

Research Process and Data Collection for Workplace Absenteeism

Posted on March 22, 2019

View this essay online:

<https://academic-master.com/research-process-and-data-collection-for-workplace-absenteeism/>

Introduction

Workplace absenteeism refers to nonattendance when an employee is scheduled to work, but meaningful research must distinguish among very different reasons for absence. Employees may miss work because of illness, disability, caregiving, bereavement, transportation problems, unsafe conditions, burnout, workplace conflict, approved leave, or deliberate withdrawal. Treating every absence as intentional misconduct creates a poor research design because it builds a conclusion into the definition before evidence is collected. Excessive absence can disrupt staffing, raise overtime costs, reduce continuity, and affect morale, yet pressure to maintain perfect attendance can also encourage presenteeism, in which employees work while too ill to function safely or productively. A useful study should therefore examine patterns, causes, and organizational context rather than simply count missed days. The strongest approach combines administrative attendance records with employee perspectives so that researchers can identify when absence occurs, how frequently it occurs, which groups experience it, and what working or personal conditions may explain the pattern. This essay outlines a systematic research process and evaluates the major data-collection methods suitable for investigating workplace absenteeism (Johns, 2010; Ruhle et al., 2020).

Defining the Research Problem and Questions

A study begins by defining exactly what problem is being investigated. "Absenteeism is high" is too broad because it does not identify the organization, time period, employee group, type of absence, or purpose of the research. A more useful question might ask why unscheduled absence increased among customer-service employees during the previous twelve months, whether workload and supervisor support predict absence frequency, or whether flexible scheduling changed short-term absence patterns. Operational definitions are equally important. Researchers may distinguish absence frequency, meaning separate episodes, from absence duration, meaning total days lost. Authorized vacation, maternity leave, occupational injury, and unexplained nonattendance should not be combined without justification. The literature review then identifies established variables such as workload, health, job satisfaction, work-family conflict, leadership, organizational support, scheduling, and workplace climate. It also helps researchers recognize confounding factors and avoid interpreting correlation as cause. Research questions should remain neutral enough to permit results that

contradict management expectations, because a study designed only to confirm that employees are irresponsible cannot produce a credible explanation.

Design, Sampling, and Ethical Protection

The design should match the question. A cross-sectional survey can describe current associations but cannot establish which factor came first, while longitudinal records can reveal whether changes in work conditions precede changes in absence. A case study can examine one organization deeply, and a quasi-experimental design can compare outcomes before and after a policy change or between similar units. Mixed methods are particularly valuable because attendance records reveal patterns but rarely explain motives. Sampling should also reflect the population. Stratified sampling can ensure representation across departments, roles, or shifts, while convenience sampling may overrepresent employees who have time or strong opinions. Ethical protection is essential because absenteeism research can affect employment and may involve health, disability, caregiving, harassment, or conflict with managers. Participation in interviews or surveys should be voluntary, confidentiality protections should be realistic rather than overstated, and administrative data should be minimized and coded wherever possible. Reports should suppress small groups when individuals could be inferred. Employees need confidence that honest responses will not become disciplinary evidence simply because they participated in research.

Questionnaires and Interviews

Questionnaires are useful when researchers need standardized information from many employees at relatively low cost. They can measure perceived workload, supervisor support, job satisfaction, work-family conflict, policy knowledge, stress, and attendance motivation using validated scales. Anonymous or confidential administration may make employees more willing to discuss sensitive issues, although researchers should not promise anonymity when demographic combinations or data linkage could identify participants. Surveys are limited by nonresponse, memory error, social desirability, and questions that respondents interpret differently. Semi-structured interviews complement surveys by allowing participants to explain how absence decisions develop over time. An employee may describe the interaction of recurring illness, inflexible scheduling, transport, or a difficult supervisor in ways that a fixed-response item cannot capture. Interviews also allow clarification and probing but require trained researchers, transcription, secure storage, and systematic coding. Power matters: employees may not speak freely to an interviewer closely connected with management. Independent interviewing, private settings, and clearly stated confidentiality procedures can improve the quality of the evidence (Brinkmann, 2014).

Administrative Records and Additional Evidence

Attendance records provide dates, duration, department, shift, tenure, and leave categories without depending on memory, making them especially useful for longitudinal analysis. Their limitation is that organizational codes do not necessarily reveal the real reason for an absence. A record labeled “sick leave” may reflect infection, chronic illness, mental distress, caregiving, or another circumstance, while an unexplained absence may result from a reporting failure rather than deliberate misconduct. Data quality should therefore be audited before analysis. Focus groups can reveal shared norms about attendance, resentment, workload, and how supervisors apply policy, although group settings are unsuitable for confidential medical details and may silence lower-status participants. Observation and work-process analysis can identify staffing pressure, missed breaks, ergonomic problems, handoff failures, or peak-demand conditions that employees have come to regard as normal. These methods shift attention from presumed individual motivation toward the design of work. The best evidence often comes from triangulation: records establish the pattern, surveys quantify relevant experiences, interviews explain mechanisms, and process observation tests whether reported conditions can be seen in everyday operations.

Analysis, Interpretation, and Intervention

Quantitative analysis should begin with careful data cleaning, missing-value assessment, and descriptive statistics. Averages alone can be misleading because a small number of long medical absences may dominate total days lost, while frequent short episodes may reflect a different process. Depending on the question, researchers may use regression, count models, time-series analysis, or multilevel models while controlling for relevant factors such as job type, season, tenure, staffing, and health. Qualitative material should be coded transparently and interpreted for both common themes and meaningful differences. Findings require context. A department with higher absence may have dangerous work, severe understaffing, a high proportion of caregivers, or a manager who appropriately encourages sick employees to remain home. A reduction in recorded absence may indicate improved well-being, but it may also reflect fear of discipline. Recommendations should therefore match identified causes. Flexible scheduling, workload redesign, supervisor training, health support, transportation assistance, fair leave practices, or attention to bullying may be more effective than punitive attendance points when the underlying problem is organizational.

Conclusion

Research on workplace absenteeism is strongest when it treats absence as a phenomenon to be explained rather than a character flaw to be assumed. The process should define the exact problem, review existing evidence, develop neutral research questions, operationalize concepts, choose an appropriate design, protect participants, collect data consistently, and integrate quantitative and

qualitative findings. Questionnaires provide scale and comparability, interviews provide context and explanation, administrative records establish longitudinal patterns, and focus groups or observation can reveal social and organizational mechanisms. None of these methods is sufficient alone. Researchers must distinguish authorized from unauthorized absence, frequency from duration, and absenteeism from presenteeism while avoiding assumptions that every missed day reflects low commitment. The purpose of research should be to identify conditions that improve health, fairness, continuity, and organizational performance. A mixed-methods study that combines records, confidential employee data, and careful follow-up is therefore more useful than a simple attendance count because it can guide interventions that address causes instead of merely punishing symptoms.

Works Cited

- Brinkmann, S. (2014). Interview. In T. Teo (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Critical Psychology* (pp. 1008–1010). Springer.
- Cucchiella, F., Gastaldi, M., & Ranieri, L. (2014). Managing absenteeism in the workplace: The case of an Italian multiutility company. *Procedia—Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 150, 1157–1166.
- Johns, G. (2010). Presenteeism in the workplace: A review and research agenda. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 31(4), 519–542.
- Ruhle, S. A., Breitsohl, H., Aboagye, E., et al. (2020). “To work, or not to work, that is the question”—Recent trends and avenues for research on presenteeism. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 29(3), 344–363.