which they feel these moods in their everyday life ("In general I feel ...") using a 4-point Likert-type scale from *not at all* (0) to *very frequently* (3). As assessed by coefficient alpha, the reliability of the two mood scales were $\alpha = .77$ for positive affect and $\alpha = .80$ for negative affect. The well-being score was created by standardizing the positive and negative mood, then subtracting negative mood from positive mood.

Table 1. The impact of action orientation and stress on well-being (hierarchical regression)

Variable	Positive Affect	Negative Affect	Well-Being (total score)
Block 1			
AOD	.41***	-.27**	.39***
Demands	-.15	.21*	-.20*
Block 2			
AOD x Demands	.033	-.14	.103
Block 1			
AOF	.51***	-.45***	.55***
Threats	-.13	.21*	-.20*
Block 2			
AOF x Threats	.01	-.079	.051

Note: Standardized regression coefficient Beta; * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$ (two-tailed)

RESULTS

Affect Regulation and Emotional Well-Being

A hierarchical regression analysis was conducted on well-being with AOD and demands entered as block one and their interaction term entered as block two. Similarly, a hierarchical regression analysis was conducted on well-being with AOF, threats and their interaction term².

² Stressful life events can be differentiated into *demands* and *threats* (Kuhl; 2001, p. 243). Life events that place high demands on a person (e.g., goals conflicts, high task difficulty, obstacles) are associated with reduced positive affect, whereas threatening life events (e.g., danger, major life changes, painful experiences) are associated with increased negative affect. According to the theory (Kuhl, 1994a), AOD/SOD is expected to moderate the effect of demands whereas AOF/SOF is expected to moderate the effect of threats.

Following a recommendation by Aiken and West (1991), predictor variables were standardized before calculating their interaction term. Dependent variables were standardized as well. As shown in Table 1, there were significant main effects for AOD and Demands. However, the AOD x Demands interaction was not significant. Similarly, significant main effects for AOF and Threats were found, but not for their interaction.

The findings suggest that the ability to self-regulate affective states under stress has an effect on well-being. This is in congruence with previous findings that persons high in action orientation generally scored higher on well-being (Baumann et al., 2005; Brunstein, 2001). In contrast to expectations, however, action orientation did not play the moderator role in the relationship between stress and emotional well-being (Hypothesis 1). Action and state oriented persons did not show signifi-

cant differences in emotional well-being when experiencing stress. How can this finding be explained? To answer the question, means and standard deviations for the predictor variables (see Table 2) were computed and their normal distribution tested. Using the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test of normal distribution, the predictor variables did not show a normal distribution ($p < .001$). The managers in the sample used were strongly action-oriented. Using the norms from the Action Control Scale (Kuhl, 1994b), there were less than 18% state-oriented persons (17.6% SOD-persons; 10.1% SOF-persons).

More importantly, the managers experienced very low level of stress. Thus there could be no call on the power of affect regulation under stress (action orientation), or this power caused a quick coping process so that moderate stress situations were not subjectively perceived as stress. In neither case was it possible to find interaction effects and to test a moderator hypothesis because of the very restricted variance.

Affect Regulation and Motive-Incongruent Goal Orientations

The amount of motive-incongruent goal orientations was calculated as an absolute

difference between explicit goal orientations and implicit motives (cf. Baumann et al., 2005). Both variables, explicit goal orientations and implicit motives, were standardized before calculating their difference.

State-oriented participants were expected to show greater incongruence between explicit motive orientations and implicit motives as stress increased (Hypothesis 2). However, as noted above, the participants were strongly action-oriented and experienced predominantly low stress. Because of the very restricted variance, it was not useful to conduct a regression analysis and to test the moderator hypothesis.

Motive Incongruence and Emotional Well-Being

Table 3 presents the mean values of motive-incongruent affiliation, achievement and power goals. Despite high action orientation and low stress, participants experienced motive incongruence. In order to test the third hypothesis, correlations between motive-incongruent goal orientations and well-being were computed. In contrast to expectations, no significant relationship was found (see Table 4).

Table 2. Means and standard deviations of predictor variables compared with norms

Variable	Present research Mean (SD)	Norms (Kuhl, 1994a) Mean (SD)	Significance
AOD	8.41 (2.8)	5.61 (2.9)	$p < .001$
AOF	8.48 (2.9)	5.69 (2.9)	$p < .001$
Demands	2.34 (2.2)	4.75 (3.0)	$p < .001$
Threats	2.96 (2.5)	5.27 (3.2)	$p < .001$

Note: AOD = decision-related action orientation; AOF = failure-related action orientation; Range for AOD/AOF: 0 - 12 (higher scores indicate stronger action orientation); Range for Demands/Threats: 0 - 12 (higher scores indicate higher stress)

Table 3. Means and standard deviations of motive incongruence

Variable	Mean (z-standardized)	Standard Deviation
Motive-Incongruent Affiliation Goals	1.11	0.87
Motive-Incongruent Achievement Goals	1.01	0.81
Motive-Incongruent Power Goals	1.06	0.70
Motive-Incongruent Achievement Goals (Baumann et al., in press)	1.10	0.79

Note: The difference between means of motive-incongruent achievement goals from the present study and from Baumann et al.'s study was not significant

Table 4. Correlations between motive incongruence and well-being

	Positive Affect	Negative Affect	Well-Being (total score)
Motive-Incongruent Affiliation Goals	.11	.17+	-.04
Motive-Incongruent Achievement Goals	-.02	-.14	.07
Motive-Incongruent Power Goals	-.10	.11	-.12

Note: + $p < .10$ (two-tailed)

How can this finding be explained? First, let us sum the expectation and findings: Motive-incongruent goal orientations were expected to be associated with low well-being, that is, with low positive affect and high negative affect. The participants, however, were highly action oriented, that is, they were able to self-generate positive affect and downregulate negative affect. Second, Koole and Jostmann (2004) found action-oriented individuals to be especially skilled at *intuitive* affect regulation. Thus, even if motive incongruence can reduce

well-being, action-oriented individuals are likely to regulate decreased affective states *intuitively* so that inhibited positive affect and increased negative affect are not perceived consciously. Therefore, motive incongruence need not necessarily be related to low well-being when a person is able to regulate his or her affective states intuitively. To test this assumption, partial correlations between motive incongruence and well-being were computed, thus checking for the impact of action orientation.

Table 5. Partial Correlations between Motive-Incongruent Goal Orientations and Well-Being (Checking for both forms of action orientation)

	Positive Affect	Negative Affect	Well-Being (total score)
Motive-Incongruent Affiliation Goals	.04	.22*	-.13
Motive-Incongruent Achievement Goals	.01	-.12	.08
Motive-Incongruent Power Goals	-.20*	.19*	-.24**

Note: * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$ (two-tailed)

As shown in Table 5, motive-incongruent affiliation and power goals were related to well-being when checking for action orientation. Motive-incongruent achievement goals did not show any relationship to well-being. Thus, only partial support for the third hypothesis was obtained.

DISCUSSION

The aim of the present study was to replicate Baumann et al.'s (2005) findings that 1) the personality disposition of action versus state orientation moderates the relationship between stressful life events and building motive-congruent goals as well as between stress and well-being, and 2) motive-incongruent goal orientations affect well-being negatively. In general, our research could neither support nor refute Baumann et al.'s findings because of a methodological problem: The participants in the sample used were strongly action-oriented and experienced predominantly very low stress. This means that there was a very restricted variance of predictor variables to allow testing the moderator hypotheses (Hypotheses 1 and 2). In future research, a population with normally distributed predictor variables is needed.

However, there is one interesting finding which was found in the present study. Despite high action orientation and low stress, participants showed motive-incongruent goals orientation. Presumably, there are additional factors that promote motive incongruence besides stress combined with state orientation (e.g., duties, tasks set by superiors). Moreover, contrary to the third hypothesis, although the participants showed these incongruent goal orientations, their well-being was not primarily impaired. How can this finding be explained? An integration process

might be important here. People have to work on many tasks and goals in their everyday life. It is possible that some of these tasks/goals are not congruent with one's implicit motives, but they have to be done. An intrapersonal conflict often results (Kehr, 2004). In such a situation, the incongruent goals have to be integrated into the self in order to resolve the conflict and to minimize its negative consequences such as impaired well-being. The process of integration has a protective function because originally incongruent goals become congruent and, in turn, are no longer perceived as a stressor. Action orientation has been found to be important for the integration process (Gröpel, Kuhl, Kazén, 2004; Kuhl, 2001). Thus, even if explicit goals are originally incongruent with implicit motives, action oriented individuals are likely to integrate these goals into the self, which minimizes their negative consequences.

An additional interpretation of the missing relationship between motive-incongruent goal orientations and well-being may be based on the compensatory role of self-regulation processes. According to Kehr (2004), self-regulation processes such as affect regulation are able to compensate for the negative impact of the incongruence between implicit motives and explicit goals. Koole and Jostmann (2004) showed why it is possible: They found action oriented persons to be especially skilled at intuitive affect regulation. Accordingly, in a sample of action-oriented individuals, it may be expected that reduced positive affect and increased negative affect, due to motive incongruence, are regulated just before they may be perceived consciously. Thus motive incongruence does not necessarily involve low well-being if a person is able to regulate his or her affective states intuitively. If this ability is allowed for,

however, the negative associations between motive incongruence and well-being should be obtained. Indeed, this assumption was partially supported: when the impact of action orientation was allowed for, motive-incongruent goal orientations were negatively linked to well-being. Only the achievement domain did not show this trend. More research is needed to replicate, specify and extend these findings.

Some limitations of the present research should be underscored. First, all but implicit motives were assessed with self-reports without checking for the social desirability bias.

Second, there were only a few female participants in the present research. Thus, it is not possible to generalize the findings for both sexes. In future research, social desirability should be checked and a more heterogeneous sample used.

To conclude, the personality disposition of action orientation was found to be beneficial for well-being because it suppressed the negative effect of motive-incongruent goal orientation. Although the incongruence between implicit motives and explicit goal orientation represents a "hidden" stressor (Baumann et al., 2005), action orientation helps to cope with it. This is a good reason for future research to examine how action orientation can be developed and trained.

Received July 20, 2005

REFERENCES

- AIKEN, L.S., WEST, S.G., 1991, Multiple regression: Testing and interpreting interactions. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- BAUMANN, N., KASCHEL, R., KUHL, J., 2005, Striving for unwanted goals: Stress-dependent discrepancies between explicit and implicit achievement motives reduce subjective well-being and increase psychosomatic symptoms. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 89, 781-799.
- BRUNSTEIN, J.C., 1993, Personal goals and subjective well-being: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 65, 1061-1070.
- BRUNSTEIN, J.C., 2001, Persönliche Ziele und Handlungs- versus Lageorientierung: Wer bindet sich an realistische und bedürfniskongruente Ziele? *Zeitschrift für Differentielle und Diagnostische Psychologie*, 22, 1-12.
- BRUNSTEIN, J.C., SCHULTHEISS, O.C., GRÄSSMANN, R., 1998, Personal goals and emotional well-being: The moderating role of motive dispositions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 71, 1006-1019.
- DIEFFENDORF, J.M., HALL, R.J., LORD, R.G., STREAN, M.L., 2000, Action-state orientation: Construct validity of a revised measure and its relationship to work-related variables. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85, 250-263.
- ELLIOT, A.J., SHELDON, K.M., CHURCH, M., 1997, Avoidance personal goals and subjective well-being. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 23, 915-927.
- EMMONS, R.A., 1986, Personal strivings: An approach to personality and subjective well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51, 1058-1068.
- EMMONS, R.A., 1996, Striving and feeling: Personal goals and subjective well-being. In: P.M. Gollwitzer, J.A. Bargh (Eds.), *The psychology of action: Linking cognition and motivation to behavior*, New York: Guilford Press, 313-337.
- GREENWALD, A.G., BANAJI, M.R., 1995, Implicit social cognition: Attitudes, self-esteem, and stereotypes. *Psychological Review*, 102, 4-27.
- GRÖPEL, P., KUHL, J., KAZÉN, M., 2004, Toward an integrated self: Age differences and the role of action orientation. Conference proceedings (CD-Rom) of the Third International SELF Research Conference, SELF Research Centre, Sydney, Australia.
- HECKHAUSEN, H., 1991, *Motivation and action*. Heidelberg/New York: Springer-Verlag.
- KEHR, H.M., 2004, Implicit/explicit motive discrepancies and volitional depletion among managers. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 30, 315-327.
- KOOHLE, S., JOSTMANN, N., 2004, Getting a grip on your feelings: Effect of action orientation and external demand on intuitive affect regulation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 87.
- KUHL, J., 1994a, A theory of action and state orientation. In: J. Kuhl, J. Beckmann (Eds.), *Volition and personality: Action versus state orientation*, Göttingen: Hogrefe & Huber, 9-46.
- KUHL, J., 1994b, Action versus state orientation: Psychometric properties of the Action Control Scale

- (ACS-90). In: J. Kuhl, J. Beckmann (Eds.), *Volition and personality: Action versus state orientation*, Göttingen: Hogrefe & Huber, 47-59.
- KUHL, J., 1999, *Der Motiv-Umsetzung-Test (MUT)*. Unpublished questionnaire, University of Osnabrück, Germany.
- KUHL, J., 2001, *Motivation und Persönlichkeit: Interaktionen psychischer Systeme*. Göttingen: Hogrefe.
- KUHL, J., BECKMANN, J., 1994, *Volition and personality: State versus action orientation*. Göttingen: Hogrefe & Huber.
- KUHL, J., KAZÉN, M., 1994, *Self-discrimination and memory: State orientation and false self-ascription of assigned activities*. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 66, 1103-1115.
- KUHL, J., KAZÉN, M., in prep., *Putting affect into affect instruments: The mood adjective checklist (BEF)*. Manuscript in preparation, University of Osnabrück, Germany.
- KUHL, J., SCHEFFER, D., 1999, *Der operante Multi-Motiv-Test (OMT): Manual*. University of Osnabrück, Germany.
- MCCLELLAND, D., 1980, *Motive dispositions: The merits of operant and respondent measures*. In: L. Wheeler (Ed.), *Review of personality and social psychology*, Vol. 1, Beverly Hills: Sage, 10-41.
- MCCLELLAND, D., 1985, *Human motivation*. Glenville, IL: Scott Foresman.
- MCCLELLAND, D., KOESTNER, R., WEINBERGER, J., 1989, *How do self-attributed and implicit motives differ?* *Psychological Review*, 96, 690-702.
- SCHEFFER, D., 2001, *Implizite Motive: Entwicklungskontexte und modulierende Mechanismen*. Unpublished dissertation, University of Osnabrück, Germany.
- SHELDON, K.M., ELLIOT, A.J., 1999, *Goal striving, need satisfaction, and longitudinal well-being: The Self-Concordance model*. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 76, 482-497.
- SHELDON, K.M., KASSER, T., 1995, *Coherence and congruence: Two aspects of personality integration*. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 68, 531-543.
- SHELDON, K.M., KASSER, T., 1998, *Pursuing personal goals: Skills enable progress but not all progress is beneficial*. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 24, 546-557.
- WATSON, D., TELLEGEN, A., CLARK, L., 1988, *Development and validation of brief measures of positive and negative affect: The PANAS scales*. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 54, 1063-1070.

REGULÁCIA AFEKTOV A MOTIVAČNÁ INKONGRUENCIA: VZŤAH K ŽIVOTNEJ POHODE

P. Gröpel

Súhrn: Cieľom predkladanej štúdie bolo testovať nasledovné hypotézy: 1) schopnosť akčnej orientácie (t.j., sebaregulácia afektov) bude moderovať vzťah medzi prežívanou mierou stresu a motivačnou inkongruenciou (t.j., diskrepancia medzi implicitnými potrebami a explicitnými cieľmi), ako i vzťah medzi prežívanou mierou stresu a životnou pohodou, a 2) motivačná inkongruencia bude stáť v negatívnom vzťahu k životnej pohode. Výskumu sa zúčastnilo 120 manažérov. Hlavné výsledky sú: Poprvé, nebol zistený interakčný efekt akčnej orientácie a stresu na mieru motivačnej inkongruencie či životnej pohody. Dané zistenie je možné vysvetliť na základe nenormálnej distribúcie prediktorov a chýbajúcej variancie: skúmané osoby boli vysoko akčne orientované a udávali nízku mieru prežívaného stresu ($p < .001$ v porovnaní s normou). Tým pádom nebolo možné potvrdiť ani vyvrátiť moderačné hypotézy. Podruhé, motivačná inkongruencia stála v negatívnom vzťahu so životnou pohodou len vtedy, ak bola zároveň kontrolovaná úroveň akčnej orientácie. To poukazuje na "ochrannú" funkciu akčnej orientácie pri negatívnom pôsobení motivačnej inkongruencie na mieru životnej pohody.