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What should you know?

Absenteeism:
An employee's intentional or habitual absence from work
Article 1:

Aversive Workplace Conditions and Absenteeism: Taking Referent Group Norms and Supervisor Support Into Account

Authors: Michal Biron and Peter Bamberger
Hypothesis 1: “There is a positive association between perceived workplace hazards and employee absenteeism”

Table 1  
Means, Standard Deviations, and Intercorrelations (Pearson) of the Measured Variables ($N = 492$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$M$</th>
<th>$SD$</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender (0 = male; 1 = female)</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (years)</td>
<td>46.05</td>
<td>8.05</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>11.42</td>
<td>6.23</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.46**</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity (0 = White; 1 = minority)</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>.12**</td>
<td>-.17**</td>
<td>-.23**</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average work hours per week</td>
<td>45.46</td>
<td>9.59</td>
<td>-.13**</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division (buses)</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>-.32**</td>
<td>-.18**</td>
<td>-.32**</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division (underground operations)</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.25**</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative affectivity</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.10*</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived job hazards</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.09#</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical aversive incidents</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.08#</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.09*</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group absence norms</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.12**</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.08#</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>.14**</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor support</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.10*</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.16**</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absenteeism</td>
<td>19.34</td>
<td>12.95</td>
<td>.08#</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.11*</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p < .1$.  * $p < .05$.  ** $p < .01$.  
# $p < .1$.  ## $p < .01$.  ### $p < .001$.  
#### $p < .0001$.  
##### $p < .00001$.  
###### $p < .000001$.
- Two-way interaction between perceived job hazards and referent group norms when supervisor support is at 1 SD below the mean.
- LOW SUPERVISOR SUPPORT
- .190, p<.01
- Two-way interaction between perceived job hazards and referent group norms when supervisor support is at 1 SD above the mean.
- HIGH SUPERVISOR SUPPORT
- .101, p<.05
Hypothesis 2: The relationship between perceived job hazards and absenteeism will be stronger as a function of more referent group absence norms.

Hypothesis 3: Perceived job hazards and absenteeism will be weaker as a function of more supportive supervision.

Hypothesis 4

- The effect of referent group absence norms on the perceived job hazards-absence association will be stronger when supervisor support is low & will be weaker when supervisor support is high.
- Three-way interaction
Results

Hypothesis 2, 3, and 4 were supported from this research

- Aversive work conditions and number of days absent was more positive under conditions of more permissive subjective referent group norms
- Significant three-way interaction among job hazards, group norms, and supervisor support
  - Indicates that job hazards-norms interaction should be examined separately at different levels of supervisor support
Take-Home Message

- More positive supervisor support
- Improve culture (group norms)
Article 2:

The Association of Meaningfulness, Well-Being, and Engagement with Absenteeism: A Moderated Mediation Model

Emma Soane, Amanda Shantz, Kerstin Alfes, Catherine Truss, Chris Rees, and Mark Gatenby
Measures and Methods

**Meaningfulness:** “The work I do is meaningful to me”

**Well-being:** “I don’t lose sleep over work related issues”

**Employee Engagement:** “I am enthusiastic about my job”

**Absences:** from 3 month period collected from HR manager

**Broaden-and-build theory:**
broadening the attention through positive emotions

**Engagement theory:**
understanding social complexities like social life or social relations
Hypothesis 1: Meaningfulness is negatively and significantly related to absence.

Hypothesis 2: Meaningfulness is positively related to engagement.

Hypothesis 3: The relationship between meaningfulness and absence is mediated by engagement.

Hypothesis 4: The relationship between meaningfulness and engagement is moderated by well-being, such that well-being strengthens the relationship.
Tests

Step 1: Show causal variable (meaningfulness) correlates (negatively) with outcome variable (absence)

Step 2: Show causal variable (meaningfulness) correlates with mediator (engagement)

Step 3: Show mediator (engagement) affects outcome variable (absence) and may be correlated to causal variable (meaningfulness)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Engagement</th>
<th>Absence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td>Step 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.01 (.07)</td>
<td>.12* (.18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.01* (.01)</td>
<td>-.05 (.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard-Copy Questionnaire</td>
<td>.06 (.07)</td>
<td>-.28** (.16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meaningfulness</td>
<td>.69** (.02)</td>
<td>-.08* (.04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.14** (.07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-statistic</td>
<td>158.75**</td>
<td>11.63**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$ (Adj. $R^2$)</td>
<td>.51 (.51)</td>
<td>.07 (.06)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: *p < .05, **p < .01.
Well-being strengthens relationship between engagement and meaningfulness at both high and low levels.

- Stronger for individuals with higher levels of well-being.
Implications for HR Practitioners

Supports emphasis on:

- positive work environments
- proactive management of absences
- focus on well-being
Am I the only one this supervisor is laughing at? Effects of aggressive humor on employee strain and addictive behaviors

Authors: Yuanyuan Huo, Wing Lam, Ziguang Chen
Terms To Know

- **Aggressive Humor** - humor that teases, denigrates, criticizes, maligns, disparages, is disrespectful, is mean-spirited, intends to embarrass, or ridicules individuals or groups of individuals.

- **Employee (Strain)** - refers to employees’ physical and psychological stress in their work environment.
Objectives

● Examine the effects of supervisors’ aggressive humor directed towards focal employees

● Examine the amount of strain aggressive supervisor humor imposes on focal employees in comparison to the amount of strain aggressive humor imposes on focal employees and their peers

● Examine the association between aggressive supervisor humor and addictive behaviors
Hypothesis 1: Supervisors’ aggressive humor positively relates to focal employee's’ strain

- Power Dependency Theory
- Built up emotions/tension
Hypothesis 2: Aggressive humor that is also directed towards peers correlates with focal employee strain

- Social Comparison Theory
- Simple Slope Test

Figure 3: Moderating Role of Supervisors’ Aggressive Humor with Peers on the Supervisors’ Aggressive Humor With the Focal Employee–Focal Employee’s Strain Relationship.
Hypothesis 3: The interaction of supervisors aggressive humor with employees and their peers causes strain, which can cause them to develop addictive behaviors (Internet addiction, problem drinking, problem smoking)

- Work related strain induces addictive behavior
- According to alcohol tension reduction research;
Take Home Message

- Supervisor training
- HR involvement
- Implement employee resources
- Team building
Article 4: Life Spillovers

The Spillover of Fear of Foreclosure in the Workplace

BELLE ROSE RAGINS,
KAREN S. LYNESS
LARRY J. WILLIAMS
DOAN WINKEL

By: Stephanie Pathammavong
Terms to Know

- **Conservation of Resources (COR) Theory** - an integrated model of stress encompassing several theories

- **Negative Home-to-Work Spillover** - acknowledgement that responsibilities and demands at home interfere with behaviors/performance at work
Study Objectives

1. Assess and document relationship of fear of home foreclosure and physical stress symptoms

2. Factors through which fear of home foreclosure is brought into the workplace

3. Examine repercussions of home foreclosure crisis on organizational commitment
Figure 1: Conceptual Model.

Note. The italicized words show the key variables in the study. Solid lines = direct and moderator relationships; Dashed lines = mediated relationships; H = hypothesis.
Take Home Message

- Employee Assistance Programs (EAPs)
  - Stress management
  - Mental health counseling
  - Financial counseling
- Train managers on how to recognize workplace stress within teams
- Managers show continuous support throughout time of need
Summary of Take Home Messages

- Positive work environment
- Positive supervisor support
- Supervisor training
- Employee Assistance Programs - stress & financial management support groups
- Team building
Questions?