

# PERSONAL WORK-RELATED RESPONSIBILITY TEST (WRT)

© 2016, PE Konsult Ltd. All rights reserved.

Job attitudes are evaluations of one's job that express one's feelings toward, beliefs about, and attachment to one's job. Work-related responsibility is one of job attitudes. Responsibility is a duty or obligation to satisfactorily perform or complete a task (assigned by someone, or created by one's own promise or circumstances) that one must fulfill, and which has a consequent penalty for failure. Work-related responsibility is one of job attitudes. Level of personal work-related responsibility means the quality or state or fact of being [responsible](#), [accountable](#).

Personal work-related responsibility test is 12-item psychometric test designed to evaluate person's individual level of work-related responsibility. Response choices ranging at Likert-type forced choice scale from 1-point "Never, very infrequently" to 6-points "Very frequently, always". For example, Personal work-related responsibility test statements include "I take responsibility for my own actions and tasks at work" or "I blaming others for mistakes and failures" or "I maintain a collegial working relationship with my co-workers".

Work locus of control reflects an individual's tendency to believe that he controls events in his work life (internality) or that such control resides elsewhere, such as with powerful others (externality) (Spector, 1988). For example, work locus of control items include "People who perform their jobs well generally get rewarded" and "Most people are capable of doing their jobs well if they make the effort"; Spector, 1988).

The Work Locus of Control Scale (WLCS) is a 16-item instrument designed to assess control beliefs in the workplace. It is a domain specific locus of control scale that correlates about .50 to .55 with general locus of control. The format is summated rating with six response choices: disagree very much, disagree moderately, disagree slightly, agree slightly, agree moderately, agree very much, scored from 1 to 6, respectively.

## THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

Personal work-related responsibility is one of job attitudes. Job attitudes are evaluations of one's job that express one's feelings toward, beliefs about, and attachment to one's job. This definition encompasses both the cognitive and affective components of these evaluations while recognizing that these cognitive and affective aspects need not be in exact correspondence with one another (Schleicher et al. 2004). Job attitudes are evaluations of one's job that express one's feelings toward, beliefs about, and attachment to one's job (Judge and Kammeyer-Mueller, 2012). Job attitudes research is arguably the most venerable and popular topic in organizational psychology.

An attitude is a psychological tendency that is expressed by evaluating a particular entity with some degree of favor or disfavor (of which job attitudes are examples) i.e. attitude is an expression of favor or disfavor toward a person, place, thing, or event (the attitude object). An attitude can be as a positive or negative evaluation of people, objects, events, activities, and ideas.

Personal responsibility is concerned with people taking individual accountability for their decisions and actions, together with the outcomes they create and their impacts on others. It is about feeling that one is the author of one's own life, accountable for the life that is created and the impacts caused through one's decisions and actions, both on oneself and on others. Sometimes it is named as self-responsibility, which refers to each employee taking responsibility for his/her own actions within and outside of normal job duties. Self-responsibility is related to accountability, which requires workers to accept blame for their errors or omissions and acknowledge the successes and contributions of others. Moreover, employees are responsible for dealing with their colleagues and superiors honestly and with integrity.

Personal responsibility is differentiated from civic or social responsibility, which is concerned with our collective responsibilities to each other as human beings. The constructs are, however, related. Personal responsibility is understood at the level of the individual; civic or social responsibility is understood at the level of the collective. Responsibility is often also defined from the perspective of legal culpability but the concept of personal responsibility differs from this constrained definition, being focused more widely on a prospective, future-focused sense of the need to take actions that will deliver appropriate outcomes over time, rather than a retrospective, past-focused accountability and culpability for previous actions.

Employee' personal of work-related responsibility is a willingness to act responsibly at work. We talk about a responsible person, responsible employee or that you are taking responsibility for your actions or for your work or accept responsibility for your actions or failures. Professional responsibility is the area of legal practice that encompasses the duties of attorneys to act in a professional manner, obey the law, avoid conflicts of interest, and put the interests of clients ahead of their own interests.

Locus of control is the degree to which people believe that they have control over the outcome of events in their lives, as opposed to external forces beyond their control. Understanding of the concept was developed by [\(Rotter, 1954\)](#). Work locus of control reflects an individual's tendency to believe that he controls events in his work life (internality) or that such control resides elsewhere, such as with powerful others (externality) (Spector, 1988). Employees with a strong internal locus of control believe events in their work life derive primarily from their own actions: for example, when receiving work results, people with an internal locus of control tend to praise or blame themselves and their abilities. Employees with a strong external locus of control tend to praise or blame external factors such as the supervisor or task.

## **VALIDATION**

Internal correlations are shown in Table below.

**Table.** Within Sample Correlations in Personal Work-related Responsibility Test (N = 624)

Responsibility for	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
1. daily work duties and tasks	1												
2. actions and tasks at work	0.76	1											
3. personal hygiene	0.47	0.56	1										
4. willingness to act and work responsibly	0.61	0.62	0.56	1									
5. well-being of my team	0.55	0.57	0.50	0.61	1								
6. errors or mistakes at work	0.42	0.44	0.38	0.48	0.62	1							
7. punctuality	0.50	0.49	0.46	0.53	0.51	0.51	1						
8. confidentiality	0.58	0.60	0.51	0.59	0.65	0.53	0.67	1					
9. collegial working relationship	0.52	0.52	0.49	0.54	0.67	0.59	0.56	0.69	1				
10. appropriate dressing	0.49	0.55	0.52	0.53	0.57	0.43	0.57	0.64	0.63	1			
11. my own failures at work	0.58	0.63	0.56	0.61	0.64	0.57	0.58	0.67	0.66	0.64	1		
12. keeping work-area safe, hygienic and attractive	0.76	0.54	0.55	0.54	0.59	0.48	0.55	0.64	0.63	0.66	0.69	1	
13. Responsibility (General)	0.74	0.78	0.71	0.78	0.81	0.70	0.75	0.83	0.80	0.77	0.84	0.79	1

All presented correlations are statistically significant ( $p < 0.001$ )

**Table.** Within Sample Correlations in Personal Work-related Responsibility Test (N = 624)

	1	2
1. Responsibility	1	
2. Work Locus of Control	-0.13	1

Presented correlation is statistically significant ( $p < 0.05$ )

## RELIABILITY

Internal consistency reliability (Cronbach  $\alpha$  or coefficient alpha) was 0.90; generally are 0.85 and .94 (see Table).

**Table.** Reliability Statistics for Personal Work-related Responsibility Test (N = 624). Scale: Responsibility: 1-point “Never, very infrequently” to 6-points “Very frequently, always”; WLCS: lower score means internality.

Factors	Number of items	Reliability Statistics*
		Cronbach $\alpha$
Responsibility	12	0.94
Work Locus of Control	16	0.85

\* Widely is accepted .70 coefficient alpha as a standard (Nunnally, 1978)

## ESTONIAN NORMS

**WLCS U.S. Norms.** U.S. norms are based on 5477 people from 37 samples. Mean of samples is 40.0, with a mean standard deviation across samples of 9.9, and a mean coefficient alpha of .83.

**Table.** Managers’ Work Locus of Control in Eastern *versus* Western Europe (CISMS Study, 2002)

Eastern European	Sample size	Work Locus of Control	USA and Western European	Sample size	Work Locus of Control
Romania	135	45,3	USA	119	37,5
Estonia	163	47,1	Germany	85	40,4
Poland	263	48,0	Sweden	210	41,5
Slovenia	488	49,1	Belgium	185	43,4
Ukraine	219	52,6	France	61	45,1
Bulgaria	165	53,3	Spain	180	46,6
			UK	201	46,8

Lower score means internality

Estonian Norms for Personal Work-related Responsibility Test (see Table). Estonian norms are based on 357 people from 3 samples (one general sample, and two occupational samples (see Table below).

**Table.** Descriptive statistics of Personal Work-related Responsibility Test in Estonia

Personal Work-related Responsibility Test	TEACHERS (N=58)		NURSES (N=78)		EST (N=279)	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
Responsibility	5.68*	0.34	4.22*	0.13	5.34	0.59
Work Locus of Control	45.83*	7.46	47.23*	7.27	57.97	4.20

\* Statistically significant comparing EST sample as norm  $p < 0.001$

## POLISH NORMS

Polish Norms for Personal Work-related Responsibility Test (see Table). Polish norms are based on 204 people from one general sample.

**Table.** Descriptive statistics of Personal Work-related Responsibility Test in Poland

Personal Work-related Responsibility Test	PL (N=204)	
	M	SD
Responsibility	4.78	0.85
Work Locus of Control	57.27	4.56

## CORRELATION BETWEEN RESPONSIBILITY AND PERCEIVED PERFORMANCE

Reliability (Cronbach  $\alpha$  or coefficient alpha) between Responsibility test and Perceived Performance Scale was 0.91.

**Table.** Correlations between responsibility (measured by Responsibility test) and perceived performance (measured by Perceived Performance Scale) (N =624)

Responsibility test	Perceived performance
Responsibility	0.41*
Work Locus of Control	-0.19*

\* Correlations are statistically significant ( $p < 0.05$ )

## PUBLICATIONS and/or CONFERENCES

(Bibliography of Studies Using the Responsibility test)

Spector, P. E.; Cooper, C. L.; Sanchez, J. I.; Driscoll, M.; Sparks, K.; Bernin, P.; Bussing, A.; Dewe, P.; Hart, P.; Lu, L.; Miller, K.; Renault de Moraes, L.; Ostrognay, G.; M., Pagon, M.; Pitariu, H.; Poelmans, S.; Radhakrishnan, P.; Russinova, V.; Salamatov, V.; Salgado, J.; Yu, S. (2002). Locus of Control and Well-Being at Work: How Generalizable Are Western Findings? *Academy of Management Journal*, 45 (2), 453–466.

Spector, P. E.; Cooper, C. L.; Sanchez, J. I.; Driscoll, M.; Sparks, K.; Bernin, P.; Bussing, A.; Dewe, P.; Hart, P.; Lu, L.; Miller, K.; Renault de Moraes, L.; Ostrognay, G.; M., Pagon, M.; Pitariu, H.; Poelmans, S.; Radhakrishnan, P.; Russinova, V.; Salamatov, V.; Salgado, J. ... Yu, S. (2001). Do national levels of individualism and internal locus of control relate to well-being: an

ecological level international study. *Journal of organizational behaviour*, 22, 815–832.

- Teichmann, M.; Spector, P. E.; Cooper, C. L.; Sparks, K.; Bernin, P.; Pagon, M. ; Pitariu, H.; Poelmans, S.; Russinova, V.; Salamatov, V.; Salgado, J. F.; Stora, J. B.; Theorell, T.; Vlerick, P.; Widerszal-Bazyl, M. (2006). Eastern European versus Western Control Beliefs at Work. Abstracts of 26-th International Congress of Applied Psychology: IAAP 26-th International Congress of Applied Psychology, Athens, Greece 2006. Ed. Efklides, A.; Papadakis, T. Athens, Greece: Hellenic Psychological Association, 111–112.
- Teichmann, M. (2006). Eastern European Managers versus Western Managers: Work Locus of Control. WP Kongress 06, *Wirtschaftspsychologie: Netzwerke verbinden: German 6th Congress on Work and Organisational Psychology*, Leipzig, 2006. Ed. Leitner, G. Leipzig, Germany: BDP e.V, 312–315.
- Teichmann, M. (2008). Professionals' work locus of control and quality of life. *International Journal of Psychology*, 43, 812.
- Teichmann, M. (2008). Professionals' Work Locus of Control and Quality of Life. Abstracts of 29th International Congress of Psychology: ICP 29th International Congress of Psychology, Berlin, Germany 2008. Berlin, Germany.
- Teichmann, M. (2016). *E-HRM* (Human Resource or Personnel or Human Factor or Human Capital). In: Conference “New approaches to HR management: do they work in Central and Eastern Europe?” University of Silesia in Katowice, Poland, the 6<sup>th</sup> of October, 2016.
- Teichmann, M., Murdvee, M., Kożusznik, B., Smorczewska, B., Gaidajenko, A., Ilvest, J. Jr. (2017). *Relationship between the Employees' Perceived Performance and Various Work Related Psychosocial Characteristics*. In: European Association of Work and Organizational Psychology (EAWOP) Congress “Enabling Change through Work and Organizational Psychology”, May 17<sup>th</sup> - 20<sup>th</sup> 2017, Dublin, Ireland (in press).