

The Situational Strength at Work (SSW) Scale

The Situational Strength at Work (SSW) Scale is based on the situational strength facet structure proposed by Meyer, Dalal, & Hermida (2010). The development and validation of the SSW is published in Meyer, Dalal, José, Hermida, Chen, Vega, Brooks, & Khare (2014).

Instructions: Please use the following 1-7 scale when answering the following questions about your current job's general work environment.

Strongly Disagree		Neither Agree nor Disagree				Strongly Agree	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	

1. On this job, specific information about work-related responsibilities is provided.
2. On this job, easy-to-understand information is provided about work requirements.
3. On this job, straightforward information is provided about what an employee needs to do to succeed.
4. On this job, an employee is told exactly what to expect.
5. On this job, precise information is provided about how to properly do one's job.
6. On this job, specific information is provided about which tasks to complete.
7. On this job, an employee is told exactly what is expected from him/her.
8. On this job, different sources of work information are always consistent with each other.
9. On this job, responsibilities are compatible with each other.
10. On this job, all requirements are highly compatible with each other.
11. On this job, procedures remain completely consistent over time.
12. On this job, supervisor instructions match the organization's official policies.
13. On this job, informal guidance typically matches official policies.
14. On this job, information is generally the same, no matter who provides it.
15. On this job, an employee is prevented from making his/her own decisions.
16. On this job, constraints prevent an employee from doing this in his/her own way.
17. On this job, an employee is prevented from choosing how to do things.
18. On this job, an employee's freedom to make decisions is limited by other people.
19. On this job, outside forces limit an employee's freedom to make decisions.
20. On this job, procedures prevent an employee from working in his/her own way.
21. On this job, other people limit what an employee can do.
22. On this job, an employee's decisions have extremely important consequences for other people.
23. On this job, very serious consequences occur when an employee makes an error.
24. On this job, important outcomes are influenced by an employee's actions.
25. On this job, other people are put at risk when an employee performs poorly.
26. On this job, mistakes are more harmful than they are for almost all other jobs.
27. On this job, tasks are more important than those in almost all other jobs.
28. On this job, there are consequences if an employee deviates from what is expected.

Notes:

¹ "On this job..." can be replaced with alternative phrases to best suit the user's purposes. For example, "In this organization..." "On this team..." "Under this supervisor..."

² Items 1-7 measure the clarity facets of situational strength, items 7-14 measure the consistency

facet, items 15-21 measure the constraints facet, and items 22-28 measure the consequences facet (see Meyer, Dalal, & Hermida, 2010 for specific definitions of each). Within each facet, items are arranged from best to worst (see Meyer, et al., 2014 for more detailed psychometric information).

Scoring:

Scoring can be performed at the facet-level by averaging the items for the facets outlined in Note 2 above. Scoring can be performed at the Global Situational Strength level by averaging all 28 items. No items are reverse-scored or differentially weighted.

Instrument Reference

Meyer, R. D., Dalal, R. S., José, I. J., Hermida, R., Chen, T. R., Vega, R. P., Brooks, C. K., Khare, V. P. (2014). Measuring job-related situational strength and assessing its interactive effects with personality on voluntary work behavior. *Journal of Management*, 40(4), 1010-1041. DOI: 10.1177/0149206311425613

Model Reference

Meyer, R. D., Dalal, R. S., & Hermida, R. (2010). A review and synthesis of situational strength in the organizational sciences. *Journal of Management*, 36(1), 121-140. DOI: 10.1177/0149206309349309