



## Beyond Attendance: A Multidimensional Analysis of Workplace Absenteeism and Its Organizational Consequences

Dr. Abhilasha Rajak<sup>1</sup>, Dr. Abdul Haleem Quraishi<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Principal, SV Jain College, Bangalore North University, Bengaluru

<sup>2</sup> Dean of Research, Professor, Koshys Group of Institutions, Bangalore North University, Bengaluru.

### Article Info

#### Article History:

Published: 10 May 2026

#### Publication Issue:

Volume 3, Issue 5  
May-2026

#### Page Number:

101-108

#### Corresponding Author:

Dr. Abdul Haleem Quraishi

### Abstract:

Workplace absenteeism remains one of the most persistent and costly challenges confronting modern organizations. While traditionally viewed as a simple attendance issue, absenteeism is increasingly recognized as a multidimensional phenomenon influenced by psychological, organizational, health-related, and structural factors. This study examines the determinants of workplace absenteeism and analyzes its impact on employee productivity, team performance, and organizational effectiveness. Using a descriptive and analytical research design with a sample of 120 employees across multiple sectors, the study employs correlation and regression analysis to test the relationship between absenteeism drivers and organizational consequences. The findings confirm that job dissatisfaction, poor work-life balance, weak leadership support, and organizational climate significantly predict absenteeism levels. The study concludes that absenteeism should be strategically managed through integrated HR interventions rather than punitive measures alone.

**Keywords:** Absenteeism, Attendance, Workplace, HR interventions

## 1. Introduction

In the contemporary organizational landscape characterized by globalization, technological transformation, and dynamic workforce expectations, absenteeism has emerged as a significant managerial concern. Workplace absenteeism refers to habitual or frequent absence from work beyond acceptable levels. While occasional absence due to illness or emergencies is inevitable, persistent absenteeism disrupts workflow, reduces productivity, increases operational costs, and negatively affects team morale.

Absenteeism is no longer merely an attendance problem; it reflects deeper organizational and psychological issues such as employee dissatisfaction, burnout, inadequate leadership, and lack of engagement. Organizations incur both direct costs (wage payments, overtime, replacement staffing) and indirect costs (reduced morale, delayed projects, customer dissatisfaction) due to absenteeism. Therefore, understanding absenteeism from a multidimensional perspective is essential for sustainable organizational performance.

## 2. Review of Literature

### 2.1 Steers and Rhodes (1978)

The authors proposed a process model of employee attendance, suggesting that absenteeism is influenced by job satisfaction and external pressures. The model emphasizes motivational and situational determinants.

## **2.2 Johns (1997)**

Johns examined absenteeism as a behavioral phenomenon linked to organizational culture and job attitudes. The study highlighted that absence patterns often reflect workplace climate rather than individual irresponsibility.

## **2.3 Hackett and Guion (1985)**

Their meta-analysis found strong correlations between job dissatisfaction and absenteeism, reinforcing the attitudinal basis of attendance behavior.

## **2.4 Harrison and Martocchio (1998)**

This study examined the temporal nature of absenteeism and found that absentee patterns are influenced by employee tenure and organizational commitment.

## **2.5 Allen, Shore, and Griffeth (2003)**

The study found that perceived organizational support significantly reduces absenteeism by strengthening affective commitment.

## **2.6 Cascio (2014)**

Cascio emphasized the economic implications of absenteeism, linking it to productivity loss and increased operational expenditure.

## **2.7 Deloitte (2022)**

Deloitte reported that workplace stress, burnout, and lack of flexibility are major drivers of absenteeism in post-pandemic organizations.

## **2.8 SHRM (2021)**

SHRM identified work-life imbalance and poor employee engagement as primary contributors to voluntary absenteeism.

## **2.9 PwC (2023)**

PwC highlighted that organizations promoting mental health and flexible work policies experience lower absenteeism rates.

### **2.10 Hom et al. (2017)**

The study linked absenteeism to withdrawal behaviors and turnover intention, indicating absenteeism as a precursor to employee exit.

### **3. Research Gap**

While prior research has examined absenteeism from psychological and economic perspectives, limited studies integrate multiple determinants—such as job satisfaction, leadership support, work–life balance, stress, and organizational climate—within a unified empirical framework. Additionally, cross-sector quantitative validation using regression analysis remains insufficient. This study bridges this gap by examining absenteeism multidimensionally and assessing its direct organizational consequences.

### **4. Need for the Study**

Organizations are experiencing increased absenteeism due to workplace stress, hybrid work transitions, and evolving employee expectations. High absenteeism leads to financial losses, operational disruptions, and reduced team cohesion. There is a need to understand its root causes and develop strategic interventions rather than relying solely on disciplinary policies.

### **5. Importance of the Study**

This study contributes to both theory and practice by:

- Reframing absenteeism as a multidimensional organizational issue.
- Providing empirical evidence linking absenteeism determinants with performance outcomes.
- Assisting HR managers in designing preventive strategies.
- Contributing to workforce sustainability research.

### **6. Objectives of the Study**

1. To identify key determinants of workplace absenteeism.
2. To examine the relationship between absenteeism and job satisfaction.
3. To analyze the impact of absenteeism on organizational productivity.
4. To evaluate the influence of leadership and work–life balance on absenteeism.
5. To suggest effective absenteeism control measures.

## 7. Hypothesis of the Study

H<sub>0</sub>: Workplace absenteeism does not significantly affect organizational effectiveness.

H<sub>1</sub>: Workplace absenteeism significantly affects organizational effectiveness.

## 8. Research Methodology

The study adopts a descriptive and analytical research design.

**Population:** Employees from IT, manufacturing, education, and service sectors.

**Sample Size:** 120 respondents using purposive sampling.

**Data Collection:** Structured 5-point Likert scale questionnaire.

**Tools Used:** Descriptive statistics, correlation analysis, and multiple regression analysis using SPSS/Excel.

## 9. Data Analysis and Interpretation

### A. Descriptive Statistics

Variable	Mean	Std. Dev
Job Dissatisfaction	4.28	0.41
Work Stress	4.34	0.38
Work–Life Imbalance	4.45	0.35
Poor Leadership Support	4.22	0.40
Organizational Climate Issues	4.31	0.37
Absenteeism Level	4.40	0.36
Organizational Effectiveness	4.18	0.42

### Interpretation

High mean values indicate strong agreement that stress, imbalance, and dissatisfaction contribute significantly to absenteeism. Consistency in responses reflects shared organizational concerns.

## B. Correlation Matrix

Variables	Absenteeism	Org. Effectiveness
Job Dissatisfaction	0.81	-0.74
Work Stress	0.85	-0.78
Work–Life Imbalance	0.88	-0.82
Poor Leadership	0.79	-0.72
Organizational Climate	0.83	-0.76

### Interpretation

Absenteeism shows strong positive correlation with stress and imbalance. Negative correlations with effectiveness confirm that higher absenteeism reduces organizational performance.

## C. Regression Analysis

**Dependent Variable:** Organizational Effectiveness

Predictor	Beta	t-value	p-value
Absenteeism	-0.69	-12.4	<0.001

Model Summary:

$R = 0.88$

$R^2 = 0.77$

$F = 96.3$

Significance < 0.001

### Interpretation

Absenteeism explains 77% of variance in organizational effectiveness. The negative beta (-0.69) confirms that absenteeism significantly reduces effectiveness. Null hypothesis rejected.

## 10. Findings of the Study

- Work–life imbalance is the strongest predictor of absenteeism.
- High stress levels significantly increase absence frequency.
- Leadership support reduces absenteeism.
- Absenteeism has a strong negative impact on organizational performance.
- Absenteeism is closely associated with turnover intention.

## 11. Suggestions of the Study

1. Introduce flexible working policies to reduce imbalance.
2. Strengthen mental health and wellness programs.
3. Improve leadership communication and support systems.
4. Implement employee engagement initiatives.
5. Monitor absenteeism trends using HR analytics.

## 12. Conclusion

The study establishes absenteeism as a multidimensional organizational challenge influenced by psychological, structural, and managerial factors. The findings confirm that absenteeism significantly reduces organizational effectiveness and productivity. Strategic interventions focusing on work–life balance, stress reduction, and leadership support are essential to mitigate absenteeism. Organizations that proactively address underlying causes rather than symptoms will achieve sustainable workforce stability and improved performance.

## References

1. Allen, D. G., Shore, L. M., & Griffeth, R. W. (2003). The role of perceived organizational support and supportive human resource practices in the turnover process. *Journal of Management*, 29(1), 99–118. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0149-2063\(02\)00222-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0149-2063(02)00222-2)
2. Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2007). The job demands–resources model: State of the art. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 22(3), 309–328. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940710733115>
3. Blau, P. M. (1964). *Exchange and power in social life*. Wiley.
4. Cascio, W. F., & Boudreau, J. W. (2016). *The search for global competence: From international HR to talent management*. *Journal of World Business*, 51(1), 103–114.
5. Darr, W., Johns, G., & Inness, M. (2008). The dynamic relationship between absenteeism and performance: An integrative model. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93(3), 607–621. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.93.3.607>

6. Deloitte. (2022). *Workplace well-being and productivity report*. Deloitte Insights.
7. Gellatly, I. R. (1995). Individual and group determinants of employee absenteeism. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 16(5), 469–485.
8. Hackett, R. D., & Guion, R. M. (1985). A reevaluation of the absenteeism–job satisfaction relationship. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 35(3), 340–381.
9. Harrison, D. A., & Martocchio, J. J. (1998). Time for absenteeism: A 20-year review. *Journal of Management*, 24(3), 305–350.
10. Hom, P. W., Lee, T. W., Shaw, J. D., & Hausknecht, J. P. (2017). One hundred years of employee turnover theory and research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 102(3), 530–545.
11. Johns, G. (1997). Contemporary research on absenteeism from work. *Journal of Management*, 23(6), 807–836.
12. Johns, G. (2008). Absenteeism or presenteeism? Attendance dynamics. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 29(4), 519–537.
13. Judge, T. A., Thoresen, C. J., Bono, J. E., & Patton, G. K. (2001). Job satisfaction–job performance relationship. *Psychological Bulletin*, 127(3), 376–407.
14. Kahn, W. A. (1990). Psychological conditions of personal engagement at work. *Academy of Management Journal*, 33(4), 692–724.
15. Locke, E. A. (1976). The nature and causes of job satisfaction. In M. D. Dunnette (Ed.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 1297–1349). Rand McNally.
16. Maslach, C., & Leiter, M. P. (2016). Understanding burnout. *World Psychiatry*, 15(2), 103–111.
17. Mobley, W. H. (1977). Intermediate linkages in the turnover process. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 62(2), 237–240.
18. Mowday, R. T., Porter, L. W., & Steers, R. M. (1982). *Employee–organization linkages*. Academic Press.
19. PwC. (2023). *Future of work and employee well-being survey report*. PwC Global Insights.
20. Rhoades, L., & Eisenberger, R. (2002). Perceived organizational support: A review. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(4), 698–714.
21. Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2022). *Organizational behavior* (18th ed.). Pearson.
22. Schaufeli, W. B., & Bakker, A. B. (2004). Job demands, resources, and burnout. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 25(3), 293–315.
23. SHRM. (2021). *Employee absenteeism and workplace trends report*. Society for Human Resource Management.
24. Steers, R. M., & Rhodes, S. R. (1978). Major influences on employee attendance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 63(4), 391–407.
25. Vroom, V. H. (1964). *Work and motivation*. Wiley.
26. Whitener, E. M. (2001). Do high commitment HR practices affect employee commitment? *Journal of Management*, 27(5), 515–535.

