

Presenteeism and Absenteeism Test

© 2016, PE Konsult Ltd. All rights reserved

Presenteeism and absenteeism are organizational culture phenomenon. Absenteeism means the frequent or habitual absence from work, school, etc. Absenteeism is a habitual pattern of absence from a duty or obligation. There are two types of presenteeism: (1) employee presence at workplace but is occupied with non-work activities (Facebook, private e-mails etc.); (2) being at work when you should be at home either because you are ill or because you are working such long hours that you are no longer effective.

Presenteeism and Absenteeism Test included four factors, namely: Absence culture (6 items), Presenteeism (14 items), Health (6 items), Absenteeism (8 items), and lie-scale. Questions/statements are like “You have felt sleepiness at work” or “You came late to an appointment or meeting” or “You have felt exhausted during a workday”. Presenteeism and Absenteeism Test is a 34-item psychometric test Responses are made on a 1-point Likert-type force choice frequency scale 1-point “Never, very infrequently” to 6-points “Very frequently, always”.

THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

Absence culture is the part of corporate culture in which absenteeism is condoned. The concept of absence culture is valuable because it provides a new perspective on researching absence that recognizes how individual behaviour may be constrained by the collective reality of organizations (Johns & Nicholson, 1985). The concept of absence culture was initially developed by Hill and Trist (1953, 1955 as cited in Iverson, Buttigieg, Maguire, 2013) in an attempt to explain the association between absence and different phases in employee job tenure.

Initially, absenteeism had been defined rather broadly, such as, “Any failure to report for or remain at work as scheduled, regardless of the reason” (Cascio, 1998). Absenteeism is a habitual [pattern](#) of absence from a [duty](#) or [obligation](#). Traditionally, absenteeism has been viewed as an indicator of poor individual performance, as well as a breach of an implicit contract between employee and employer; it was seen as a management problem, and framed in economic or quasi-economic terms (Johns, 2007). One of the earliest conceptualizations of presenteeism was “on-the-job absenteeism”, wherein employees are merely physically present (Trice & Belasco, 1967).

Cooper (1996) defined presenteeism as “being at work when you should be at home either because you are ill or because you are working such long hours that you are no longer effective.” Simpson (1998) echoes the latter sentiment, suggesting that presenteeism is when an employee stays at work beyond the time that is needed for effective job performance. In essence, all definitions of presenteeism will include suboptimal performance as a key indicator, regardless of the cause of decreased performance, e.g. illness, injury, or other circumstances (Hemp, 2004). Presenteeism or working while sick can cause productivity loss, poor health, exhaustion and workplace epidemics. While the contrasting subject of [absenteeism](#) has historically received

extensive attention in the management sciences, presenteeism has only recently been studied (Johns, 2010).

In a nod to such dissection, De Beer (2007) distinguishes between health and non-health related presenteeism, categorizing health related impairment impaired presenteeism and impairment unrelated to health, such as boredom, distraction, or stimulation as motivational or disengagement presenteeism. D’Abate and Eddy (2007) further dissect presenteeism in describing nonwork-related presenteeism, wherein employees are at work, but spend a portion of the workday engaging in personal but spend a portion of the workday engaging in personal business on the job. Nonetheless, it is worth noting that other researchers have argued that such dissection is of little importance because regardless of origin, the outcome remains the same, that of suboptimal performance (D’Abate & Eddy, 2007; Schultz, Chen & Edington, 2009).

VALIDATION

For validation of our psychometric Presenteeism and Absenteeism Test we used Stanford Presenteeism Scale (SPS-6) (N=727; Cronbach α was 0.89), and The Health and Work Performance Questionnaire (HPQ). In HPQ: Presenteeism Scale Items (N=727; Cronbach α was 0.79), and The Health and Work Performance Questionnaire (HPQ); HPQ: Absenteeism Scale Items (N=727; Cronbach α was 0.90)

Internal correlations are shown in Table below.

Table. Within Sample Correlations in Presenteeism and Absenteeism Test (N =789)

Factors	1	2	3	4
1. Absence culture	1			
2. Presenteeism	0.83	1		
3. Health	0.91	0.48	1	
4. Absenteeism	0.43	0.57	0.58	1

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

RELIABILITY

Internal consistency reliability (Cronbach α or coefficient alpha) was 0.87; Generally ranges from 0.70 to 0.89 (see Table below).

Table. Reliability Statistics for Presenteeism and Absenteeism Test (N =789)

Presenteeism and Absenteeism Test Factors	Number of items	Reliability Statistics* Cronbach α
1. Absence culture	6	0.77
2. Presenteeism	14	0.83
3. Health	6	0.70
4. Absenteeism	8	0.89

* Widely is accepted 0.70 coefficient alpha as a standard (Nunnally, 1978)

ESTONIAN NORMS

Estonian Norms for Presenteeism and Absenteeism Test (see Table)

Estonian norms are based on 501 people from 4 samples (one general sample, N=266, and three occupational samples).

Table. Descriptive statistics of Presenteeism and Absenteeism Test results in Estonia.

Presenteeism and Absenteeism Test	CHIEF NURSES (N=65)		NURSES (N=55)		CIVIL SERVANTS (N=115)		EST (N=266)	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
1. Absence culture	2.82	0.53	2.90	0.69	2.85***	0.60	3.21	0.68
2. Presenteeism	3.38	0.85	3.35	0.85	3.30	0.81	3.46	0.88
3. Health	2.43	0.58	2.70	0.75	2.60***	0.68	3.08	0.75
4. Absenteeism	2.35	0.39	2.17	0.34	2.36	0.31	2.28	0.52

Significantly different from the EST sample: * $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$; *** $p < 0.001$

POLISH NORMS

Polish Norms for Presenteeism and Absenteeism Test (see Table)

Polish norms are based on 226 people from one general sample.

Table. Descriptive statistics of Presenteeism and Absenteeism Test results in Poland.

Factors	M	SD
1. Absence culture	3.18	0.93
2. Presenteeism	3.36	1.04
3. Health	3.04	1.03
4. Absenteeism	2.46	0.78

CORRELATION BETWEEN PRESENTEEISM & ABSENTEEISM AND PERCEIVED PERFORMANCE

Reliability between Presenteeism and Absenteeism Test test and Perceived Performance Scale (PPS) was 0.92.

Table. Correlations between Presenteeism and Absenteeism Test and perceived performance (measured by Perceived Performance Scale) (N =297)

	Perceived performance
1. Absence culture	-0.33
2. Presenteeism	-0.12
3. Health	-0.42
4. Absenteeism	-0.35

All correlations are negative and statistically significant ($p < 0.05$)

PUBLICATIONS and/or CONFERENCES

(Bibliography of Studies Using Presenteeism and Absenteeism Test)

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 6th of October 2016.

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*. In: 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. (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).