

CALL FOR PAPERS

Be There or Be Square?

Theoretical and Empirical Advancements in Workplace Attendance Behavior Research

July 20 and 21, 2023



Submission deadline for abstracts: April 03, 2023

Organizers

Sascha A. Ruhle (University of Tilburg)

Heiko Breitsohl (University of Klagenfurt, Austria)

Organizing committee

Carolyn Dietz (University of Technology Chemnitz, Germany)

Maria Karanika-Murray (University of Leicester, UK)

Brigitte Kroon (University of Tilburg, Netherlands)

Ann-Kristina Løkke Møller (Aarhus Universitet, Denmark)

Mariella Miraglia (University of Liverpool, UK)

Charmi Patel (University of Reading, UK)

Marc van Veldhoven (University of Tilburg, Netherlands)

Zara Whysall (Nottingham Business School, UK)

Lena Zöhrer (University of Klagenfurt, Austria)

Keynote speaker

Eeske van Roekel

(Director of the Tilburg Experience Sampling Center, Netherlands)

Background and Motivation

The COVID-19 pandemic has increased interest in individual workplace attendance behavior, for example the decision (not) to work when exhibiting signs of illness (e.g., Kinman & Grant, 2021; Taylor et al., 2021), as the pandemic has highlighted the importance of health-related behaviors for individuals and organizations, such as spreading a highly contagious virus (Manski & Molinari, 2021). At the same time, working from home (telework) has been on the rise and has impacted people's attendance behavior (Biron et al., 2021; Ruhle & Schmoll, 2021). Research has found ample evidence for dispositional and contextual characteristics, such as optimism or job insecurity affecting attendance behavior (Lohaus & Habermann, 2019; Miraglia & Johns, 2016). In addition, evidence points to harmful consequences of the attendance decision, such as reduced employee productivity (Burton et al., 2004; Collins et al., 2005), long-term employee sickness absenteeism (Bergström et al., 2009; Hansen & Andersen, 2009), and impaired physical and psychological health (Bergström et al., 2009; Gustafsson & Marklund, 2014).

While these prior findings offer some insights into the antecedents and consequences of employee attendance behavior at work, more research is warranted (Ruhle et al. 2020). Given recent developments, it is important to better understand (a) the decision process, (b) potential consequences, and (c) different methodological approaches to tackle these challenges, such as a health-promoting design of telework arrangements, the consideration of individual needs of employees, or finding an optimal time frame for measuring attendance behavior (thereby balancing recall bias and the occurrence of health events). With regard to the decision process, the underlying dynamics involved are still unclear (Cooper & Lu, 2016; Halbesleben et al., 2014; Lohaus & Habermann, 2021; Whysall et al., 2022). Arguably, the pandemic has impacted the decision process of individuals, but it remains to be explored how this will translate to future situations. In addition, the “new way” of virtual work might create an even more complex situation in which (additional) contextual aspects need to be taken into account. In a similar vein, our state of knowledge about the potential consequences of attendance behaviors does not provide much insight into the underlying psychological mechanisms and boundary conditions, that might have an impact on the further consequences of the shown attendance behavior. Beyond initial reports of adverse impacts of attending work while ill (Skagen & Collins, 2016), more and more evidence for its functional potential has been found (Boekhorst & Halinski, 2022; Karanika-Murray & Biron, 2020; Lohaus et al., 2020; Wang et al., 2022). Evidence suggests that, again, this might be impacted by the

context, such as the place of working (Brosi & Gerpott, 2022) or the specific decision situation, such as a job interview (Schilpzand et al., 2022). Finally, presenteeism research still depends heavily on cross-sectional research designs using single-source and/or self-reported data (Miraglia & Johns, 2016), which might have biased the results of these studies. We therefore aim at broadening and contextualizing research in a globalized economy. In order to provide a more extensive forum for an in-depth discussion of the challenges noted above (and others), we want to conduct a conference to further advance the field.

Conference Aims and Scope

First, we want to use the conference as a forum to strengthen existing international cooperation to move the field forward on the issues addressed above. Second, we would like to create the opportunity for new researchers in the field of attendance behavior to join our discussion, exchange ideas, and learn from past successes and failures. Third, we are looking for an opportunity to improve the empirical and methodological state of the field by discussing problems, pitfalls, and potential solutions to research on attendance behavior.

Consequently, we want to bring together scholars from different disciplines interested in, and with diverse perspectives on, attendance behavior to evaluate, discuss, and stimulate research that addresses current challenges for attendance behavior research in theory and practice. The COVID-19 pandemic shifted the perceptions of illness in the workplace and opened the door for more working from home. Insights on how this might affect the attendance decision of individuals and the expectations within organizations are of great importance, since first indications of differences in employees' attendance decision exist (e.g., Biron et al., 2021; Ruhle & Schmoll, 2021; Steidelmüller et al., 2020) and working from home arrangements are expected to remain available to a large part of the workforce even after the pandemic is over (e.g., Kniffin et al., 2021).

In addition, we want to initiate reflection about the nature of health events triggering attendance decisions and how this might impact the positive and negative consequences of (not) working while ill. We want to further unravel the commonalities and differences of the consequences of mental and physical health impairment (including chronic illnesses and “invisible” illnesses) for the attendance decision.

As with the previous events on attendance behavior (Small Group Meetings, Symposia), we want to share experiences with different methodological approaches (e.g., conceptual, qualitative, quantitative, simulation) to study attendance behavior and provide opportunities to

deepen existing and foster new cross-national collaborations, as cross-cultural research is still sparse, particularly regarding presenteeism.

Consequently, we seek contributions that are aimed at advancing our understanding of all types of attendance behavior. Possible contributions may refer to one or more of the following broad categories within research on absenteeism and presenteeism: (1) *the decision process*; (2) *perceptions of illness and attendance behaviors*; (3) *functional potential of presenteeism*; (4) *methodological advancement of attendance research*; and (5) *presenteeism in unusual or under-researched contexts*; (6) *practices or interventions in organizations to counter unhealthy attendance behaviors*.

Meeting format

The conference aims at including around 40 scholars, allowing for in-depth discussions, and fostering further collaboration. The program will consist of paper presentations and more interactive formats, plenty of time for informal exchange, and a keynote address by Eeske van Roekel. The meeting will take place over two days (Thursday and Friday) at the University of Tilburg, which is located in beautiful Tilburg, Netherlands, close to both Belgium and Germany.

Participation fees

The planned fee for participating in Conference is 150 Euros, or 100 Euros for (PhD) students. This fee will cover participation in the meeting as well as lunches and refreshments during meeting days, and a dinner (Thursday). Participants will have to cover their travel and accommodation expenses. Suggestions for travel and accommodation will be provided upon acceptance of submissions.

Submissions

If you are interested in being part of the conference, we kindly ask you to submit an extended abstract (2,000 words, excluding references and tables/figures). Each contribution will be reviewed by at least two peer reviewers, and rated according to the fit to the conference topic as well as scientific standards, namely clear structure, purpose of the contribution, rigor, adequate design and methodology, as well as possible results, limitations, and implications. Regarding structure as well as manuscript and citation style, please follow APA style, 7th edition.

Please send your extended abstract and an anonymous version of it as PDF documents to S.A.Ruhle@tilburguniveristy.edu

Timeline

Submission deadline for abstracts: April 3, 2023

Decision on submissions: May 1, 2023

Deadline for registration: May 31, 2023

Conference: July 20/21, 2023 (University of Tilburg, Netherlands)

Contact

If you have any questions about the conference, please feel free to reach out to Sascha Ruhle (S.A.Ruhle@tilburguniversity.edu) or Heiko Breitsohl (Heiko.breitsohl@aau.at).

References

- Bergström, G., Bodin, L., Hagberg, J., Aronsson, G., & Josephson, M. (2009). Sickness presenteeism today, sickness absenteeism tomorrow? A prospective study on sickness presenteeism and future sickness absenteeism. *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, *51*(6), 629–638. <https://doi.org/10.1097/JOM.0b013e3181a8281b>
- Biron, C., Karanika-Murray, M., Ivers, H., Salvoni, S., & Fernet, C. (2021). Teleworking While Sick: A Three-Wave Study of Psychosocial Safety Climate, Psychological Demands, and Presenteeism. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *12*. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.734245>
- Boekhorst, J. A., & Halinski, M. (2022). Do sick coworkers make us help others?: Investigating the critical roles of citizenship pressure and psychological detachment. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2600>
- Brosi, P., & Gerpott, F. H. (2022). Stayed at home—But can't stop working despite being ill?! Guilt as a driver of presenteeism at work and home. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2601>
- Burton, W. N., Pransky, G., Conti, D. J., Chen, C.-Y., & Edington, D. W. (2004). The Association of Medical Conditions and Presenteeism. *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, *46*, S38–S45. <https://doi.org/10.1097/01.jom.0000126687.49652.44>
- Collins, J. J., Baase, C. M., Sharda, C. E., Ozminkowski, R. J., Nicholson, S., Billotti, G. M., Turpin, R. S., Olson, M., & Berger, M. L. (2005). The Assessment of Chronic Health Conditions on Work Performance, Absence, and Total Economic Impact for Employers. *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, *47*(6), 547–557. <https://doi.org/10.1097/01.jom.0000166864.58664.29>
- Cooper, C. L., & Lu, L. (2016). Presenteeism as a global phenomenon: Unraveling the psychosocial mechanisms from the perspective of social cognitive theory. *Cross Cultural & Strategic Management*, *23*(2), 216–231. <https://doi.org/10.1108/CCSM-09-2015-0106>
- Gustafsson, K., & Marklund, S. (2014). Associations between health and combinations of sickness presence and absence. *Occupational Medicine (Oxford, England)*, *64*(1), 49–55. <https://doi.org/10.1093/occmed/kqt141>
- Halbesleben, J. R., Whitman, M. V., & Crawford, W. S. (2014). A dialectical theory of the decision to go to work: Bringing together absenteeism and presenteeism. *Human Resource Management Review*, *24*(2), 177–192. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2013.09.001>
- Hansen, C. D., & Andersen, J. H. (2009). Sick at work—a risk factor for long-term sickness absence at a later date? *Journal of Epidemiology & Community Health*, *63*(5), 397–402. <https://doi.org/10.1136/jech.2008.078238>

- Karanika-Murray, M., & Biron, C. (2020). The health-performance framework of presenteeism: Towards understanding an adaptive behaviour. *Human Relations*, 73(2), 242–261. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726719827081>
- Kinman, G., & Grant, C. (2021). Presenteeism during the COVID-19 pandemic: risks and solutions (6-7). *Oxford University Press UK*, 71 (6/7), 243–244. <https://doi.org/10.1093/occmed/kqaa193>
- Kniffin, K. M., Narayanan, J., Anseel, F., Antonakis, J., Ashford, S. P., Bakker, A. B., Bamberger, P., Bapuji, H., Bhawe, D. P., Choi, V. K., Creary, S. J., Demerouti, E., Flynn, F. J., Gelfand, M. J., Greer, L. L., Johns, G., Kesebir, S., Klein, P. G., Lee, S. Y., Ozcelik, H., Petriglieri, J. L., Rothbard, N. P., Rudolph, C. W., Shaw, J. D., Sirola, N., Wanberg, C. R., Whillans, A., Wilmot, M. P., & van Vugt, M. (2021). COVID-19 and the workplace: Implications, issues, and insights for future research and action. *American Psychologist*, 76(1), 63–77. <https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/amp0000716>
- Lohaus, D., & Habermann, W. (2019). Presenteeism: A review and research directions. *Human Resource Management Review*, 29(1), 43–58. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2018.02.010>
- Lohaus, D., & Habermann, W. (2021). Understanding the Decision-Making Process Between Presenteeism and Absenteeism. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 3073. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.716925>
- Manski, C. F., & Molinari, F. (2021). Estimating the COVID-19 infection rate: Anatomy of an inference problem. *Journal of Econometrics*, 220(1), 181–192. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeconom.2020.04.041>
- Miraglia, M., & Johns, G. (2016). Going to work ill: A meta-analysis of the correlates of presenteeism and a dual-path model. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 21(3), 261–283. <https://doi.org/10.1037/ocp0000015>
- Ruhle, S. A., & Schmoll, R. (2021). COVID-19, Telecommuting, and (Virtual) Sickness Presenteeism: Working From Home While Ill During a Pandemic. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 4501. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.734106>
- Ruhle, S. A., Breitsohl, H., Aboagye, E., Baba, V., Biron, C., Correia Leal, C., Dietz, C., Ferreira, A. I., Gerich, J., Johns, G., Karanika-Murray, M., Lohaus, D., Løkke, A., Lopes, S. L., Martinez, L. F., Miraglia, M., Muschalla, B., Poethke, U., Sarwat, N., Schade, H., Steidelmüller, C., Vinberg, S., Whysall, Z., & Yang, T. (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. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1359432X.2019.1704734>
- Schilpzand, P., Restubog, S. L. D., & Chen, Y. (2022). Sick on the day of the interview? Effects of presenteeism on selection outcomes and the moderating role of raters’ perspective - taking. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2646>
- Steidelmüller, C., Meyer, S.-C., & Müller, G. (2020). Home-based telework and presenteeism across Europe. *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, 62(12), 998–1005. <https://doi.org/10.1097/JOM.0000000000001992>
- Skagen, K., & Collins, A. M. (2016). The consequences of sickness presenteeism on health and wellbeing over time: a systematic review. *Social Science & Medicine*, 161, 169-177. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2016.06.005>
- Taylor, S. G., Butts, M. M., Cole, M. S., & Pounds, T. (2021). Are you sick? Understanding the effects of coworker presenteeism on workplace mistreatment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 106(9), 1299–1313. <https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/apl0000966>
- Wang, M., Lu, C. Q., & Lu, L. (2022). The positive potential of presenteeism: An exploration of how presenteeism leads to good performance evaluation. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2604>
- Whysall, Z., Karanika-Murray, M., & Chen, H. (2022). Understanding the process of decision-making for presenteeism behavior: An integration and conceptual model. In: L. Lapierre & C. Cooper (Eds.), *Cambridge Companion to Organizational Stress and Well-Being*. Cambridge University Press.