

WORK-RELATED EMOTIONAL WELLBEING SCALE (WEWS)

© 2016, PE Konsult Ltd. All rights reserved).

Work-related Emotional Wellbeing Scale (WEWS) is a psychometric instrument specially designed to measure the employee's emotions and feelings during the ordinary working days in past weeks. Employee's emotional wellbeing refers to the frequency of positive or negative feelings and emotions at work.

The Part 1 contained ten items about quality of working life (it includes five items of positive and five negative feelings and emotions, for example, satisfaction with working life, pessimism or optimism concerning a job etc.). The Part 2 included 30 items of work-related positive and negative emotions and feelings.

In an application of the scale, respondents were asked how often they had experienced each of the emotions at work over the past weeks: "Thinking of the past weeks, how frequently has your job made you feel each of the following?". Every item was scored on a 6-point scale (1 - Never, very infrequently; 2- Infrequently; 3 - Occasionally; 4 – Sometimes; 5 – Frequently; 6 - Very frequently, always). Higher scores indicate more positive or negative work-related emotions. For example, Work-related Emotional Wellbeing Scale (WEWS) test questions include "Are you satisfied with your working life?" or "How often you feel tired or exhausted?" or statements like "I have felt helpless" or "I have felt excited" or "I have felt shame" or "I have felt successful".

THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

The starting point should be to provide a clear definition of emotional wellbeing at work. Despite the fact that employee's work-related emotional wellbeing is a term that has seen increasing use in recent decades it is not easiest task. In one hand, there has been considerable consensus in scientific community what emotional wellbeing is not about, and there is lack of coherent understanding what work-related emotional wellbeing actually is about. Work-related emotional wellbeing is not about the absence of emotions, but it is employee's ability to understand the own emotions and use emotions to move his/her working life forward in positive direct.

As positive emotions are a key component in subjective wellbeing (Myers and Diener, 1995), it is essential to definite what the work-related emotions are. Emotions understood as any conscious experience characterized by intense mental activity and a high degree of pleasure or displeasure (Cabanac, 2002; Schacter, 2011).

From a practical perspective, we predict that work-related emotions evolve over time i.e. nowadays work-related emotions have been changed during the past decades. First, the world of work itself has been dramatically changed during the past ten years. And there is no reason to believe that work-related emotions have remained exactly the same, as it was when JAWS designed (JAWS was copyrighted in 1999). Second, JAWS asked to indicate the amount to which any part of job (e.g., the work, coworkers, supervisor, clients, pay) has made employee feel that emotion in the past 30 days. Our pilot-study shows that it would be exaggerated to expect that person remember

emotions that he/she has felt during the ordinary workday about month ago. For that reason we suggest that “the past weeks” could be better formulation for remembering work-related emotions. Based on the foregoing, we decided to design measurement the Work-related Emotional Wellbeing Scale.

VALIDATION

For validation of our Work-related Emotional Wellbeing Scale we used Job-related Affective Well-being Scale (JAWS © 1999, Paul T. Van Katwyk, Suzy Fox, Paul E. Spector, and E. Kevin Kelloway, All rights reserved).

In one hand, there are numbers of psychometric instruments for that purpose. For example, the Job-related Affective Well-being Scale (JAWS) is most commonly used having a wide range of applications and continually gaining popularity. The JAWS is a scale designed to assess people's emotional reactions to their job. Accordingly, JAWS has 30-item (full version) or 20-item (short version) scale designed to assess people's emotional reactions to their job. The JAWS ask participants to indicate for each of 30 emotions (20 emotions in the short form) how often they have experienced them in the past 30 days.

Moreover, we found well-adapted Polish version of JAWS (Basinska et al., 2014) but unfortunately only the shorter version of JAWS i.e. the 8-item version (Cronbach α between 0.66 and 0.78), 12-item version (Cronbach α between 0.75 and 0.82), and 20-item version (Cronbach α from 0.82 to 0.87). Clearly, the longer JAWS version showed the better psychometric properties (Cronbach, 1951). A similar trend was observed an original JAWS as USA Cronbach α was between 0.92 and 0.95 in 30-item full version, and from 0.80 to 0.90 in JAWS 20-item short version (Van Katwyk et al., 2000).

As in Estonia lacked both versions of JAWS (either 30-item full version as well as the 20-item short version). For reasons explained ahead we decided to adopt a 30-item full version of JAWS. The original version of JAWS was in English. Two professional translators, both native speakers separately prepared the preliminary Polish and Estonian versions. Two psychologists (one Polish native speaker, another Estonian native speaker) were involved as the experts for acceptance the translations. Next, two pilot-studies (first group of 15 Polish Human Resource Management (HRM) students, and second group of 15 Estonian HRM students) were provided to address potential translation or conceptual problems. After that, the final version of JAWS was established.

Internal consistencies for the total score and four subscales are in the Table 1. Table 1 shows comparison of internal reliability of JAWS full 30-item version in our results (Estonia - EST, Poland - PL) and comparison with USA (Spector, 2002), Romania - ROM (Cicei et al., 2012), and Slovenia - SL (Rode, 205). Our EST-PL findings demonstrate internal consistency or precision of most factors values above 0.80 that indicate good reliability (Field, 2009; Nunnally and Bernstein, 1994). Moreover, only one PL scale, namely High pleasurable-Low arousal (HPLA) maintained an adequate internal consistency as Cronbach α was 0.72 and this reliability assessed with the widely accepted 0.70 coefficient alpha standard (Nunnally, 1978). It shows quite similar internal reliability as it was in USA and Romanian studies, and Slovenian study

represents good reliability in total JAWS but not satisfactory reliability in all four factors.

Table 1. Comparison of Internal Reliability of Job-Related Affective Well-Being Scale (JAWS) for Estonia (EST) and Poland (PL) with USA, Romania (ROM) and Slovenia (SL)

Reliability Statistics	EST	PL	USA ¹	ROM ²	SL ³
Cronbach α					
Total JAWS (30 items)	0.93	0.89	0.95	0.81	0.89
High pleasurable-High arousal (HPHA)	0.88	0.81	0.90	0.83	0.65
High pleasurable-Low arousal (HPLA)	0.81	0.72	0.81	0.81	0.68
Low pleasurable-High arousal (LPHA)	0.84	0.85	0.80	0.80	0.69
Low pleasurable-Low arousal (LPLA)	0.86	0.83	0.80	0.80	0.62
Number of valid cases	245	186	114	85	94

¹ Results for USA from Paul E. Spector (2002)

² Results for Romania from Cristiana C. Ciceci (2012)

³ Results for Slovenia from Nino Rode (2005)

Table. Within Sample Correlations in Work-related Emotional Wellbeing Scale (WEWS) and Job-Related Affective Well-Being Scale (JAWS) EST-PL sample (N = 431)

	1	2	3	4	5
1. WEWS Total	1				
2. Positive emotional state in workplace	0.60	1			
3. Negative emotional state in workplace	-0.52	-0.19	1		
4. Emotional wellbeing at work: positive	0.75	0.66	-0.20	1	
5. Emotional wellbeing at work: negative	-0.81	-0.30	0.59	-0.22	1
1. JAWS Total	1				
2. High pleasurable-High arousal (HPHA)	0.58	1			
3. High pleasurable-Low arousal (HPLA)	0.65	0.70	1		
4. Low pleasurable-High arousal (LPHA)	-0.73	-0.40	-0.31	1	
5. Low pleasurable-Low arousal (LPLA)	-0.80	-0.32	-0.29	0.86	1

All correlations were statistically significant ($p < 0.05$)

Table. Correlations between Work-related Emotional Wellbeing Scale (WEWS) and Job-Related Affective Well-Being Scale (JAWS) scales (EST-PL samples; n = 431)

WEWS \ JAWS	JAWS Total	High pleasurable -High arousal	High pleasurable -Low arousal	Low pleasurable -High arousal	Low pleasurable -Low arousal
Positive emotional state in workplace	0.61	0.41	0.51	-0.38	-0.43
Negative emotional state in workplace	-0.47	-0.11	-0.21	0.47	0.47
Emotional wellbeing at work: positive	0.72	0.71	0.69	-0.27	-0.37
Emotional wellbeing at work: negative	-0.64	-0.22	-0.15	0.77	0.77

All correlations were statistically significant ($p < 0.05$)

Internal correlations are shown in Table below.

Table. Within Sample Correlations in Work-related Emotional Wellbeing Scale (WEWS) (N = 431)

	1	2	3	4	5
1. WEWS Total	1				
2. Positive emotional state in workplace	0.60	1			
3. Negative emotional state in workplace	-0.52	-0.19	1		
4. Emotional wellbeing at work: positive	0.75	0.66	-0.20	1	
5. Emotional wellbeing at work: negative	-0.81	-0.30	0.59	-0.22	1

All presented correlations are statistically significant ($p < 0.05$)

RELIABILITY

Internal consistency reliability (Cronbach α or coefficient alpha) generally ranges from .70 to .95 (see Table).

Table. Reliability Statistics for WEWS

Reliability Statistics Cronbach α	Number of items	TOTAL (N=788)
WEWS Part 1: Positive emotional state at workplace	5	0.82
WEWS: Negative emotional state at workplace	5	0.70
WEWS Part 2: Emotional wellbeing at work: Positive	15	0.95
WEWS: Emotional wellbeing at work: Negative	15	0.93

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

ESTONIAN NORMS

Estonian Norms for WEWS (see Table). Estonian norms are based on 788 people from 4 samples (one general sample, and 3 occupational (nurses', civil servants', teachers' samples).

Table. WEWS (N = 788) in Part 1: Positive *versus* negative emotional states in workplace, and in Part 2: Work-related emotions in alphabetic order

Part 1: Positive emotional state in workplace	M	SD	Negative emotional state in workplace	M	SD
Satisfaction with quality of working life	4.64	1.01	Feel tired or exhausted	3.42	1.16
Enjoyable work life	4.54	1.04	Feel worried at work	4.09	1.23
Mostly in good mood	4.91	0.90	Feelings of sadness	2.98	1.35
Optimistic	4.80	1.01	Pessimistic	2.56	1.23
Experience positive feelings	4.71	1.01	Experience negative feelings	3.49	1.24
Part 2: I have felt ...	M	SD	I have felt ...	M	SD
Active	4.49	1.00	Hopeless	2.41	1.27
Angry	2.47	1.23	Hostility	2.44	1.29
Annoyed	2.82	1.16	Included	4.21	1.11
Cheerful	4.50	1.05	Irresponsible	2.41	1.30
Comfortable	4.43	1.06	Loneliness	2.36	1.28
Committed	4.56	1.01	Miserable	2.01	1.18
Depressed	2.40	1.20	Motivated	4.38	1.10
Disappointed	2.81	1.17	Optimistic	4.50	1.05
Enthusiastic	4.40	1.02	Pleased	4.52	0.99
Excited	4.13	1.11	Shame	2.15	1.14
Energetic	4.36	1.03	Successful	4.34	1.00
Fun	4.25	1.14	Trust	4.50	1.07
Gloomy	2.36	1.13	Unhappy	2.49	1.23
Happy	4.40	1.02	Unsuccessful	2.51	1.12
Helpless	2.75	1.26	Useless	2.22	1.28

Table. Descriptive statistics of Work Related Emotional Wellbeing Scale (WEWS)

WEWS	TEACHERS (N=144)		NURSES (N=219)		CIVIL SERVANTS (N=89)		EST (N=245)	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
Positive emotional state in workplace	4.88	0.67	5.03***	0.65	4.86	0.60	4.85	0.66
Negative emotional state in workplace	3.59***	0.79	3.46*	0.75	3.52	0.88	3.31	0.82
Emotional wellbeing at work: positive	4.58*	0.72	4.64***	0.64	4.55*	0.60	4.39	0.77
Emotional wellbeing at work: negative	2.51	0.87	2.30	0.74	2.26	0.74	2.41	0.89

Significantly different from the EST sample: * $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.001$

POLISH NORMS

Polish Norms for WEWS (see Table). Polish norms are based on 186 people from one general sample.

Table. WEWS (N = 186) in Part 1: Positive *versus* negative emotional states in workplace, and in Part 2: Work-related emotions in alphabetic order

Part 1: Positive emotional state in workplace			Negative emotional state in workplace		
	M	SD		M	SD
Satisfaction with quality of working life	4.08	1.27	Feel tired or exhausted	3.14	1.24
Enjoyable work life	3.81	1.18	Feel worried at work	3.23	1.32
Mostly in good mood	4.33	1.23	Feelings of sadness	3.03	1.26
Optimistic	4.41	1.22	Pessimistic	2.98	1.37
Experience positive feelings	3.97	1.18	Experience negative feelings	3.37	1.41
Part 2: I have felt ...			I have felt ...		
	M	SD		M	SD
Active	3.97	1.13	Hopeless	2.58	1.43
Angry	2.89	1.27	Hostility	2.67	1.40
Annoyed	2.86	1.24	Included	3.66	1.15
Cheerful	3.73	1.18	Irresponsible	2.54	1.36
Comfortable	3.87	1.05	Loneliness	2.78	1.29
Committed	4.05	1.19	Miserable	2.58	1.22
Depressed	2.79	1.17	Motivated	4.02	1.19
Disappointment	2.94	1.19	Optimistic	4.03	1.30
Enthusiastic	3.95	1.14	Pleased	4.06	1.10
Excited	3.58	1.22	Shame	2.45	1.29
Energetic	3.84	1.11	Successful	3.88	1.20
Fun	3.67	1.28	Trust	3.86	1.27
Gloomy	2.70	1.21	Unhappy	2.76	1.32
Happy	3.99	1.16	Unsuccessful	2.74	1.33
Helpless	2.96	1.31	Useless	2.74	1.38

Table. Descriptive statistics of Work Related Emotional Wellbeing Scale (WEWS)

WEWS Factors	PL (N=186)	
	M	SD
Positive emotional state in workplace	4.20	1.00
Negative emotional state in workplace	3.18	1.08
Emotional wellbeing at work: positive	3.88	0.86
Emotional wellbeing at work: negative	2.73	1.00

CORRELATION BETWEEN WORK-RELATED EMOTIONAL WELLBEING (WEWS) AND PERCEIVED PERFORMANCE

Reliability (Cronbach α or coefficient alpha) between WEWS and PPS was 0.91.

Table. Correlations between work-related emotional wellbeing (measured by Work Related Emotional Wellbeing Scale, WEWS) and perceived performance (measured by Perceived Performance Scale, PPS) (N =974)

WEWS	Perceived performance
Positive emotional state in workplace	0.60*
Negative emotional state in workplace	-0.35*
Emotional wellbeing at work: positive	0.59*
Emotional wellbeing at work: negative	-0.40*

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

PUBLICATIONS and/or CONFERENCES

(Bibliography of Studies Using the Work-Related Emotional Wellbeing Scale)

Teichmann, M., Murdvee, M., Kożusznik, B., Smorzewska, B., Gaidajenko, A., Ilvest, J. Jr. (2017). *Relationship between the Employees' Perceived Performance and Various Work Related Psychosocial Characteristics*. European Association of Work and Organizational Psychology (EAWOP) Congress "Enabling Change through Work and Organizational Psychology", May 17th - 20th 2017, Dublin, Ireland (in press).

Teichmann, M., Murdvee, M., Rudnicka, P., Chrupala-Pniak, M., Kożusznik, B., Ilvest, J.Jr., Gaidajenko, A., Smorzewska, B., Wiecek, K. (2017). *Does Emotional Wellbeing Relate to Teachers' Perceived Performance* (in press).

Teichmann, M. (2017). *Changing world of work*. In Congress "Psychology in the crossroad of traditions and innovations or Psychology between traditions and innovations", 11th of May, 2017, Vilnius. Lithuania (in press).