Background

What is grit?
- “a positive, non-cognitive personality trait based on an individual’s passion for a particular long-term goal or end state, combined with a powerful motivation to achieve their respective objective” (Duckworth, Peterson, Matthews, & Kelly, 2007)

Current job performance predictors include:
- Personality Measures
  - Big Five (Conscientiousness)
  - Integrity Tests
- Cognitive Ability
- Past Accomplishments
- Skill-based Assessments

Why should grit be a good predictor for job performance?
- Personality trait
- Slight overlap with Conscientiousness (Duckworth, Peterson, Matthews, & Kelly, 2007)
- Increase the incremental validity with Conscientiousness
- Moderate positive correlation with cognitive ability
- Good prediction with other workplace variables
  - Job tenure (Eskreis-Winkler, Shulman, Beal & Duckworth, 2014)
  - Psychological resilience (Maddi, Matthews, Kelly, Villarreal, & White, 2012)
  - Organizational Citizenship Behavior

But grit is usually measured as a general trait, not specific to the workplace.
- Personality measures are better predictors when the items and instructions specifically reference the workplace.

Grit may predict better in jobs that are less satisfying or less instrumental for the employee.
- More willing to put in effort even for jobs that don’t satisfy one’s long-term career goals.

Discussion

• Because we are still collecting data now, we just could guess infer what will mean.
• Based on our current data, the results indicated that grit in general was negatively related to task performance, which was opposite of our hypothesis.
• In addition, grit in workplace was negative correlated with task performance and OCBI, which was also opposite of our hypothesis.
• For other hypothesis, our results could support them partly. However, more data are desired to make the supports stronger.

Hypotheses & Method

Hypothesis 1: Grit is a one-dimensional construct.
Hypothesis 2: Grit is positively related to conscientiousness, both in general and workplace-specific forms.
Hypothesis 3: Grit is positively related to job performance, job satisfaction and organizational citizenship behavior.
Hypothesis 4: For measuring grit in workplace, workplace (specific) version will be better than general version.
Hypothesis 5: Grit will better predict performance for participants in jobs that are not related to their career path.
Hypothesis 6: Workplace version will have better validity and reliability to predict job performance, job satisfaction and organizational citizenship behavior.

Method: Anonymous online survey. Participants are randomly assigned to complete measures of grit and conscientiousness that are workplace-specific (treatment) or general (control). Participants then complete measures of work behavior (task performance and citizenship), job satisfaction, and demographic information.

Results

Data collection is still in progress. To date, 14 participants have completed the measures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workplace</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 descriptive statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Grit (general)</th>
<th>Grit (workplace)</th>
<th>Conscientiousness (general)</th>
<th>Conscientiousness (workplace)</th>
<th>Task performance</th>
<th>OCBI</th>
<th>OCBO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grit (general)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.46</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grit (workplace)</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>-.51</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness (general)</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness (workplace)</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task performance</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>-.51</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>-.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCBI</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCBO</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 correlations among all the variables
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