To Be or Not to Be (Absent): Development and Validation of the Voluntary Intent to be Absent Measure

By

Ivona Đukić

A Thesis Proposal Submitted to
Saint Mary's University, Halifax, Nova Scotia
In Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements of
The Degree of Masters of Science in Applied Psychology

July, 2020, Halifax, Nova Scotia

Approved by: Dr. Kevin Kelloway
Supervisor

Approved by: Dr. Debra Gilin
Internal Examiner

Approved by: Dr. Nicolas Roulin
Internal Examiner

Approved by: Dr. Jane Mullen
External Examiner

Date: July, 2020

`

Table of Contents

`

`

`

`

Dedication

I dedicate this work to my mom, Lidija Hajdler. Your wisdom, positive outlook on life and perseverance have taught me many valuable lessons that have helped me through my own journey.

Thank you for showing me the strength of a woman and instilling values in me that helped me pave my own path.

`

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank my thesis advisor, Dr. Kevin Kelloway, for his continuous support and guidance through this endeavour. On so many occasions you have enlightened me and enabled me to push through challenging moments. Thank you for believing in my idea and for your generosity which made it possible!

I would also like to thank my thesis committee, Dr. Nicolas Roulin and Dr. Debra Gilin, who always took the time to provide detailed and timely feedback. My discussions with you challenged my ideas and contributed to making this research more thorough.

Thank you to my mentors, Janine Knackstedt, Jennifer Price and Mark Sheppard, who supported me before this journey began and during, what seemed, at times, a never-ending road. Your wisdom and invaluable advice have, without failure, served me well. I consider myself extremely lucky to have you in my life.

I am extremely grateful to my family who supported me through the ups and downs of yet another goal I wanted to accomplish…Your support means the world to me.
Now, I am taking a break!

Last but not least, to quote Snoop Dog during his Hollywood Walk of Fame acceptance speech (2018), “I want to thank me for believing in me, I want to thank me for doing all this hard work..” because, frankly, without me, I wouldn’t even be writing this ;)

`

Abstract

To Be or Not to Be (Absent): Development and Validation of the Voluntary Intent to be Absent Measure

By Ivona Đukić

Abstract: Although absenteeism has received a considerable amount of research attention it has, thus far, mainly been examined in a *post hoc* fashion. To further our understanding regarding employees' absenteeism I developed a voluntary intent to be absent (VIA) measure. Using a shortitudinal study design I examined VIA measure's factor structure, psychometric properties, its nomological network – by analyzing its relationship with constructs, such as perceived absence norms, job satisfaction, workplace incivility, and psychological distress, and its incremental value over-and-above Martocchio's (1992) absence intentions scale and the aforementioned work attitudes. Factor analyses revealed that a 7-item VIA scale accounted for a similar amount of variance in measuring this construct as compared to lengthier versions. Additionally, findings showed that the 7-item VIA scale is a reliable and valid measure that adds value in predicting future voluntary absences over and above the existing absence intentions scale and work attitudes.

July 27, 2020

`

To Be or Not to Be (Absent): Development and Validation of the Voluntary Intent to be Absent Measure

Although absenteeism has been studied in abundance the angle taken has mostly been after-the-fact whether it be by looking at absenteeism records (Biron & Bamberger, 2012; Elshout, Scherp, & van der Feltz-Cornelis, 2013) or by using self-reported absenteeism data (Frooman, Mendelson, & Murphy, 2012; Dolan & Léonard, 1991; ten Brummelhuis, Johns, Lyons, & ter Hoeven, 2016). Given that it would be in organizations' best interest to reduce, and, whenever possible, prevent absenteeism, arguably, one's intent to be absent versus actual absences should be of primary interest. In fact, addressing one's absence-related intent before it turns into action could, perhaps, prevent employees' future absence behaviour. Thus, to expand our current knowledge of absenteeism in the workplace, my aim was to develop and validate a measure of voluntary intent to be absent (VIA). To establish validity of the VIA measure I examined its content, construct, and criterion-related validity. Additionally, one's VIA tendency was looked at within its nomological network to include hypothesized antecedents, such as perceived absence norms, job satisfaction, workplace incivility and psychological distress.

Examining absenteeism from an intent to be absent stance (i.e., before the intent becomes a behaviour) vice once it actually occurs (i.e., absence records), is a step towards preventing voluntary absenteeism instead of managing it. Moreover, exploring four potential antecedents of one's VIA tendency provides insight into interventions organizations could implement to prevent employees' proclivity to form VIA tendencies.

`

Measuring Absenteeism – Conception and Theoretical Background

An important initial step when developing a scale is clearly conceptualizing the construct measured and ensuring that items developed are based on theory (Clark & Watson, 1995; Hinkin, 1995). Thus, a literature review of constructs related to one's VIA is provided, which in turn leads to a discussion of steps taken to develop the initial item pool.

Defining Absence and its Impact on Organizations

Fichman (1984) defines absence as "the allocation of time across nonwork activities when an individual is expected to be working" (p. 20). Notwithstanding the prevalence of absence definitions and categories, Fichman highlights difficulties in defining and categorizing absences, which he describes as a "socially defined event" (p. 16). He explains that organizations have their own concept and categorization of attendance, which give absence a meaning. Additionally, the meaning individuals experiencing absenteeism give to absence may not be the same as the meaning attributed by an organization, which in itself is a conundrum. Thus, given that absence is "socially defined more than once" (Fichman, 1984, p. 16) defining this behaviour or construct becomes challenging. Absenteeism is a dynamic process, which varies between individuals and social contexts (Chadwick-Jones, Nicholson, & Brown, 1982), and thus, events that potentially impact absenteeism should be considered when conducting research. Fichman (1984) cautions us that absence definitions should not be data driven, but rather theory driven, as such the construct of voluntary intent to be absent was defined based on theory.

Over the years, absenteeism has been characterized as being either culpable – within the individual's control – or innocent, which is involuntary (Hicks Morley Hamilton Stewart Storie, 1995), legitimate or illegitimate (Frooman et al., 2012), and voluntary or involuntary (Birioukov, 2016; Driver & Watson, 1989; Hackett & Guion, 1985). For my study, the latter characterisation

`

was used which defines voluntary absences as being “under the direct control of individual workers” (Hackett & Guion, 1985, p. 341) and involuntary absences as being “beyond the immediate control of workers” (Hackett & Guion, 1985, p. 342).

An increasing trend for full-time employees’ absences between 2014 and 2018 has been reported by Statistics Canada (2019), in that employees were absent 8.8, 8.9, 9.5, 9.6, and 10 days per year, respectively. These statistics reflect the total days lost as related to disabilities, illnesses, and personal or family responsibilities. Although employees’ absenteeism rates are smaller for personal or family reasons, there is, nonetheless, an upward trend (1.5 days in 2014 and 2015, 1.7 in 2016 and 2017, and 1.9 in 2018). Similarly, the Bureau of Labor Statistics reported an alarming absence rate of 4.2 million workers in January 2018, which is an increase from previous years (U.S. Department of Labor, 2018). The annually estimated resident population of the United States in 2018, as of July 1st, was 327, 167, 434 (U.S. Census Bureau, 2018), and, in January 2018, 60.2% of individuals who were 16 years of age and older were employed, (U.S. Department of Labor, 2018), which equates to approximately 196, 954, 795.27 of the annual estimated resident population. Thus, if these population estimates are taken into account, it would mean that in January 2018 approximately 2.13% of the workforce was absent (i.e., calculations done by myself using information from cited sources). Although these absences were due to illnesses, injuries, medical reasons or appointments (i.e., no details were provided on types of illness or medical reasons), they are, nonetheless, concerning. Canadian law prohibits employers from obtaining specific or private details regarding reasons of employees’ absences, nonetheless, in 2012, 63% of organizations within the public sector and 39% in the private sector reported using some kind of mechanism to track absenteeism (Stewart, 2013). This aspect of human management is critical for organizations because the reduction of absences contributes

`

towards organizational productivity (Dolan & Léonard, 1991) and an organization's competitive advantage (Huczynski & Fitzpatrick, 1989). For instance, to ensure a competitive advantage, the Canadian Pulp and Paper Industry sought to examine employees' absenteeism. This endeavour revealed that the pulp and paper industry's absenteeism rates were estimated to be higher by 0.5% to 1% compared to other Canadian industries, which in turn represents important monetary losses (Dolan & Léonard, 1991). In addition to financial costs, one's uncertified absences were found to lead to higher job dissatisfaction, lower performance and college achievement one year after the initial questionnaire administration, whereas the opposite relationship was not supported (Tharenou, 1993). Given the negative impact absenteeism has on organizations, it becomes critical to use effective measures to capture it accurately.

Measuring Absenteeism

Landy, Vasey and Smith (1984) start a chapter on "Methodological Problems and Strategies in Predicting Absence" by expressing that "we would like to outline the correct methods for gathering, analyzing, and interpreting absence data. We would like to – but we cannot" (p. 110). They explain that issues, which threaten our ability to make inferences, mainly revolve around the distribution of absence data and the stability of absence-related tendencies.

Absenteeism research has often relied on organizational records, and the variation of time used to examine absence instances ranges from days to years (Johns, 2003). Its measurement has mainly focused on after-the-fact measures, such as magnitude, frequency, and duration (Atkin & Goodman, 1984; Johns, 2003). Monitoring absenteeism by maintaining records of employees' absences and analyzing absence trends is critical for establishing an effective strategy to control and reduce absenteeism (Huczynski & Fitzpatrick, 1989), and, perhaps, may be a reason why most research on absenteeism has used either existing records of absences (e.g., Biron &

`

Bamberger, 2012; Elshout, Scherp, & van der Feltz-Cornelis, 2013) or self-reported measures of absenteeism (e.g., Magee, Gordon, Robinson, Caputi & Oades, 2017; ten Brummelhuis et al., 2016). For example, Nicholson, Brown, and Chadwick-Jones (1976) used the time lost, frequency and attitude indexes to examine the relationship between job satisfaction and absences. Similarly, to examine the construct validity of voluntary and involuntary absenteeism, Driver and Watson (1989) used measures of frequency and time lost by looking at employees' existing absence records. To examine leadership styles as determinants of absenteeism, Frooman et al. (2012) asked participants to report their levels of agreement for items alluding to legitimate and illegitimate reasons for missing work. For instance, participants rated their agreement levels for items, such as "I go to work even when I am sick" and "Only under extreme cases do I use sick time". Similarly, self-reported "number of hours worked", "number of hours of absences", and "percentage of hours of absences caused by occupational accident or occupational illness" were used in Dolan and Léonard's (1991) analyses. They applied two formulas to measure absenteeism in terms of the "Rate of Time Lost", which is the most claimed measure of voluntary absences (Hackett & Guion, 1985), and the "Rate of Time Lost due to Work Accidents or Occupational Illness". As the authors caution, the duration of absences and the frequency of short absences were not taken into account in these formulas, which in turn did not enable them to obtain the most accurate information on absenteeism, but rather only allowed them to provide general tendencies. In essence, these omissions impacted the rate of time lost calculations, and, in turn, the validity of the data. This is not an emerging concern as in 1984 Atkin and Goodman indicated that one of the main difficulties in measuring absenteeism is determining how to accurately report absenteeism using frequency or duration measures, amongst others. In a more

`

recent study, Magee et al. (2017) reported their inability to distinguish between frequency and duration of absences as one of their limitations.

In addition, the low reliability of absenteeism measures (Chadwick-Jones, Brown, Nicholson, & Sheppard, 1971; Huse & Taylor, 1962) is indicative of our inability to accurately measure absenteeism, which in turn casts doubt on the interpretation of findings (Steers & Rhodes, 1978). Steers and Rhodes (1978) proposed a model of employees' attendance which suggests that employees' motivation and ability to attend are two influencing factors. They argued that attendance behaviour is not stable over time, and thus would not be a reliable construct. Although these arguments suggest difficulties in assessing absenteeism, other studies provide indications of factors that influence absenteeism. For instance, multiple personal characteristics, such as age, tenure in organization and position, and sex were found to correlate with absenteeism, whereas, out of the five different work experiences examined, such as group attitudes and organizational dependability, only experienced job challenge was correlated to absenteeism (Spencer & Steers, 1980). In another study, personality traits did not correlate with employees' future intent to be absent for reasons related to external pressures or commitments; however, personality traits, such as extraversion and openness were positively correlated with one's future intention to be absent for a number of reasons that are within one's control (e.g., leisure activities, short holiday). Additionally, agreeableness was negatively correlated with absence intentions for reasons, such as leisure activities, not feeling like going to work and late-night socializing (Darviri & Woods, 2006). Arguably, given that both stable characteristics, such as gender and one's personality, and changing situations, such as random effects and work circumstances (Johns, 2003), relate to one's absenteeism a more general approach for measuring

`

this construct seems to be required to ensure both stable and dynamic influences can be considered.

Measuring Intent to be Absent

Just as one's intent to turnover has been found to be a better predictor of actual turnover than job satisfaction or organizational commitment, across multiple studies (Steel & Ovalle, 1984), one's intent to be absent could reveal to be a valid predictor of actual absenteeism, and thus the importance of further exploring employees' intentions.

In their study of emotional and behavioural responses to workplace incivility, Porath and Pearson (2012) measured targets' absenteeism in terms of reduced time spent at work and their instances of calling in sick when they were not actually sick. The former item was created by the authors to complement the latter one taken from Skarlicki and Folger's (1997) Organizational Retaliatory Behavior scale. Although these two items reflect voluntary absences that are within one's control, the authors examined them once they had occurred, which is a method used in a plethora of absenteeism-related research. Whilst the reliability of these two items was acceptable ($\alpha = .68$), the measure could include additional items to further contribute to content validity, which could, perhaps, lead to an increase in internal reliability. Martocchio (1992) examined absence intentions using items that specified eight reasons due to which one could be absent (e.g., "to get relief from dissatisfying work situation", "to fulfill religious commitment", p. 151). Similarly, Martocchio and Judge (1994) studied one's absence intentions by asking participants how likely is it that they would miss work for one of the 12 specific reasons given (e.g., leisure activities unrelated to work, illness, day of the week, community activities), six of which were based on Nicholson and Payne's (1987) work. A decade later, Darviri and Woods (2006) also examined one's future absence intentions, and its relationship with one's personality, by

`

categorizing one's intent to be absent by the reasons of the absence. The absences were either due to external pressures or commitments (which they labelled ABCo), such as family commitment, or because of one's choice – absence by choice (ABCh), such as leisure activities and late-night socializing. Using self-report measures, participants were asked to indicate their future intentions of being absent based on a number of reasons within each category. Results revealed that personality was not related to future intentions to be absent based on commitment, but certain personality traits were related to future intentions to be absent as a result of choice. In a different study, using items assessing one's "intention to stay home", "intention to work at the shelter", and "intention to socialize and recreate", Harrison (1995) found that one's intention to partake in volunteer work positively predicted their attendance four to eight weeks after. Conversely, intent to stay home or socialize and recreate negatively predicted attendance, but this was only the case for less experienced volunteers at the shelter. Experienced volunteers' attendance was not significantly impacted by these alternative intentions.

Given that differences amongst individuals exist, in that reasons for absenteeism are not stable across individuals (Johns, 2003; Martocchio, 1992), a broader and more general measure of intent to be absent seems to be warranted. In other words, given that existing measures and questions related to absenteeism are more fitting for measuring past absenteeism or one's specific reasons for absenting themselves in the future vice examining their overall intent to be absent there is a need to bridge this knowledge gap. Hence, my research revolved around the development of a scale for measuring one's VIA that is not based on a limited number of reasons or circumstances.

`

Measuring Voluntary Intent to be Absent

With their theory of reasoned action Fishbein and Ajzen (1975) explained that one's behavioural intention "refers to a person's subjective probability that he will perform some behavior" (p. 288). Furthermore, these authors stated that one's behaviour is a result of their intentions to perform that behaviour, and thus, to determine whether one will perform a behaviour or not the best predictor would be to ask the individual if they intend to perform it. Consequently, when discussing absenteeism, examining one's intent to be absent should enable us to infer whether voluntary absences (e.g., calling in sick when not sick, deciding to not go to work when one is expected to be at work) will occur. As previously mentioned, intent to be absent has been measured in the past; however, measures were based on a limited number of reasons for being absent, which, arguably, limits our ability to generalize beyond these circumstances. In fact, as expressed by Martocchio and Judge (1994), the external validity of their study was a limitation because employees' intent to be absent was based on a specific list of reasons. Given the results obtained, they indicated that causes of absence should be considered on an individual basis. Also, in addition to having a limited number of reasons for voluntary absences, the sample of employees used by Martocchio (1992) for the elicitation study for item generation for the absence intentions scale was similar to the sample used to examine one's intent to be absent as both employee samples were from the same organization. As such, the VIA scale would be a more appropriate measure of absenteeism in that relationships, as indicated by hypotheses discussed in detail below, are expected to be stronger with the VIA scale than the existing absence intentions scale, with the exception of job satisfaction, due to VIA's more general approach to measuring absence intent.

`

Similarly, Darviri and Woods (2006) noted that the limited list of reasons for being absent used in their study was one of their limitations. The development of the VIA measure fills this void. Specifically, the VIA measure focuses on Fichman's (1984) definition of absence as "the allocation of time across nonwork activities when an individual is expected to be working" (p. 20) and aims at examining voluntary absences. Specifically, I was interested in measuring absences taken by individuals knowing that they should be going to work and knowing that they are fully capable and able of going to work. Contrary to items used in previous research, the VIA measure does not focus on specific reasons for being absent, but it rather takes a more holistic approach to examine employees' intent to be absent. I proposed that one's intent to be absent is voluntary due to the requirement of the individual to make a decision to be absent or not. Just as one can decide to go to work when they are not feeling good, another can decide to be absent when they are not actually sick (i.e., knowing that they are fully capable of going to work). In light of this, the VIA scale is not aimed at measuring absence intent related to unavoidable limitations impacting one's ability to attend, which can be grouped into illnesses and accidents, family responsibility, and transportation problems (Mowday, Porter, & Steers, 1982), as one does not choose these impediments. Rather, the VIA scale measures absence intent when individuals recognize that they are fully able and capable of attending work. Thus, I defined VIA as one's proclivity to choose to be absent from work knowing that they are fully able and capable of working. Given that absenteeism can be described as inconsistent behaviour and as a "bouillabaisse whose exact ingredients are in constant flux" (Atkin & Goodman, 1984, p. 61), I expected employees' VIA tendencies to vary, to a certain extent, depending on the work environment and circumstances they are subjected to. In fact, knowing that absenteeism changes over time and depending on circumstances (Atkin & Goodman, 1984), the focus of absenteeism-

`

related research should, arguably, be on examining temporal or circumstantial effects. Hence, in addition to examining the scale's factor structure and psychometric properties, I looked at employees' VIA tendency's relationship with perceived absence norms, job satisfaction, workplace incivility, and psychological distress, as these constructs represent work-related circumstances, which are within VIA's nomological network.

VIA Scale's Psychometric Properties

The Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing (American Psychological Association (APA), 1999) highlight, amongst other things, the critical requirements of assessing a scale's validity and reliability. Validity, which refers to a scale's ability to measure what it purports to measure, is described as the "most fundamental consideration in developing and evaluating tests" (p. 9). The *Standards* further explain that validation is a process done to ensure tests scores can be interpreted for their intended use. Evidence of scale validity can be gathered using content, construct and criterion validity, all of which are discussed in detail below. VIA's validity was confirmed using bi-variate correlations as they are often used to examine the strength of relationships between variables. Generally accepted cut off values exist that describe the strength of these associations, such that correlations equal to or below .35 are considered low or weak, between .36 and .67 are considered moderate, between .68 to .89 are considered high, and .90 or above are considered very high (Taylor, 1990). As such, my hypotheses were tested against these values.

In addition to the requirement to be valid, a scale must be reliable. Reliability refers to scales' consistency in measurement when it is administered on multiple occasions to the same individuals (APA, 1999). As explained by APA (1999), a scale's reliability can be analyzed by examining its internal consistency, test-retest coefficient, and by administering alternate forms of

`

the scale. Given the importance of reliability and reducing measurement error, the first two methods have been used to examine VIA scale's reliability. Reliability of the VIA scale, discussed further below, was examined using the coefficient alpha, in addition to bi-variate correlations.

Content Validity

Content validity refers to a scale's ability to capture the content domain of the construct it has been designed to measure. It includes aspects, such as item wording, format, and test administration and scoring (APA, 1999). The *Standards* highlight that evidence of content validity can be gathered by clearly specifying the content domain and developing items in line with this specification, and by soliciting help from subject matters experts (SMEs) who can, for instance, rate the degree of representativeness of items. Ensuring content validity of the VIA scale was the main focus during the initial item development process, which is thoroughly described in Study 1.

Construct Validity

Construct validity is concerned with the relationship between a scale that claims to measure a given construct and other scales that claim to either measure similar – convergent validity – or dissimilar – discriminant validity – constructs (APA, 1999). *The Standards* further inform us that construct validity evidence can be gathered using experiential or correlational means. Thus, to show evidence of VIA scale's construct validity an assessment of convergent and discriminant validities was conducted in Study 2 by examining correlations. Specifically, convergent validity was examined using Martocchio's (1992) absence intentions measure. As

`

discussed previously, where Martocchio's (1992) measure provides specific reasons for being absent, which have been found to predict one's paid absences, the VIA measure takes a broader approach. Nonetheless, both measures examine individuals' absence intentions when it comes to voluntary absences, and thus the following hypothesis was tested:

Hypothesis 1: Employees' voluntary intent to be absent is expected to have a moderate to high correlation (*r* between .36 to .89) with Martocchio's (1992) eight-item absence intentions measure.

Confirmation of hypothesis 1 would provide evidence of convergent validity.

On the other hand, discriminant validity was assessed using an intent to turnover measure. Although absenteeism and turnover share common antecedents they are distinct concepts (Mowday et al., 1982). Cohen and Golan (2007) found that past absenteeism predicted future absenteeism and turnover intentions. These authors indicate that absenteeism can be an indicator of withdrawal and one's intent to leave the organization, and thus, both absenteeism and turnover can be seen as "similar processes of withdrawal" (p. 427). On the other hand, based on their review of research done related to turnover and absenteeism, Porter & Steers (1973) revealed that absenteeism and turnover have distinctive characteristics such that absenteeism, compared to turnover, has less negative consequences, it is a more impromptu decision, and it "sometimes represents a substitute type of behavior for turnover" (p. 173). Thus, although these two constructs have common antecedents and characteristics, they are, nonetheless different

`

concepts (Porter & Steers, 1973; Spencer & Steers, 1980). As such, scales measuring these constructs should be distinct, and thus the following was hypothesized:

Hypothesis 2: Employees' voluntary intent to be absent is expected to have a weak correlation ($r \leq .35$) with their intent to turnover.

In addition, discriminant validity was tested using a measure of motivation. In his proposed A-B Continuum of absence, where the "A" side of the continuum comprises absences that are not influenced by an individual's choice and the "B" side reflects absences that are influenced by an individual's choices, Nicholson (1977) discussed attendance motivation as a predictor of absence behaviour. Specifically, the continuum model differentiates absences based on the extent one's choice dictates whether they will be absent or not, which in itself can vary from one individual to another due to individuals' attendance motivation. In this sense, certain absences – "B" Continuum" – are seen as avoidable events. Three decades later, Bakker's (2008) study on work-related flow revealed that flow comprises three dimensions, one of the dimensions being intrinsic work motivation, which is related to work enjoyment (Bakker, 2008). Intrinsic work motivation is defined as "the degree to which a person wants to work well in his or her job in order to achieve intrinsic satisfaction" (Warr, Cook, & Wall, 1979). Given the definition of intrinsic work motivation and the impact one's motivation can have on absenteeism, it becomes critical to examine the relationship between the VIA and intrinsic work motivation measures to ensure they are measuring two separate constructs. In other words, ensuring that the newly developed VIA measure is actually a measure of one's intent to be absent and not a measure of one's motivation is an important distinction to make. As such, I tested the following hypothesis:

`

Hypothesis 3: Employees' VIA tendency is expected to have a weak correlation ($r \leq .35$) with employees' intrinsic work motivation.

If hypotheses 2 and 3 are supported, then discriminant validity as related to these two constructs will be achieved.

Criterion Validity

Criterion validity refers to the relationship between one's score on a test or scale and a criterion (i.e., outcome) for which evidence is often gathered through predictive or concurrent methods (APA, 1999). Criterion validity of the VIA scale was first examined using postdictive validity, also known as retrospective validity, which refers to the extent a scale correlates with past instances of the behaviour examined – behaviour that the scale is said to measure (APA Dictionary of Psychology, n.d.). This method was used in previous scale validation efforts, such as Lussier, Corrado, Healey, Tzoumakis, and Deslauriers-Varin's (2011) examination of the postdictive validity of the Cracow instrument – tool used to assess risk/needs factors for youth – using frequency of aggression in the past year to determine if there was a relationship between the five domains of the scale and aggression in the past year. Postdictive validity was also used to validate the Criminal Sentiment Scale (CSS) in that the numbers of prior incarcerations and prior convictions were used (Mills & Kroner, 1997). Thus, in the current study postdictive validity was analyzed by examining the relationship between participants' self-reported past voluntary absences and their VIA tendency. The following hypothesis was tested:

`

Hypothesis 4: Employees' past voluntary absences will relate to their VIA tendency in that employees reporting more past voluntary absences will have higher VIA tendencies.

Criterion validity was also explored using predictive validity, which revolves around examining the extent to which one's scores on a test or measure predict their scores on a criterion (i.e., outcome) measured thereafter (APA, 1999). Seeing that the VIA scale was developed with the aim to predict employees' voluntary absences the following hypothesis was tested:

H*ypothesis 5:* Employees' VIA tendency will predict their voluntary absences in the 3 months following the administration of the VIA measure.

If hypotheses 4 and 5 are supported, then there will be evidence of criterion-related validity.

Scale Reliability

In addition to assessing the VIA scale's validity, its reliability was explored using various methods. The assessment of a scale's reliability, which provides evidence regarding the consistency of measurement, should be done for all tests (APA, 1999). Thus, the internal consistency of the final VIA scale was explored using Cronbach's alpha for which Nunnally (1978) recommends a coefficient of .70 for a measure to be deemed reliable. This threshold was applied herein. Furthermore, test-retest reliability of the scale was assessed using Pearson correlations as the VIA scale was administered at two separate occasions three months apart. However, Altman and Bland (1983) have criticized the use of correlations for the examination of measurement variations by arguing that this technique is not a valid measure of agreement but

`

rather a measure of association. Given this shortcoming, creating a plot of the difference between the two measures (i.e., Y axis) and the average of these two measures (i.e., X axis) is what they recommend as this plot provides a visual representation of the disagreement levels, outliers, and overall trends. To completement this visual representation a regression analysis, using the difference of the two measurement points as the dependent variable and the mean of the two measurements as the independent variable, can be conducted to confirm whether there is a level of agreement.

The aforementioned said, achieving acceptable test-retest reliability for an absenteeism-related measure could be challenging considering that absenteeism has been described as a changing and inconsistent behaviour (Atkin & Goodman, 1984).

VIA Scale's Nomological Network

Although the reliability of the VIA scale was examined, some researchers state that the typical focus on reliability is not suitable for measuring absenteeism as there may not be a "true value" associated with absenteeism due to the changing nature, over time, of this construct (Atkin & Goodman, 1984). The typical reliability assessment would not be adequate given that absenteeism-related data would most likely have a non-normal distribution and would violate assumptions of homogeneity. Test-rest reliability is ill-advised as history, in addition to measurement error, comes into play. Thus, these authors argue that the assessment of behaviour consistency over time periods and between individuals or groups is more fitting. In other words, the changing nature of absence-related behaviours – its inconsistency – calls for the examination of circumstances under which absenteeism would be consistent instead of focusing on the stability of the behaviour, itself, over time (Atkin & Goodman, 1984). Considering these

`

arguments, instead of only focusing on the reliability of the VIA scale I explored individuals' VIA tendency by exploring its relationship to potential antecedents. Taking this approach allowed me to gather information regarding differences between employees' VIA tendencies whilst considering four different circumstances: perceived absence norms, job satisfaction, workplace incivility, and psychological distress. These four constructs were chosen because they have been previously associated with absenteeism, and thus are considered to be part of VIA's nomological network. These exploratory analyses were deemed important as, in the event that these constructs are associated with one's VIA tendency, interventions could be developed to address these matters, which would in turn contribute to the reduction of employees' VIA tendencies. Additionally, given the broader measurement approach of the VIA scale, as compared to Martocchio's absence intentions measure based on 8 specific reason for being absent, the strength of the relationship between each of the aforementioned constructs and the VIA scale was hypothesized to be stronger than that with Martocchio's absences intentions scale, and thus this difference was explored with tests of dependent correlations to determine if the strength of these associations differed significantly depending on the scale.

Perceived Absence Norms

Perceived absence norms, which have been found to sway one's behaviour (Nicholson & Johns, 1985), have also proven to be empirically related to absenteeism. In fact, Biron and Bamberger (2012) revealed that job hazards and critical incident exposures did not have a direct effect on absenteeism, rather, both group norms and perceived supervisor support moderated this relationship, such that the relationship between job hazards and critical incidents, and

`

absenteeism rates was stronger under more permissive referent group norms – in terms of absenteeism – and lower under higher supervisor support conditions. Furthermore, supervisory support impacted the moderating effect that group norms have on the relationship between one's perceived job hazards and critical incident exposure, and absenteeism, in that group norms had a stronger effect on this relationship when employees reported lower supervisor support. In addition, Chadwick-Jones et al. (1982), using the social exchange theory, explained that employees base their own absence-related decisions on acceptable norms to ensure their absences fall within acceptable limits. Similarly, Nicholson and Johns (1985) discussed "the absence culture", which includes norms regarding what is consider acceptable and not acceptable absenteeism. These norms, which are based on a given social context, influence an individual's behaviour. That said, employees perceive their peers to be more absent than themselves (Johns, 1994; Harrison & Shaffer ,1994), in certain instances twice as much, which is the case for both employees and students (Harrison & Shaffer, 1994). Johns (1994) also found that managers perceived their own team members to be less absent than employees within other teams. He thus argued that the perception of having a better absenteeism track record than that of peers may influence employees to be more open to being absent given that missing work here and there should not damage their own (perceived) positive track record. In line with this argument, ten Brummelhuis et al. (2016), using case scenarios, examined absence norms' impact on individuals' decisions to be absent. Participants were randomly assigned to either the high co-worker absence or low co-worker absence scenario after which they were asked to make a decision regarding the following scenario: "One morning this week you get up not feeling super fit, but you also know that you are not really sick either. You are considering to calling in sick" (p. 20). Answer options ranged from "*I go to work for sure"* to "*I call in sick for sure*". Results

`

revealed that participants in the high co-worker absence condition were significantly more prone to making the decision to call in sick than those in the low co-worker absence condition, as absence norms in the former condition were such that absenteeism was tolerated. Furthermore, participants were less likely to decide to be absent when they were in highly socially integrated teams, even in high co-worker absences conditions, compared to when they were in lower socially integrated teams. Although the aforementioned studies provide insight into absence norms' impact on absenteeism tendencies, they do not shed light on one's overall voluntary intent to be absent when not actually sick (i.e., when one is fully capable of going to work). Thus, given the established relationship between perceived absence norms and absenteeism I hypothesized the following:

Hypothesis 6a: Employees' perceived absence norms will be related to their voluntary intent to be absent such that employees perceiving higher absence norms will have a higher VIA tendency.

Hypothesis 6b: Employees' perceived absence norms will be more strongly related to their VIA tendency than to their absence intentions, as measured with Martocchio's scale.

Job Satisfaction

In addition to perceived absence norms, absenteeism has often been examined from a job satisfaction perspective and there is a common belief that absences are a result of low job satisfaction (Chadwick-Jones et al., 1982; Huczynski & Fitzpatrick, 1989). In some instances,

`

absenteeism, resulting from employees' low job satisfaction, has been found to, in turn, contribute to lower job satisfaction (Ybema, Smulders, & Bongers, 2010). Conversely, Gadourek's (1965) study of Dutch workers (i.e., mainly male shift workers), Nicholson et al.'s (1976) review of 29 studies with blue-collar production workers, and Steers and Rhodes' (1978) review of 104 empirical studies do not support the argument that employees' job satisfaction is related to their absenteeism. Similarly, in their study of 1 222 employees across 16 organizations Chadwick-Jones et al. (1982) did not find a significant relationship between job satisfaction and absenteeism. Hackett and Guion's (1985) meta-analysis revealed that job satisfaction is not strongly related to absenteeism as only less than 4% of variance in absences can be explain by one's job satisfaction. Thus, these authors argue that job satisfaction should not be further examined as a cause of absences. Similarly, Huczynski and Fitzpatrick (1989) argue that it would be prudent to treat job satisfaction as a contributing factor to absences instead of a direct cause of them. As such, I tested the following hypothesis:

Hypothesis 7a: Employees' job satisfaction will be weakly ($r \leq .35$), and negatively, related to their voluntary intent to be absent tendency in that employees reporting higher job satisfaction will have lower VIA tendency compared to employees with lower job satisfaction.

Hypothesis 7b: Employees' job satisfaction will be less related to their voluntary intent to be absent tendency than to their absence intentions.

`

Workplace Incivility

Workplace incivility was also examined as a potential antecedent of one's VIA tendency. Targets of continuous workplace incivility take multiple avenues (actions) to stay away from work, including taking sick days and vacation days (Roter, 2019). In Sliter's (2018) study focusing on victim incivility, firefighters' absenteeism was negatively predicted by victims' incivility, a relationship that is attenuated by engagement and aggravated by empathy. Counterproductive work behaviours (CWBs) for targets of incivility are also aggravated by job involvement and task interdependency (Welbourne & Sariol, 2017). Specifically, production deviance and withdrawal tendencies were found to be higher for targets of incivility who reported higher levels of job involvement and task interdependency, a relationship that was stronger for females than males. These authors suggest that engaging in CWBs may be a coping mechanism for targets of incivility. In fact, some targets of incivility change jobs to avoid the instigator, whilst others lose work time worrying about the instigator (Pearson, Andersson, & Porath, 2000; Pearson & Porath, 2005). Pearson, Andersson, and Wegner (2001) suggest that targets of incivility having less power than the instigator may be more likely to withdraw and experience negative emotions and reciprocate the incivility towards individuals with lower power. More recently, Porath and Pearson (2012) found that both fear and sadness fully meditated the relationship between workplace incivility and absenteeism, and the consequences associated with these negative emotions are worst for lower status targets than for equal or higher status targets. In case of power differences between the target and the instigator, targets of lower status than the instigator are typically less inclined to reciprocate the behaviour, but they rather engage in behaviours that will hurt the individual, such as spreading rumours about the

`

instigator, or the organization, such as decreasing their productivity or their working hours (Pearson & Porath, 2005). Also, target's status moderated the relationship between their experienced anger, following workplace incivility, and displacement on the organization and on others, in that lower status targets displaced their anger more on the organization and others than higher status targets. Furthermore, target's status also moderated the relationship between sadness experienced and absenteeism, in that targets having low levels of sadness and being of a lower status demonstrated higher tendencies for being absent compared to targets of equal or higher status. One's status did not moderate the relationship between target's fear and absenteeism (Porath & Pearson, 2012).

Thus, I proposed that in order to avoid their instigators targets of workplace incivility may contemplate staying away from work even if they are fully capable of going to work. In line with this argument I tested the following hypotheses:

Hypothesis 8a: Targets experiencing higher frequencies of workplace incivility will report a higher voluntary intent to be absent tendency than employees experiencing incivility less frequently.

Hypothesis 8b: Employees' experience with supervisors' workplace incivility, compared to their experience with co-worker's incivility, will have a stronger association with their voluntary intent to be absent tendency.

Hypothesis 8c: Employees' experience with workplace incivility will have a stronger relationship with their voluntary intent to be absent tendencies than with their absence intentions.

`

Psychological Distress

Lastly, psychological distress was included in this study as a potential antecedent of one's VIA tendency. Horwitz (2007) explains that stressful situations give rise to distress – a normal reaction and not a disorder. He elaborates by stating that "the *typical* outcomes of the sorts of stressful social arrangements that sociologist study, however, are not internal psychological dysfunctions but instead are natural responses that non-disordered people make to stressful conditions" (p. 275). A study examining psychological distress of employees providing health care-related services revealed that individuals who were deemed as "cases", as measured by the General Health Questionnaire-12, had significantly higher absences than "noncases". In fact, their number of absences were approximately double than that of "noncases". Moreover, psychological distress had a significant effect on predictive ability on absences. In fact, when examined in conjunction with employees' job satisfaction psychological distress still had a significant effect on one's absences above and beyond the effect of job satisfaction (Hardy, Woods, & Wall, 2003). Similarly, in their study of school board employees Negrini, Perron, and Corbière (2014) found that employees who were absent – absenteeism resulting from psychological disability – had higher psychological distress scores than those who were not absent. Furthermore, psychological distress, as compared to self-determined work motivation and subjective well-being, was the most significant predictor of absences.

Given the impact of psychological distress on absenteeism its relationship to employees' voluntary intent to be absent tendency was examined. The following hypotheses were tested:

`

Hypothesis 9a: Employees' levels of distress will be associated with their VIA tendency such that employees reporting higher levels of distress will report a higher VIA tendency.

Hypothesis 9b: Employees' levels of distress will be more strongly associated with their VIA tendency than with their absence intentions.

VIA Scale's Incremental Value

Given the existence of Martocchio's (1992) absence intentions scale I examined VIA's incremental value. As discussed previously, Martocchio's scale focuses on 8 specific reasons for voluntary absenteeism, and thus, its generalizability and broader use is, arguably, limited. This said, due to VIA scale's more general approach to assessing one's voluntary intention to be absent it should add to the predictive ability of voluntary absences over and above Martocchio's scale. The incremental value's effect size was assessed using Cohen's (1992) calculation (i.e., $f^2 = R^2 / (1 - R^2)$) where indices for multiple regressions of $f^2 = .02$, $f^2 = .15$, and $f^2 = .35$ represent small, medium and large effect sizes, respectively. Hence, the following hypothesis was tested:

Hypothesis 10: The VIA scale will add incremental value over and above Martocchio's absence intentions scale in predicting voluntary absences.

Moreover, the incremental value of the VIA scale in predicting future voluntary absences over-and-above four work-related attitudes was examined. Given that research has shown that frequency of past absences is a better predictor of future absences than work attitudes, such as

`

work satisfaction, job involvement or supervisory satisfaction (Breaugh, 1981), I examined whether one's VIA tendency would add value in predicting future voluntary absences over-and-above the work attitudes examined herein, which were also hypothesized to be potential antecedents of one's VIA tendencies: perceived absence norms, job satisfaction, workplace incivility, and psychological distress. In fact, if the frequency of past absences was found to be a better predictor of future absence, which is what the VIA scale intends to measure, then one's VIA tendency in itself could also add to this predictive ability. Thus, I hypothesized the following:

Hypothesis 11: One's VIA tendency will have incremental value in predicting one's future voluntary absences over-and-above the four work attitudes.

Study 1 – Item Generation and Initial Item Reduction

Method

Procedure

Item Generation. The initial item pool development was done using a deductive approach. To ensure content validity an attempt was made to develop the initial item pool in a manner to fully reflect the content area of one's voluntary intent to be absent, as recommended by Clark and Watson (1995), and Hinkin (1995). Given that items may be lost due to weak factor loadings, the aim at this stage was to develop at least double the number of items I expected to have in the final scale (i.e., 4 to 6 approximately), as recommended by Hinkin (1995). Efforts

`

were made to write items that are concise, in plain language, and not double-barreled. Moreover, following the first of three best practices recommended by Crawford and Kelder (2019), item development was based on a literature review.

In line with Fishbein and Ajzen's (1975) theory of reasoned action and the "specificity of intentions", the *intention* measured in this study is specific in terms of behaviour, target, situation and time. Specifically, the *behaviour* examined was absenting oneself, the *target* was from work, the s*ituation* examined was when not actually sick (i.e., when expected to be at work, when capable and able of going to work), and the *time* was within the next three months. The specific time frame – shorter versus longer – was chosen to limit the amount of "intervening events" that could influence one's intention to perform a behaviour, which, in turn, would result in a lower correlation between the intent and the behaviour (Fishbein & Ajzen, 1975) and to mimic what has been done in previous research (e.g., Antón, 2009). For instance, previous research has found a predictive ability of one's intent toward partaking in scheduled volunteer work four to eight weeks after participants had completed a questionnaire regarding their intention toward attending the scheduled volunteer work (Harrison, 1995). Also, in his study of absence intentions, based on specific reasons for voluntary absences, Martocchio (1992) found that one's absence intentions significantly predicted paid absences three months after survey administration, which was not the case for unpaid absences. In a study of absence records of highway workers, Landy et al. (1984) examined absence proneness by reporting stability coefficients for aggregate periods of one week (.10), two weeks (.16), one month (.13), and 3 months (.58). In essence, as discussed by the authors, these coefficients reveal that a three-month period may be the most appropriate observation period to reliably examine "true scores" as "the opportunity" to be absent is more viable over a three-month period than over one week, for instance. However, these authors

`

recognized and reported that other researchers found lower stability coefficients for the three-month period. Although one specific time period may not be appropriate for all types of organizations and all settings (Landy et al., 1984), given past research efforts and our knowledge that absenteeism is a low base-rate phenomenon (Atkin & Goodman, 1984; Darr & Johns, 2008), three months was the timeframe used for my study, as one week, for instance, would most likely not have been sufficient to gather absence-related data to adequately assess this low base-rate behaviour. Thus, items 1 to 6 (see Table 1) were written to reflect Fishbein and Ajzen's theory of reasoned action in that they specifically allude to one's intent to engage in behaviours related to voluntary absenteeism, such as calling in sick when not sick and deciding to not go to work even if one is capable of going to work.

In addition, Fichman's (1984) definition of absence (i.e., "the allocation of time across nonwork activities when an individual is expected to be working") and proposition that one's absence-related decisions (i.e., time allocation) could be influenced by rewarding employees for desired behaviour (i.e., attendance) and ensuring that attending work is more attractive than non-work alternatives were also taken into consideration during item development. Given that these two potential influences are general and do not allude to specific reasons for being absent they seemed fitting for examining employees' VIA tendencies. Thus, item 7 was written to reflect Fichman's absence definition, and items 8 to 11 were written to reflect the two influences (see items in Table 1).

Moreover, validated scales measuring other types of intent, such as intent to turnover (Cohen & Golan, 2007), intent to pursue a sales career (Peltier, Cummins, Pomirleanu, Cross, & Simon, 2014), and absence intentions based on specific reasons (Martocchio, 1992), have been referred to during the item generation phase. Hinkin (1995) explains that most scale development

`

efforts "derived items to tap a previously defined theoretical universe" (p. 969). Thus, existing intent-related scales have been used to develop the initial item pool. Specifically, given the predictive validity of the intent to turnover measure on one's actual turnover, the initial item pool of the VIA scale included, amongst others, three items mimicking Cohen and Golan's (2007) 3-item turnover intentions scale derived from Mobley's (1979) turnover decision schema (see items 12 to 14 in Table 1). Examples of how turnover items were adapted to measure one's VIA are: "*I think a lot about leaving the organization*" to "*I will think a lot about being absent from work*", and "*As soon as it is possible, I will leave the organization*" to "*I will be absent from work, as soon as it is possible*".

In addition to the aforementioned 14 items developed by the author, following the second of three best practices for item generation alluding to the need to separate the researcher from the item development and obtain input from experts (Crawford & Kelder, 2019), 27 subject matters experts (SEMs) in the industrial and organizational, and forensic psychology fields (i.e., faculty members and post graduate students) were asked to create items based on the aforementioned definitions and theory. Of the 27 SMEs contacted two responded and created 16 additional items (see items 15 to 30 in Table 1).

Initial Item Reduction. To ensure face and content validity of the initial item pool, which is the third best practice for item development (Crawford & Kelder, 2019), 26 different SMEs in the same fields of psychology were contacted to review the items created by the author and previous SMEs. These SMEs were provided with the list of items, and definitions and theories based on which these items should have been created. SMEs were asked to provide feedback or recommendations to ensure items created are reflective of definitions and theories used herein and, following Zaichkowksy's (1985) method, which has also been used in studies

`

reviewed by Hardesty and Bearden (2004), SMEs were asked to judge whether each item is "completely representative" (2 points), "somewhat representative" (1 point) or "not representative" (0 points) of the VIA construct. Additionally, SMEs were also asked to determine whether each item assessed one's VIA or one's intent to be absent based on a specific reason. The latter was used as a classification category given that it relates to Martocchio's (1992) absence intentions measure revolving around specific reasons for absenteeism (e.g., spend leisure time with family, get relief from a dissatisfying work situation, etc.). In fact, this categorization was used to ensure the VIA scale's items were not measuring one's voluntary absenteeism based on specific reasons, and thus, one's VIA was expected to have one factor. Of the 26 SMEs that were contacted five provided feedback and ratings. SMEs ratings of the 30 items are found in Table 1.

Firstly, the "sum score" decision rule was used to select items for retention given that this decision rule was found to correlate more strongly with items included in final scales. Although the complete decision rule is also related to the inclusion of items in final scales it is slightly less effective in this prediction than the sum score (Hardesty & Bearden, 2004). In the scale developments efforts reviewed by Hardesty and Bearden (2004) Zaichkowsky's (1985) method was followed based on which researchers retained items that received at minimum a rating of "somewhat representative" from each judge. Applying this logic to my study, the minimum cut-off score required to retain an item would have been 5 (i.e., 5 SMEs x 1 point); however, a more stringent "sum score" cut-off was implemented to compensate for the low return rate of SME's ratings. Only items for which the "sum score" was at least eight (i.e., out of maximum possible score of ten) were kept. Secondly, item reduction was also based on the percentage of SMEs who assigned an item to the VIA construct based on definitions provided.

`

Although Hinkin (1998) recommended a threshold of 75% for construct classification agreement a 60% cut-off for construct agreement was implemented herein (i.e., equates to three out of the five SMEs assigning an item to the VIA category – in accordance with definitions provided – versus the specific reasons category) based on Hardesty and Bearden (2004) explanation that some researchers retained items when at least 60% of judges assigned them to the intended construct even though a 75% of agreement was, in majority of cases, deemed as the minimum acceptable threshold. In essence, the 60% cut-off was deemed acceptable herein as it was used in conjunction with a more stringent "sum score" cut-off.

Results

Based on the aforementioned procedures and decision rules 18 items were kept (see Table 1, bolded items). Taking SME's feedback and recommendations into account, I reviewed each item to ensure they are in line with the definitions and concepts provided herein and that they are properly worded. The final wording of the items retained and administered to participants can be seen in Appendix A. Of these 18 items eight were created by the author (items 1-8) and 10 by the two SMEs (items 9-18). A 5-point scale was used for all VIA items (1 = *strongly disagree* to 5 = *strongly agree)*. A 5-point scale was deemed most appropriate for use as an increase in responses choices (e.g., 7-point or 9-point) may reduce the validity of the scale due to potential inabilities of participants to discern between points of the scale, and thus, respond randomly (Clark & Watson, 1995).

`

Table 1

Decision Rule Results of Subject Matter Experts' Ratings for the Initial VIA Item Pool

Items	DoR			DRS			Construct	
	C	SW	N	S	C	N	VIA	R
1. I intend to be absent even if I am fully capable of going to work.	**5**	**0**	**0**	**10**	**100**	**0**	**5**	**0**
2. I intend to call in sick even if I am not actually sick.	**5**	**0**	**0**	**10**	**100**	**0**	**4**	**1**
3. It is likely that I will decide not to go to work even if I am fully capable and able of going to work.	**5**	**0**	**0**	**10**	**100**	**0**	**5**	**0**
4. I will not show up to work if I do not feel like it.	**4**	**1**	**0**	**9**	**80**	**0**	**5**	**0**
5. I will not go to work even though I am only feeling a little bit under the weather. *	2	2	0	6	40	0	2*	2
6. I will often ask myself if I should call in sick to work even if I am not actually sick.	**4**	**1**	**0**	**9**	**80**	**0**	**5**	**0**
7. I intend to spend my time across non-work activities (i.e., outside of work) even though I am expected to be working.	2	1	1	5	40	20	4*	0
8. I won't go to work if my time can be better spent elsewhere than at work.	2	3	0	7	40	0	4**	1
9. I intend to be absent from work if it serves me best.	**3**	**2**	**0**	**8**	**60**	**0**	**4**	**1**
10. I will decide to be absent from work if the reward value of attending work is less than not attending work.	1	4	0	6	20	0	3**	2
11. I intend to be absent from work if non-work alternatives are more attractive than work.	**4**	**1**	**0**	**9**	**80**	**0**	**3****	**2**
12. I will think a lot about being absent from work.	2	1	2	5	40	40	4**	1
13. I will actively search for reasons not to go to work.	**4**	**1**	**0**	**9**	**80**	**0**	**5**	**0**
14. I will be absent from work, as soon as it is possible.	1	4	0	6	20	0	4**	0
15. I intend to "play hooky".	2	1	1	5	40	20	3	2
16. I intend to call in sick to work without a real reason.	**4**	**1**	**0**	**9**	**80**	**0**	**4**	**1**
17. I intend to skip work without a valid reason.	**4**	**1**	**0**	**9**	**80**	**0**	**5**	**0**
18. I intend to call in sick for the first half (e.g., morning) of my workday/shift.	1	1	3	3	20	60	2	3
19. I intend to take the day off just because.	**4**	**0**	**1**	**8**	**80**	**20**	**5**	**0**
20. I intend to take a sick day because I feel like it.	**3**	**2**	**0**	**8**	**60**	**0**	**5**	**0**
21. I intend to call in sick because I have plans the night before my work shift.	**3**	**2**	**0**	**8**	**60**	**0**	**3****	**2**
22. I intend to skip work to do other activities.	4	1	0	9	80	0	2	3
23. I intend to take a "personal day" to hang out with people.	3	0	2	6	60	40	2	3
24. I intend to call in sick to do some recreational activity.	**4**	**1**	**0**	**9**	**80**	**0**	**3**	**2**
25. I intend to be absent from work to participate in an activity that I view as being more fun.	**5**	**0**	**0**	**10**	**100**	**0**	**3**	**2**
26. I intend to be absent from work to avoid unfavourable work activities.	**5**	**0**	**0**	**10**	**100**	**0**	**3**	**2**
27. I intend to be absent from work to complete other life activities that I did not complete during non-work hours.	**3**	**2**	**0**	**8**	**60**	**0**	**3****	**2**
28. I intend to be absent from work to extend my weekend/other time off.	**4**	**1**	**0**	**9**	**80**	**0**	**4****	**1**
29. I intend to be absent from work to participate in an activity that I view as being more valuable. *	3	1	1	7	60	20	3**	1
30. I intend to be absent from work to participate in other paid tasks. *	2	3	0	7	40	0	1**	3

Note. $N = 5$. VIA = Voluntary intent to be absent; DoR = Degree of representativeness; C = Completely; SW = Somewhat; N = Not; S = Sum; DRS = Decision rule scores (two last columns represent percentages); R = Intent to be absent based on a specific reason. The * next to an item indicates that SMEs omitted to provide a rating on the degree of representativeness and/or on the construct. The ** in the Construct (VIA) column indicates that one of the SMEs judged that the item is consistent with the assessment of both constructs. The 18 bolded items are those that have been retained and administered to participants. Items 1 to 14 were created by the author and items 16 to 30 were created by 2 SMEs.

`

Discussion

Together with SMEs in the industrial and organizational, and forensic psychology fields, I initially created a 30-item VIA sale, which was reviewed by a second set of SMEs in the same fields of psychology. These SMEs provided feedback regarding each items' wording and representativeness of the VIA construct. Based on the "sum score" decision rule, SMEs construct representativeness ratings, and SMEs written feedback regarding the wording of each item the VIA scale was reduced to 18 items which were administered to participants. The scale development processed used herein, based on reported best practices, facilitated the creation of items that represent the content domain of the VIA construct, which, in turn, contributed to VIA scale's content validity. Of the 18 items retained eight were created by the author and 10 were created by the SMEs.

Study 2 – VIA Scale's Factor Structure, Psychometric Properties, and Nomological Network

Considering the results obtained in Study 1, Study 2 was designed and conducted to examine the factor structure (i.e., further reduce the number of items), psychometric properties, nomological network, in terms of potential antecedents, and incremental value of the VIA scale.

Method

Procedure

A "shortitudinal" study design (i.e., shorter time intervals between measurements), a method proposed by Dormann and Griffin (2015), was used to examine the VIA scale's factor structure, psychometric properties and consistency. Using the Amazon Mechanical Turk Prime

`

(TurkPrime) – an online crowdsourcing platform – 510 participants were recruited at Time 1 to complete a survey administered using Qualtrics (see all survey questions in Appendices B to M). Participants recruited were at least 18 years of age, for consent purposes, and employed on a full-time basis (i.e., 26 or more hours per week). The latter selection criterion was in place because the measure developed examines one's voluntary intent to be absent from work. To have a representative sample, employees from the United States of America and Canada working in any type of industry were recruited. With the exception of the demographic section and the VIA scale, which were presented to participants immediately after the screening questions, all other sections of the survey were randomized in that the order of presentation of each scale as well as items within each scale were randomized. Participants were compensated $2.00 USD for completing the survey. Three months following the initial survey administration participants from Time 1 who expressed their interested in completing another survey related to this study of absenteeism were sent an invitation for the Time 2 survey. In addition to all of the questions administered at Time 1 the Time 2 survey included a measure of social desirability. The same financial compensation was provided to participants at Time 2.

Given that the exploratory (EFA) and confirmatory (CFA) factor analyses have been found to be effective in examining "factor indeterminacy" (Haig, 2005) and scale validity (Flora & Flake, 2017) both were conducted in this study. In fact, to enable a proper factor analysis using both EFA and CFA I obtained a large sample, as a sample size of 100 is considered "poor", 200 is "fair", 300 is "good", 500 is "very good" and 1 000 is "excellent" (Comrey, 1973). Furthermore, I followed Matsunaga (2010) recommendations to obtain as big of a sample as possible, given the anticipated loss of data points due to participants' failure of attention checks (i.e., "bogus items"), which can range between 15% and 20% (Fleischer, Mead, & Huang, 2015).

`

To conduct the main analyses, using SPSS v24's select cases function, the Time 1 sample was randomly split in two subsamples with approximately 60% of cases for the EFA (n = 307, sample 1) and 40% of cases for the CFA (n = 189, sample 2). The unequal split of participants for the two subsamples was done in favour of the EFA subsample as this initial factor analysis step is concerned with theory generation (Haig, 2005) and "shows more clearly that certain predictions regarding factor structure could be incorrect" (Flora & Flake, 2017, p. 82). Moreover, considering that item reduction, which occurs at the EFA stage, contributes to a more parsimonious solution (Guadagnoli & Velicer, 1988), I deemed the EFA sample size to be of critical importance. In fact, the EFA is the initial step of a factor analysis whereas the CFA – based on prior evidence of numbers of factors in the model (Brown, 2006), which can be taken from the EFA (Flora & Flake, 2017) – is used for theory evaluation (Haig, 2005) to confirm the underlying factor structure and their loadings (Brown, 2006). Although the methods for determining the appropriate sample size for factor analysis vary – participant to item ratios range from 3 to 20 participants per item (Cattell, 1978; Everitt, 1975; Hair, Anderson, Tatham, & Black, 1995, as cited in Mundfrom, Shaw, & Ke, 2005), whilst Guadagnoli and Velicer (1988) found that component saturation was the main determinant of sample size, and Mundfrom et al. (2005) found that the required sample size should be based on the variables-to-factors ratio and levels of communality – each subsample in the current study at least met the mid-range 10:1 participant to item ratio.

During the EFA a principal axis factoring (PAF) with oblique rotation was conducted as common factor methods have proven to be more accurate (Conway & Huffcutt, 2003). The number of factors was determined by looking at eigenvalues and the scree plot. Specifically, factors with eigenvalues above 1 were retained. Following most common practices (Hinkin,

`

1995) only items with factors loadings of .40 and above were considered. Furthermore, the percentage of variance explained by each factor and the parsimony of the model were taken into account to ensure factors that explained most variance and had the simplest structure were retained (Conway & Huffcutt, 2003). A CFA was conducted to further refine the scale and assess the latent factors accounting for the variations and covariations amongst items by specifying the factor model (Brown, 2006).

Following factor analyses, bivariate correlations, using Time 1 data (i.e., samples 1 and 2 combined), were examined to evaluate the psychometric properties of the VIA scale and its relationship to constructs within its nomological network. Hierarchical regressions were also conducted using Time 1 and Time 2 data to assess VIA sale's incremental value. Finally, Time 1 data was used in conjunction with Time 2 data to further examine VIA scale's psychometric properties, such as its predictive validity and test-retest reliability.

Sample

Of the 510 participants who were recruited via TurkPrime at Time 1 and who consented to participate in the study eight were eliminated from further analyses as they did not meet the screening criteria (i.e., six reside outside of USA or Canada – no data collected for these cases – and two were under 18 years of age) and five other participants indicated that they wanted their data withdrawn from the study. Moreover, one case was deleted as the participant did not complete any items of the VIA scale. All remaining participants passed at least one of the two attention checks, which was the threshold used to screen out careless respondents. In fact, only three participants failed the attention check added to the K6 scale, whereas all participants passed the attention check added to the VIA scale. The final Time 1 sample ($N = 496$) was manly

`

composed of U.S. residents (99.6%), Caucasians (82.5%) and males (59.3%), with an age average of 39.60 (*SD* = 10.45). The most frequent response for education was a bachelor's degree (41.1%) and for employment status was that of an employee/worker without subordinates (66.1%). Industries that were most represented in this sample were: Professional, Scientific, and Technical Services (13.1%), Educational Services (10.9%), Manufacturing (9.7%), Finance and Insurance (9.3%), Retail Trade (8.9%), Information (8.1%), Health Care and Social Assistance (7.5%), and Government (6%). On average, participants reported being in their current position for 65.12 months (5.43 years) (*SD* = 61.02 months, 5.08 years) and in their current organization for 89.02 months (7.42 years) (*SD* = 93.03 months, 7.75 years).

At Time 2 – sample 3 – 351 participants of the 481 invited from Time 1 completed the survey resulting in a 72.97% response rate. Of the 351 data points 13 were deleted due to not having completed any of the scales' items. Two participants failed the attention check embedded in the VIA scale; however, they passed the second attention check. Similarly, one participant failed the attention check embedded in the K6 measure but passed the one in the VIA scale. Thus, no data points were deleted for failed attention checks as all participants passed at least one of the two attention checks. The final Time 2 sample (*N* = 338) included U.S. residents only, 87.3% of which were Caucasian, 60.4% male with an average age of 41.04 (*SD* = 10.75). For the most part participants hold a bachelor's degree (42.6%), are employees/workers without subordinates (63%). Industries that were mainly represented in sample were: Educational Services (13.6%), Finance and Insurance (10.7%), Professional, Scientific, and Technical Services (9.8%), Retail Trade (9.5%), Manufacturing (8.9%), Health Care and Social Assistance (8.9%), and Information (8.6%). Participants reported working in their current position for 71.07

`

months (5.92 years) (*SD* = 58.78, 4.90 years) and 96.64 months (8.05 years) (*SD* = 76.70, 6.39 years) for their current organization.

The detailed demographics breakdown of the Time 1 and Time 2 samples, to include the EFA (sample 1) and CFA (sample 2) sub-samples, are found in Table 2. Industries that had less than 5% of participants working in them were not included in the table.

`

Table 2

Demographics for Time 1 and Time 2 Samples, and EFA and CFA Sub-Samples

Variable	Overall sample	Sample 1	Sample 2	Sample 3
Residence U.S. (Canada)	99.6 (.40)	99.70 (.30)	99.50 (.50)	100 (0)
Age				
22 – 35	39.80	41.20	38.80	35.10
36 – 45	33.00	32.60	34.30	37.50
46 – 55	16.20	16.20	16.40	17.00
56 and above	10.20	10.20	10.40	14.10
Sex				
Male (Female)	59.30 (40.10)	59.60 (39.70)	58.70 (40.70)	60.40 (39.10)
Other	.60	.70	.50	.60
Ethnicity				
Caucasian	82.50	82.70	82.00	87.30
African American	8.30	8.80	7.40	5.60
Hispanic / Latino	3.80	3.60	4.20	2.70
Asian	3.60	2.90	4.80	2.40
Other	1.80	2.00	1.60	2.10
Education				
University Degree	71.30	72.60	68.30	70.50
High School	16.90	15.30	19.60	14.50
College/Post Sec	7.10	7.80	5.80	8.00
Trade/Voc/Tech	4.50	4.20	4.80	6.80
Position Status				
Employee/Worker	66.10	67.80	63.50	63.00
Supervisor/Manager	32.90	31.30	35.40	35.50
Director/CEO/President	1.00	1.00	1.10	1.50
Industry				
Professional, Scientific, and Technical	13.10	14.00	11.60	9.80
Educational Services	10.90	11.70	9.50	13.60
Manufacturing	9.70	8.80	11.10	8.90
Finance and Insurance	9.30	9.40	9.00	10.70
Retail Trade	8.90	8.80	9.00	9.50
Information	8.10	8.10	7.90	8.60
Health Care and Social Assistance	7.50	8.10	6.30	8.90
Government	6.00	6.50	5.30	5.00
Tenure Position (Tenure Org)	65.12 (89.02)	67.05 (87.69)	61.63 (84.43)	71.07 (96.64)
Paid sick days - Yes (No)	77.60 (22.40)	77.90 (22.10)	77.20 (22.80)	78.40 (21.60)
Paid Personal days - Yes (No)	77.40 (22.60)	77.90 (22.10)	76.70 (23.30)	76.00 (24.00)

Note: Overall sample –Time 1– (*N* = 496, 3, 2, 4, and 5 data points are missing for Education, Industry, Tenure Position, Tenure Org, respectively). Sample 1 = EFA sample (*n* = 307, 1, and 2 data points are missing for Industry and Tenure Org, respectively). Sample 2 = CFA sample (*n* = 189, 3, 1, 1, and 2 data points are missing for Education, Industry, Tenure position, and Tenure Org, respectively). Sample 3 = Time 2 data (N = 338, 3, 1, 4 and 2 data point missing from Education, Industry, Tenure Position, and Tenure Org, respectively. Other = Native, Aboriginal, and Indigenous, Mixed, and Other. Post Sec = Post-Secondary; Voc = Vocational; Tech = Technical Degree; University Degree = Associate's, Bachelor's, Master's or Advanced Degree (e.g., Ph.D., M.D., etc.); Employee/Worker = Employees without subordinates; Tenure Position = Tenure in current position; Tenure Org = Tenure in organization. All statistics reported in percentages except for "Tenures" where averages are reported in months.

`

Measures

All survey respondents at Time 1 and Time 2 voluntarily completed the first 11 sections/measures, in addition to the consent form and the two screening questions relevant to their age and country of residence (see Appendix B). The Time 2 survey included a social desirability measure. These measures were selected for their relevance to the construct of interest and their proven reliability.

Demographics. Demographic questions such age, sex, ethnicity, and current position were included at the beginning of the survey (see Appendix C for the complete list of questions).

Voluntary Intent to be Absent. The 18-item VIA scale, which had an alpha coefficient of .97 for all samples (i.e., samples 1 and 2 at Time 1, and sample 3 at Time 2) was administered to participants. Using a 5-point scale ranging from 1 = *strongly disagree* to 5 = *strongly agree,* where a higher rating implies a higher VIA proclivity, participants were asked to report their voluntary absence-related intentions whilst excluding statutory holidays and illnesses, for instance. An example item is "I intend to be absent even if I am fully capable of going to work" (see Appendix D for the complete list of questions).

Absence Intentions. Martocchio's (1992) eight items were used to assess absence intentions for specific reasons (sample 1 α = .88; sample 2 α = .86; sample 3 α = .90). As per Martocchio's study participants were asked to answer questions without considering sick days, holidays, or scheduled vacation as absences. A 7-point scale was used ranging from 1= *highly likely* to 7 = *highly unlikely*. An example item is "to fulfill religious commitments" (see Appendix E for the complete list of questions).

`

Past Voluntary Absences. Participants were asked to report the number of times they absented themselves from work in the past three months knowing that they were fully capable and able of going to work (see Appendix F for the complete question). The three-month period was implemented based on timelines used in previous absenteeism-related studies, as mentioned previously.

Turnover Intention. Intention to leave the organization was measured using a 3-item scale (sample 1 α = .94; sample 2 α = .96; sample 3 α = .94) taken from Cohen and Golan (2007), based on the Mobley, Griffeth, Hand and Meglino's (1979) schema of employees' turnover decision. A 5-point scale was used for these items ranging from 1 = *strongly disagree* to 5 = *strongly agree*. An example item is "I am actively searching for an alternative to the organization" (see Appendix G for the complete list of questions).

Intrinsic Work Motivation. Intrinsic work motivation was measured using the 5-item intrinsic work motivation subscale from Bakker's (2008) Work-Related Flow Inventory (WOLF). The reliability of this subscale for all three samples was α = .87. A 7-point scale was used for these items ranging from 1 = *never* to 7 = *always*. An example item is "I find that I also want to work in my free time" (see Appendix H for the complete list of questions).

Perceived Absences Norms. Perceived absence norms were assessed using Johns' (1994a) three items addressing occupational and group norms, and self-reported absenteeism during a one-year period. A 30-point scale was used for these items ranging from 1 = *1 day or less* to 30 = *30 days or more*. An example item is "currently about how many days a year does the average employee in your work group miss due to absenteeism". In addition, an item asking participants to compare their number of absences to that of other employees in their company

`

was included (Johns, 1994a). A 5-point scale ranging from 1 = *much less than average* to 5 = *much more than average* was used for this item. These four items are listed in Appendix I.

Job Satisfaction. A single item was used to assess one's overall job satisfaction. Single-item measures of facet satisfaction were found to be effective in measuring job satisfaction as they demonstrated significant correlations with the Job Descriptive Index, a multi-item measure of job satisfaction (Nagy, 2002). Similar findings were reported by Dolbier, Webster, McCalister, Mallon, and Steinhardt (2005) who examined the psychometric properties of a single-item job satisfaction measure as compared to the 15-item Job Satisfaction Scale. Thus, the single item from Dolbier et al.'s (2005) study measuring overall job satisfaction was used in my study: "Taking everything into consideration, how do you feel about your job as a whole?" (see Appendix J). A 7-point scale was used ranging from 1 = *extremely dissatisfied* to 7 = *extremely satisfied*.

Workplace Incivility. Leiter's (2012) 5-item supervisor incivility subscale (sample 1 α = .95; samples 2 and 3 α =.93) and 5-item co-worker incivility subscale (sample 1 α = .95; samples 2 and 3 α = .93) of the straightforward incivility scale (SIS) were used to measure employees' experience with workplace incivility in the past week. A 7-point scale was used for both subscales ranging from 0 = *never* to 6 = *daily*. An example item is "behaved without consideration for you" (see Appendix K for the complete list of questions).

Psychological Distress. The effect of psychological distress experienced by employees was measured using the 6-item Kessler Psychological Distress Scale (K6; Kessler, Andrews, Colpe, Hiripi, Mroczek, Normand, Walters, & Zaslavsky, 2002) – a screening measure looking at non-specific psychological distress (i.e., cases not diagnosed according to DSM disorders)

`

(samples 1 and 3 α = .91; sample 2 α = .88). A 5-point scale was used ranging from 0 = *never* to 4 = *all of the time*. An example item is "about how often did you feel nervous" (see Appendix L for the complete list of items).

Attention Checks. To ensure attentive responding and data quality, whilst preserving scale validity (Kung, Kwok, & Brown, 2018), two attention check items (see Appendix M), created by the author, were included in the survey. An example item is "for this question, please answer "Agree". Specifically, one item was embedded in the VIA and K6 measures.

Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale. Although anonymity was assured to participants, which, in the past, has been used as a means for ensuring participants' responses were not driven by social desirability (Antonakis, Fenley, & Liechti, 2011), the short form (13 items, sample 3 α = .82) of the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability (MCSD) scale (Ballard, 1992) was added to the survey at Time 2 to control for participants' socially desirable responding. Respondents were asked to answer *true* or *false* to each question. An example item is "I'm always willing to admit it when I make a mistake" (see Appendix N for the complete list of questions).

Results

During the examination of the overall Time 1 sample (i.e., frequencies) an implausible entry was found and was treated as a missing value. Given the low percentages of missing values, results of the missing values analysis are not reported as *t*-tests examining patterns of missingness of variables are applicable for variables having at least 5% of missing values (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2019). In fact, with the exception of one item in the absence intentions scale, which had 21.1% of missing values, the rest of the variables did not have missing values

`

above .8%. The 21.1% of missing data is of low concern as the instruction provided to participants is “if you do not have children, leave blank”. Next, univariate and multivariate outliers were examined separately for samples 1 and 2. Firstly, univariate outliers were examined using standardized scores. In sample 1 anywhere between 2 and 11 outliers (i.e., Z scores below -3 or above 3) were found for 11 of the variables or scales used. Furthermore, outliers were also examined by observing the box-and-whisker plot, which revealed anywhere between 2 and 27 cases. Similarly, in sample 2, using standardized scores, anywhere between 1 to 6 univariate outliers were found for 13 of the variables or scales used. Looking at the box-and-whisker plot 2 to 20 outliers were observed. Although univariate outliers were present, Cook’s distance – a measure of influential data points (Stevens, 1984) – revealed that there were no influential outliers. In fact, cases with a Cook’s distance of 1, approximately, are deemed large and influential as they can be outliers for both predictor and outcome variables (Cook & Weisberg, 1982, as cited in Stevens, 1984). For my study, even though univariate outliers were present all Cook’s distances for sample 1 were .12 or less and for sample 2 .25 or lower, consequently all data points were kept as they were not deemed influential. Lastly, bi-variate correlations between the 18 VIA items did not reveal any multicollinearity, which occurs when correlations coefficients are higher than .85 (Schroeder Lander, & Levine-Silverman, 1990) or .95 (Zainodin & Yap, 2013), as the highest correlation was .84 (i.e., lowest being .42) for sample 1 and .81 (i.e., lowest being .37) for sample 2.

At Time 2 – sample 3 – a frequency analysis revealed three implausible responses for the length of time participants have been in their current position, and thus these three data points were treated as missing data. Overall, 1.2% of data was missing, at most, for any given variable with the exception of the first question of Martocchio’s (1992) absence intentions scale that had

`

20.10% of missing data, which is not a concern due to the formulation of the question, as was the case for Time 1 data. Next, univariate outliers were examined using standardized scores. Anywhere between 1 to 13 outliers (i.e., Z scores below -3 or above 3) were found for 13 variables or scales used. Univariate outliers were also examined using the box-and-whisker plots. Based on box-and whisker plots anywhere between 2 and 27 outliers were found. Even though univariate outliers were present these cases were not deemed worrisome as all Cook's distances were, once again, below 1. In fact, the highest Cook's distance was .20, and thus all cases were kept for further analyses as they were not deemed influential. Lastly, social desirability answering is not deemed to be a concern as the highest correlation between the MCSD and any other scale was -.29 (i.e., this was the correlation with the VIA scale, which was significant), which is considered to be a weak association. Thus, results of the main analyses can be interpreted with the knowledge that social desirably did not have a strong influence on participants' responses.

VIA Scale's Factor Structure

Exploratory Factor Analysis

The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin test of .96 and a significant Bartlett's test of sphericity ($p < .001$) revealed that sample 1 was adequate for factor analyses, and thus, using IBM SPSSv24, a PAF of the 18-item VIA scale was conducted. The decision regarding the underlying factor structure and item reduction were made using result from the PAF, which, as suggested by Flora and Flake (2017), should be used in a majority of situations, as compared to a PCA, for instance, which is not considered to be a type of factor analysis, per se, and can lead to

`

misinterpretation (Flora & Flake, 2017). In an attempt to arrive to an interpretable solution, the PAF was conducted using an oblique rotation (i.e., direct Oblim) – rotation used when factors are expected to correlate (Flora & Flake, 2017). Using eigenvalues above one and the scree test as criteria for factor selection, one factor was extracted accounting for 62.10% of variance (see Table 3), which is line with the aim of the VIA scale, that is to measure one's overall tendency to voluntarily absent themselves from work, and meets the commonly acceptable threshold of 60% (Hinkin, 1998). Although items with factor loadings of .30 or .40 and higher are typically considered for further analyses (Brown, 2006; Guadagnoli & Velicer, 1988; Hinkin, 1995; Matsunaga, 2010) a more stringent cut off of .70 (i.e., .60 or 70 is considered to be highly conservative (Matsunaga, 2010) was applied in this study to reduce the number of items as the coefficient alpha is very much impacted by the number of items (Cortina, 1993), and to follow Hinkin's (1995) recommendation to have approximately 4 to 6 items in the final scale. Thus, this resulted in the removal of items 4, 8 and 16 that had factor loadings of .67, .66, and .69, respectively (see Table 3). The resulting 15-item scale accounted for 64.82 % of variance and had an alpha of .96.

Next, the corrected item-total correlations of the 15 items were considered to ensure each item contributed to the measurement of the VIA construct. The lowest corrected item-total correlation of items was .71, thus all 15 items meet the .30 threshold (Ferketich, 1991). In addition, inter-item correlations were looked at as correlations below .30 suggest that items are not related enough and inter-item correlations above .70 suggest redundancy (Ferketich, 1991) and, in turn, increase a scale's coefficient alpha (Cortina, 1993). Thus, taking these thresholds into consideration items 5, 7, 11, 13, 15, 17, and 18 were kept for the subsequent EFA given that their inter-item correlations were either all .70 or below (see Table 4), or they had inter-item

`

correlations of .71 with only one other item, whereas all other items had multiple inter-item correlations above the .70 threshold. No inter-item correlations were below the .30 threshold. The PAF analysis revealed that the 7-item VIA scale – the short scale – (see Appendix O) accounted for 59.55% of variance and had an alpha of .91.

Given that some researchers (e.g., Norris, Carpenter, Eaton, Guo, Lassche, Pett, Blumenthal, 2015) used a more liberal cut-off by deleting items that had correlations above .80 or below .20, I also ran a PAF after deleting items, from the 15 item scale, using this cut-off. Specifically, given that items 9 and 10 had a .84 correlation I removed item 9 as it alludes to "call in sick to work" which is already covered by items 2 ("call in sick even if I am not actually sick") and 12 ("take a sick day because I feel like it") that have inter-item correlation with item 9 of .77 and .75, respectively. PAF results for the 14-item VIA (see Appendix P), which from hereon is considered as the full VIA scale, are also reported in Table 3.

Although these results reveal that the full VIA scale accounts for a slightly higher amount of variance than the shorter VIA scale, the stricter cut off score for inter-item correlations was applied herein to ensure the coefficient alpha is not driven by the number of items in my scale and to reduce item redundancy. Considering this, all subsequent analyses (e.g., CFA, correlations, regressions) were conducted using the 7-item VIA scale (i.e., short version); however, the same analyses were conducted with the full scale, for comparison purposes, for which results are reported either in a footnote or in an Appendix.

`

Table 3

Factor Loadings of the 18, 15, 14 and 7-Item VIA Scale using PAF

	Items	18	15	14	7
1.	I intend to be absent even if I am fully capable of going to work (1)	.84	.83	.83	—
2.	I intend to call in sick even if I am not actually sick (2)	.83	.84	.83	—
3.	It is likely that I will decide to not go to work even if I am fully capable of going to work (3)	.84	.83	.83	—
4.	If I do not feel like working, I will not show up (4)	.67	—	—	—
5.	I will often ask myself if I should call in sick to work even if I am not actually sick (6)	.71	.72	.71	.68
6.	I intend to be absent from work if non-work alternatives are more attractive than work (11)	.85	.83	.84	—
7.	I intend to be absent from work if it serves me best (9)	.78	.77	.77	.79
8.	I will actively search for reasons to not go to work (13)	.66	—	—	—
9.	I intend to call in sick to work without a valid reason (16)	.83	.85	—	—
10.	I intend to skip work without a valid reason (17)	.85	.86	.84	—
11.	I intend to take the day off just because (19)	.79	.79	.79	.79
12.	I intend to take a sick day because I feel like it (20)	.83	.84	.83	—
13.	I intend to call in sick because I have plans the night before my work shift (21)	.78	.78	.77	.76
14.	I intend to call in sick to do a recreational activity (24)	.84	.85	.84	—
15.	I intend to be absent from work to participate in an activity that I view as being more fun (25)	.82	.79	.80	.81
16.	I intend to be absent from work to avoid unfavourable work activities (26)	.69	—	—	—
17.	I intend to be absent from work to complete other life activities that I did not complete during non-work hours (27)	.77	.76	.76	.80
18.	I intend to be absent from work to extend my weekend/other time off (28)	.76	.74	.74	.77
	Eigenvalues	11.18	9.72	9.00	4.17
	Percentage of variance	62.10	64.82	64.31	59.55
	Coefficient alpha	.97	.96	.96	.91

Note. Listwise $N = 299$. PAF = Principal axis factoring (pattern matrix and extraction sums of squared loadings reported). Loadings extracted using eigenvalues and scree plot. Coefficient alphas reported from sample 1. Numbers in front of the items reflect the order that items were administered to participants. Numbers in parenthesis represent the original item number from the 30-item VIA list (see Table 1).

Table 4

Descriptive Statistics and Inter-Item Correlations for the 7-Item VIA Measure (EFA Sample)

Item	*M*	*SD*	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. I will often ask myself if I should call in sick to work even if I am not actually sick (5)	2.22	1.24	—						
2. I intend to be absent from work if it serves me best (7)	2.28	1.25	.53**	—					
3. I intend to take the day off just because (11)	2.28	1.24	.57**	.56**	—				
4. I intend to call in sick because I have plans the night before my work shift (13)	1.82	1.08	.55**	.63**	.56**	—			
5. I intend to be absent from work to participate in an activity that I view as being more fun (15)	2.26	1.27	.53**	.68**	.68**	.56**	—		
6. I intend to be absent from work to complete other life activities that I did not complete during non-work hours (17)	2.13	1.21	.55**	.63**	.63**	.66**	.59**	—	
7. I intend to be absent from work to extend my weekend/other time off (18)	2.31	1.30	.48**	.60**	.65**	.56**	.67**	.62**	—

Note. Listwise $N = 305$. VIA = Voluntary intent to be absent scale. Numbers in front of the items reflect the order that items are in the final scale. Numbers in parenthesis at the end of each item represent the order in which items were administered to participants. ** Significant at the $p < .01$ (2-tailed).

Confirmatory Factor Analysis

A confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was conducted with sample 2, using JAMOVI, to confirm the factor structure of the 7-item VIA scale obtained following the item reduction in the EFA stage. All factor loading estimates are well above the .40 cut-off and all are significant, thus indicating that all 7 items load on the same factor (see Table 5).

Table 5

Factor Loadings of the CFA of the 7-Item VIA Scale

Items	Std. Est	SE	Z
1. I will often ask myself if I should call in sick to work even if I am not actually sick (5)	.72[a]	—	—
2. I intend to be absent from work if it serves me best (7)	.79***	.12	10.23
3. I intend to take the day off just because (11)	.80***	.12	10.39
4. I intend to call in sick because I have plans the night before my work shift (13)	.69***	.09	8.94
5. I intend to be absent from work to participate in an activity that I view as being more fun (15)	.72***	.12	9.37
6. I intend to be absent from work to complete other life activities that I did not complete during non-work hours (17)	.77***	.12	10.06
7. I intend to be absent from work to extend my weekend/other time off (18)	.81***	.12	10.54

Note. $N = 189$. [a] fixed parameter. Std. Est = Standardized estimates. Numbers in front of the items reflect the order that items are in the final scale. Numbers in parenthesis at the end of each item represent the order in which items were administered to participants *** Significant at the $p < .001$.

In addition, the extent to which the model fits the data was examined using absolute (i.e., standard root-mean-square residual (SRMR) and chi-square), comparative (e.g., comparative fit index (CFI) and Tucker-Lewis index (TLI)) and parsimonious (e.g., root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA)), fit indices. The closer to zero the SRMR and RMSEA are the better the model fit (Brown, 2006). Specifically, SRMR values below or close to .08 and RMSEA values below or close to .06 suggest a good model fit. Conversely, the closer the CFI and TLI are to 1, but higher than .95, the better the fit (Hu & Bentler, 1999). Following these guidelines all fit indices, with the exception of the significant chi-square, $\chi^2(14, N = 189) = 40.7,\ p < .001$,

`

suggest a good fit to the data: CFI = .96, TLI = .94, SRMR = .03, RMSEA = .10, 90% CI [.07, .14]. It is noteworthy that the full scale had a lower CFI and TLI, and a higher SRMR, RMSEA and chi-square, thus suggesting a slightly poorer fit to the data, but, nonetheless, a good fit[1].

Table 6 shows bi-variate correlations for the main variables and scales used for analyses. The correlation analyses were done on the overall Time 1 sample (i.e., samples 1 and 2) and on the Time 2 sample using the short VIA scale[2].

[1] CFI = .92, TLI = .91, SRMR = .04, RMSEA = .11, 90% CI [.10, .12], and $\chi^2(77, N = 189) = 532, p < .001$.
[2] Bi-variate correlations, using the full scale (i.e., 14 items), for Time 1 and Time 2 data are found in Appendix Q.

`

Table 6

Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlations for all Study Variables and Measures for Time 1and Time 2 Using the Short VIA Scale

	Measure	*M*	*SD*	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	*M*	*SD*
1.	Age	39.55	10.42	–	.46**	.47**	.03	.05	-.07	-.12*	-.10	-.13*	-.06	41.06	10.76
2.	Tenure Pos	65.33	61.10	.43**	–	.73**	-.09	-.06	-.10	.00	-.05	-.02	.01	70.94	58.88
3.	Tenure Org	86.61	75.32	.45**	.70**	–	-.10	-.11	-.05	-.05	-.05	-.10	-.04	97.13	76.99
4.	Paid SD	1.23	.42	-.02	-.09*	-.09	–	.56**	.06	-.06	-.08	-.11*	.02	1.21	.41
5.	Paid PD	1.23	.42	.07	-.05	-.10*	.48**	–	-.02	-.09	-.14**	-.13*	-.02	1.23	.43
6.	PVAQ	1.08	2.22	-.07	-.10*	-.04	.01	.03	–	.27**	.28**	.39**	.31**	.77	1.95
7.	ONA	7.51	5.61	-.13**	-.07	-.04	-.08	-.08	.41**	–	.69**	.69**	.16**	6.97	5.20
8.	GNA	7.95	5.56	-.07	-.12*	-.04	-.08	-.10*	.38**	.60**	–	.64**	-.05	7.43	5.39
9.	SRA	4.56	4.83	-.06	-.07	.01	-.12**	-.07	.57**	.64**	.58**	–	.42**	3.98	4.58
10.	CA	1.95	.93	-.04	.01	.01	-.03	.00	.38**	.24**	.08	.54**	–	1.83	.86
11.	Job Sat	5.00	1.61	.10*	.06	.07	-.11*	-.15**	-.01	-.06	-.05	-.02	.01	5.08	1.57
12.	VIA	2.18	.98	-.11*	-.06	-.04	-.04	-.09	.56**	.34**	.30**	.50**	.41**	2.08	.99
13.	AI	2.80	1.35	-.06	.03	.04	-.05	-.08	.45**	.25**	.27**	.39**	.25**	2.70	1.37
14.	Turnover	2.35	1.29	-.12**	-.10*	-.12**	.15**	.10*	.26**	.11*	.11*	.15**	.12**	2.14	1.20
15.	IWM	3.24	1.39	.02	.07	.08	-.02	-.09	.17**	.08	.04	.10*	.01	3.21	1.34

`

16.	SIS – Sup	.61	1.11	-.07	-.02	-.06	.05	.04	.38**	.18**	.19**	.21**	.16**	.45	.91
17.	SIS- CW	.60	1.03	-.08	-.09*	-.10*	.02	.01	.38**	.20**	.23**	.19**	.16**	.51	.99
18.	K6	.93	.85	-.18**	-.13**	-.13*	.09*	.09*	.36**	.13**	.15**	.21**	.18**	.88	.83
19.	MCSD	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	5.80	3.46

Note. Listwise $N = 487$ for Time 1 (below diagonal). Listwise $N = 329$ for Time 2 (above diagonal). Coefficient alphas for the short VIA scale are reported in the Results section – Scale Reliability – and for all other scales they are reported in the Measures section. Age reported in years; Tenure Pos = Tenure in current position (in months); Tenure Org = Tenure in Organization (in months); Paid SD = Paid Sick Days (1 = *Yes*, 2 = *No*); Paid PD = Paid Personal Days (1 = *Yes*, 2 = *No*); PVAQ = Past voluntary absences question; ONA = Perceived occupational norms absence (per year); GNA = Perceived group norms absence (per year); SRA = Self-reported absence (per year); CA = Comparison of absences (overall); Job Sat = Job satisfaction; VIA = Voluntary intent to be absent scale (7-items); AI = Absence intentions scale; Turnover = Turnover intent scale; IWM = Intrinsic work motivation sub-scale; SIS – Sup = Straightforward incivility scale – Supervisor incivility; SIS – CW = Straightforward incivility scale co-worker incivility; K6 = Kessler psychological distress scale; MCSD = Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability scale.
* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$ (2-tailed).

`

Table 6

Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlations for all Study Variables and Measures for Time 1 and Time 2 Using the Short VIA Scale (continued)

	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19
1. Age	.15**	-.09	-.10	-.15**	.09	-.09	-.08	-.20**	.04
2. Tenure Pos	.05	-.00	-.02	-.08	.09	-.06	-.09	-.14**	-.03
3. Tenure Org	.11*	-.07	-.01	-.15**	.15**	-.01	-.01	-.13*	.04
4. Paid SD	-.14**	-.11*	-.14*	.11*	-.12*	.06	.10	.09	.03
5. Paid PD	.01	.05	.01	.04	.04	.28	.08	.12	-.05
6. PVAQ	-.08	.39**	.28**	.15**	.06	.25**	.20**	.17**	-.06
7. ONA	-.17**	.33**	.24**	.20**	-.08	.15**	.07	.05	-.09
8. GNA	-.11*	.27**	.21**	.10	-.03	.12*	.13*	.10	-.06
9. SRA	-.09	.46**	.32**	.15**	-.05	.13*	.06	.07	-.18**
10. CA	-.08	.42*	.22**	.16**	-.09	.17**	.07	.13*	-.21**
11. Job Sat	–	-.26**	-.17**	-.79**	.60**	-.27**	-.28**	-.38**	.13*
12. VIA	-.24**	–	.55**	.42**	-.16**	.31**	.25**	.30**	-.29**
13. AI	-.09	.56**	–	.26**	-.06	.21**	.20**	.22**	-.16**
14. Turnover	-.72**	.39**	.25**	–	-.45**	.37**	.35**	.42**	-.14*
15. IWM	.55**	-.07	.05	-.37**	–	-.01	-.02	-.18**	.20**

16.	SIS - Sup	-.31**	.36**	.26**	.44**	.05	–	.79**	.48**	.03
17.	SIS - CW	-.22**	.36**	.25**	.41**	.09*	.73**	–	.50**	.05
18.	K6	-.38**	.35**	.23**	.48**	-.05	.56**	.55**	–	-.21**
19.	MCSD	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–

Note. Listwise $N = 487$. Listwise $N = 332$ for Time 2 (above diagonal). Coefficient alphas for the short VIA scale are reported in the Results section – Scale Reliability – and for all other scales they are reported in the Measures section. Age reported in years; Tenure Pos = Tenure in current position (in months); Tenure Org = Tenure in Organization (in months); Paid SD = Paid Sick Days (1 = *Yes*, 2 = *No*); Paid PD = Paid Personal Days (1 = *Yes*, 2 = *No*); PVAQ = Past voluntary absences question; ONA = Perceived occupational norms absence (per year); GNA = Perceived group norms absence (per year); SRA = Self-reported absence (per year); CA = Comparison of absences (overall); Job Sat = Job satisfaction; VIA = Voluntary intent to be absent scale (7 items); AI = Absence intentions scale; Turnover = Turnover intent scale; IWM = Intrinsic work motivation sub-scale; SIS – Sup = Straightforward incivility scale – Supervisor incivility; SIS – CW = Straightforward incivility scale co-worker incivility; K6 = Kessler psychological distress scale; MCSD = Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability scale.
* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$ (2-tailed).

VIA Scale's Psychometric Properties

Psychometrics properties of the final 7-item VIA sale were analyzed using bi-variate correlations. Additionally, convergent and discriminant validity were examined using CFA as it has proven effective for comparing the association of respondents' scores on existing scales to their scores on another instrument (Flora & Flake, 2017) to ensure indicators load on the appropriate factors (Brown, 2006). The complete Time 1 sample (i.e., samples 1 and 2) were used for the aforementioned analyses.

Construct Validity

Construct validity of the short VIA scale was examined in terms of convergent and discriminant validity. Convergent validity was tested using Martocchio's (1992) 8-item absence intentions scale measuring one's intent to be absent based on specific reasons (e.g., hobby, family responsibilities, community activities), which is a theoretically similar concept to one's VIA proclivity. The significant bi-variate correlations examined ($r = .56$, $p < .01$) suggest that the two scales are moderately correlated, supporting hypothesis 1. Although this correlation is deemed moderate, it is well below .85 indicating that there is no multicollinearity. The same correlation was obtained with the full VIA scale.

Additionally, a CFA was conducted, using JAMOVI, to compare the model fit of a 1 and 2-factor solution to confirm whether the two scales measure different constructs. As reported in Table 7[3], although it came shy of having an adequate fit, a 2-factor solution has proven to be a

[3] Results of these analysis using the full VIA scale are reported in Appendix R.

`

better fit to the data, CFI = .88, TLI = .86, SRMR = .06, RMSEA = .11, 90% CI [.10, .12] and χ^2 (89, N = 382) = 466.00, p < .001 than a 1-factor solution, CFI = .69, TLI = .64, SRMR = .11, RMSEA = .17, 90% CI [.16, .18] and χ^2 (90, N = 382) = 1054.00, p < .001, with a χ^2 difference (1, N = 382) = 588.00, p < .01. Thus, the bi-variate correlations support hypothesis one, whilst the model fit indices supporting a 2-factor model highlight that the two scales measure two distinct constructs.

Discriminant validity of the VIA scale was examined using the 3-item intent to turnover measure and the 5-item intrinsic work motivation sub-scale. Bi-variate correlations between the VIA and one's intent to turnover scale suggest that the two are moderately correlated (r = .39, p < .01)[4]. Although these correlations are moderate, and thus hypothesis 2 is not supported, they are not strong enough to suggest that the two scales are measuring the same construct. On the other hand, the weak, negative and non-significant bi-variate correlation (r = -.07)[5] between the VIA and intrinsic work motivation sub-scale scale support hypothesis 3 and suggest that the two scales are not strongly correlated as to suggest construct overlap. In addition to examining the correlations, CFAs were conducted to investigate whether a 2-factor model would be a better fit to the data than a 1-factor, which would be additional proof of discriminant validity between the VIA and the intent to turnover and IWM scales – a method that has been used in previous scale development efforts (e.g., Djurdjevic, Stoverink, Klotz, Koopman, da Motta Veiga, Yam, &

[4] Bi-variate correlation between the full VIA scale and the intent to turnover measure was .40.
[5] Bi-variate correlations between the full VIA scale and the intrinsic motivation sub-scale was -.08.

`

Chiang, 2017). As reported in Table 7[6], a 2-factor solution, CFI = .98, TLI = .97, SRMR = .04, RMSEA = .07, 90% CI [.05, .08] and $\chi^2(34, N = 490) = 111.00$, $p < .001$ has proven to be a better fit to the data for the VIA and turnover intention scales than a 1-factor solution, CFI = .61, TLI = .49, SRMR = .15, RMSEA = .28, 90% CI [.27, .30] and $\chi^2(35, N = 490) = 1416.00$, $p < .001$, with a χ^2 difference $(1, N = 490) = 1305.00$, $p < .01$. Similarly, a 2-factor solution, CFI = .96, TLI = .96, SRMR = .05, RMSEA = .07, 90% CI [.06, .08] and $\chi^2(53, N = 487) = 169.00$, $p < .001$ has also proven to be a better fit to the data for the VIA and intrinsic work motivation scale than a 1-factor solution, CFI = .59, TLI = .49, SRMR = .19, RMSEA = .22, 90% CI [.21, .23] and $\chi^2(54, N = 487) = 1370.00$, $p < .001$, with a χ^2 difference $(1, N = 487) = 1201.00$, $p < .01$. As such, the CFA results provide evidence of VIA's discriminant validity supporting hypotheses 2 and 3.

[6] Results of these analysis using the full VIA scale are reported in Appendix R.

`

Table 7

Model Fit Indices Comparisons Between the Short VIA and the AI, TI, and IWM Measures Using Time 1 Sample

	1-factor model					2-factor model					Difference
Measures	χ^2 (*df*)	RMSEA	SRMR	CFI	TLI	χ^2 (*df*)	RMSEA	SRMR	CFI	TLI	$\Delta\chi^2$ (*df*)
VIA and AI	1054.00(90)***	.17	.11	.69	.64	466.00(89)***	.11	.06	.88	.86	588.00(1)**
VIA and TI	1416.00(35)***	.28	.15	.61	.49	111.00(34)***	.07	.04	.98	.97	1305.00(1)**
VIA and IWM	1370.00(54)***	.22	.19	.59	.49	169.00(53)***	.07	.05	.96	.96	1201.00(1)**

Note. Listwise *N* for VIA and AI = 382; Listwise *N* for VIA and TI = 490; Listwise *N* for VIA and IWM = 487. Fixed parameter constraint used. VIA = Voluntary intent to be absence scale; AI = Absence intentions scale; TI = Intent to turnover scale; IWM = Intrinsic work motivation sub-scale. χ^2 = Chi-squared; RMSEA = Root mean square error of approximation; SRMR = standard root-mean-square residual; CFI = Comparative fit index; TLI = Tucker Lewis index.
* $p < .05$, ** < .01, *** $p < .001$.

`

Criterion Validity

Criterion validity was first explored using postdictive validity by looking at employees self-reported past voluntary absences in the last three months. As hypothesized, one's past voluntary absences were moderately correlated with their VIA proclivity ($r = .56$, $p < .01$)[7]. In essence, employees reporting higher instances of past voluntary absences also had a higher VIA tendency, which supports hypothesis 4 and VIA's criterion-related validity. Next, criterion validity was examined using predictive validity by conducting a regression analysis to assess whether participants' VIA scores at Time 1 predicted their voluntary absences in the following three months (i.e., measured by participants' self-reported absences in the past three months reported at Time 2). Regression results reveal that one's VIA score significantly predicted one's voluntary absences in the following three months, $R^2 = .09$, $F\ (1, 332) = 31.10$, $r = .29$, $p < .001$, supporting hypothesis 5. In fact, 8.60% of voluntary absences were accounted for by one's VIA score. Similar results were obtained for the full VIA scale[8].

Scale Reliability

The internal consistency of the 7-item VIA scale was examined using the coefficient alpha which was .91 for the Time 1 sample and .92 for the Time 2 sample[9]. The deletion of any of the 7 items would have resulted in a slightly lower Cronbach's alpha (i.e., lowest being .90).

---

[7] Bi-variate correlation between self-reported past voluntary absences in the last three months and the full VIA scale was .58.
[8] Regression results for the full VIA scale were: $R^2 = .09$, $F\ (1, 332) = 31.33$, $p < .001$.
[9] Coefficients alpha for the full VIA scale were .96 and .97 for the Time 1 and Time 2 sample, respectively.

Thus, these items reliably measure one's VIA tendency considering that the acceptable threshold of .70 (Nunnally, 1987) was highly exceeded. It is noteworthy that VIA's reliability was higher than that of Martocchio's (1992) absence intentions scale, which, in his original study, had an alpha of .78 and in the current study an alpha of .87 in the Time 1 sample and .90 in the Time 2 sample.

Test-rest reliability was examined by looking at the Pearson correlation of participants' average VIA score between Time 1 and 2 (i.e., administered 3 months apart), and by creating a Bland-Altman plot and following it up with a *t*-test and a linear regression to examine the level of agreement. Results revealed a significant correlation of .64 for the short VIA scale[10]. Moreover, the Bland-Altman plot and the non-significant *t*-test result, $t(334) = -1.52$, $p = .13$, looking at the difference between Time 2 and Time 1 scores, and the non-significant regression results, $\beta = .03$, $p = .53$, looking at the difference between the Time 2 and Time 1 scores as the dependant variable and the mean of the two scores as the independent variable, suggest that there is a level of agreement between Time 1 and Time 2 scores. Consequently, the 7-item VIA scale's test-retest reliability is supported[11].

VIA Scale's Nomological Network

VIA's consistency was explored by examining bi-variate correlations, with the Time 1 sample, between VIA and its potential antecedents that are part of its nomological network: perceived absence norms, job satisfaction, workplace incivility, and psychological distress.

---

[10] Test-retest reliability correlation of the full VIA scale was .66 and it was significant.
[11] Bland-Altman plot and the regression results, $\beta = .02$, $p = .78$, for the full VIA scale also suggest a level of agreement between Time 1 and Time 2 scores.

Additionally, using Lee and Preachers' (2013) online calculator (http://quantpsy.org/corrtest/corrtest2.htm), tests of dependent correlations were conducted comparing antecedents' correlation with the VIA measure to their correlation with the existing absence intentions scale. For all tests conducted the correlation of unshared variance was the correlation between the VIA measure and Martocchio's (1992) absence intentions measure (r = .56)[12]. In essence, these calculations provide results regarding "the test of the equality of two correlation coefficients obtained from the same sample, with the two correlations sharing one variable in common." (Lee & Preacher, 2013, The purpose of this page section). Following listwise deletion, all analyses were done on the Time 1 sample.

Perceived Absence Norms

Perceived absence norms – measured with 4 individual items –were related to one's VIA proclivity in that the positive correlations were weak to moderate, providing partial support for hypothesis 6a. Specifically, one's perceived occupational norm (r = .34, p < .01) and one's perceived group norm (r = .30, p < .01) showed weak correlations with employees' VIA tendency whereas one's self-reported absences (in a year) (r = .50, p < .01) and their comparison of absences (r = .41, p < .01) were moderately correlated with their VIA tendency[13]. All of these correlations were higher with the VIA than the absence intentions scale, as can be seen in Table 6. Furthermore, the tests of dependent correlations were significant, with a 2-tailed test, for

[12] The correlation of unshared variance for the full VIA scale was also .56.
[13] Correlations between the full VIA scale and these variables were as follows: perceived occupational norm (r = .34, p < .01), perceived group norm (r = .30 p < .01), self-reported absences (in a year) (r = .51, p < .01), and comparison of absences (r = .41, p < .01).

perceived occupational norms ($p = .03$), self-reported absences ($p = .003$), and comparison of absences ($p < .001$). Conversely, the test of dependent correlations was not significant for group norms ($p = .46$)[14]. Thus, hypothesis 6b was supported for three of the four perceived absence norms, in that employees' perceived occupational norms, self-reported absences (in a year), and comparison of absences were significantly more correlated with their VIA tendency than with their absence intentions.

Job Satisfaction

Regarding one's job satisfaction, a weak negative relationship with one's VIA tendency was obtained ($r = -.24$, $p < .01$)[15], supporting hypothesis 7a. Additionally, as revealed by the significant result of the test of dependent correlations ($p < .001$), the correlation between one's job satisfaction and their VIA tendency was significantly stronger than the correlation between one's job satisfaction and their absence intentions, as measured with Martocchio's (1992) scale, contrary to hypothesis 7b[16].

Workplace Incivility

Employees reported experiences with workplace incivility were analyzed. Positive and moderate bivariate correlations were obtained between one's experience with supervisor incivility ($r = .36$, $p < .01$), and between co-worker incivility ($r = .36$, $p < .01$), and their VIA

---

[14] Tests of dependent correlations for the full VIA scale were as follows: perceived occupational norm ($p = .03$), self-reported absences ($p = .002$), comparison of absences ($p < .001$), and group norm ($p = .52$).
[15] Correlations between the full VIA scale and job satisfaction was $r = -.24$, $p < .01$.
[16] Tests of dependent correlations for the full VIA scale, as it relates to job satisfaction, was $p < .001$.

tendency, which is in line with hypothesis 8a[17]. Hypothesis 8b was not supported as employees who experienced supervisors' incivility and those having experienced co-worker's incivility had a correlation of the same strength with their VIA tendency.

Next, bivariate correlations between both supervisor and co-worker incivility were stronger with the VIA (r = .36 for both) than with the AI scale (r = .26; r = .25, respectively)[18]. Additionally, as revealed by the test of dependent correlations, employee's experience with both supervisor incivility and co-worker incivility were significantly more related to their VIA tendency that to their absence intentions ($p \leq .01$), supporting hypothesis 8c.

Psychological Distress

Lastly, employees' psychological distress levels were positively and weakly (r = .35, $p <$. 01)[19], albeit marginally weak (i.e., r between .36 and .67 are moderate), related to their VIA tendency supporting hypothesis 9a. Additionally, a test of dependent correlations revealed that one's distress level was significantly more associated with their VIA tendency than with their absence intentions ($p < .01$)[20], which confirms hypothesis 9b.

---

[17] Correlations between the full VIA scale and supervisor incivility was (r = .36, $p < .01$), and with co-worker incivility (r = .38, $p < .01$).
[18] Tests of dependent correlations for the full VIA scale were significant for both supervisor (p = .02) and co-worker incivility ($p \leq .001$).
[19] Correlations between the full VIA scale and psychological distress was r =.33, $p < .01$.
[20] Tests of dependent correlations for the full VIA scale, as it relates to psychological distress, was p = .01.

VIA Scale's Incremental Value

In addition to conducting tests of dependent correlations, which suggested significantly stronger correlations between various presumed antecedents of absenteeism and the VIA scale as compared to the absence intentions scale, further analyses were conducted to determine whether the VIA scale offers added value for the prediction of voluntary absenteeism.

Specifically, a hierarchical regression analysis was conducted to explore VIA tendency's – measured at Time 1 – ability to predict voluntary absences over and above Martocchio's (1992) 8-item absence intentions scale – also measured at Time 1. As shown in Table 8, results reveal that Martocchio's (1992) absence intentions – included in Step 1 of the hierarchical regression – significantly predicted one's future absences – represented by the self-reported number of voluntary absences in the past three months, measured at Time 2, $R^2 = .06$, $F\ (1, 332) = 19.59$, $p < .001$. More importantly, one's VIA tendency – entered in Step 2 – significantly contributed to the prediction of the dependent variable over-and-above the absence intention measure, $R^2 = .09$, $\triangle R^2 = .04$, $F\ (2, 331) = 16.83$, $p < .\ 001$. The effect size of .10 (i.e., $f^2 = R^2 / (1 – R^2) = .09 / (1 - .09) = .0989$) is considered small to moderate, albeit it is much closer to the moderate than to the small effect size index. In fact, one's VIA accounted for an additional 4% of variance above and beyond one's absence intentions, thus supporting hypothesis 10. The same analyses were run with the full VIA scale and results are practically identical (see Appendix S).

Table 8

Regression of One's Absence Intentions and VIA Tendency (Short Scale) on Future Voluntary Absences

	Self-Reported Past Absences					
Predictor	*b (SE)*	*β*	*F*	*df1/df2*	R^2	ΔR^2
Step 1			19.59	1/332	.06	
Constant	-.18(.24)					
Absence Intention	.35 ***(.08)	.24				
Step 2			16.83	2/331	.09	.04
Constant	-.64*(.27)					
Absence Intention	.15(.09)	.10				
VIA	.48***(.13)	.24				

Note. Listwise $N = 334$; VIA = Voluntary intent to be absent (7-items, short version) measured at Time 1; Self-reported past absences = self-reported number of voluntary absences in the past three months, measured at Time 2.
*$p \leq .05$.** $p \leq .01$.***$p \leq .001$.

Next, a hierarchical linear regression was conducted to examine whether one's VIA proclivity adds to the prediction of future voluntary absenteeism over and above the four work attitudes included in my study: perceived absence norms, job satisfaction, workplace incivility – supervisor's and co-worker's, and psychological distress. Employees' results related to the four attitudes – measured at Time 1– were entered in Step 1 followed by their VIA tendency – also measured at Time 1– in Step 2 (see Table 9). Results reveal that the four work attitudes – Model 1 – accounted for 8.20% of variance in one's future absences, $R^2 = .08$, F (8, 325) = 3.62, $p < .001$. More importantly, one's VIA proclivity – Model 2 – added significant value towards the prediction of one's future absences over and above the work attitudes, $R^2 = .11$, $\triangle R^2 = .03$, F (9, 324) = 4.60, $p < .001$. Once again, the effect size of .12 (i.e., $f^2 = R^2 / (1 - R^2) = .11 / (1 - .11) = .124$) is considered to be moderate (i.e., closer to the moderate than the small effect size index). Thus, these results support hypothesis 11. Similar results were obtained with the full VIA scale (see Appendix T).

Table 9

Regression of Work Attitudes and One's VIA Tendency (Short Scale) on Future Voluntary Absences

	Self-Reported Past Absences					
Predictor	*b (SE)*	*β*	*F*	*df1/df2*	R^2	ΔR^2
Step 1			3.62	8/325	.08	
Constant	-.41(.52)					
ONA	.02(.03)	.07				
GNA	.02(.03)	.06				
SRA	.05(.04)	.11				
CA	.13(.15)	.06				
Job Sat	.03(.07)	.02				
SIS - Sup	.12(.13)	.06				
SIS - CW	-.03(.15)	-.01				
K6	.25(.16)	.11				
Step 2			4.60	9/324	.11	.03
Constant	-1.28*(.58)					
ONA	.02(.03)	.05				
GNA	.02(.03)	.07				
SRA	.01(.04)	.03				
CA	.04(.15)	.02				
Job Sat	.09(.07)	.07				
SIS - Sup	.11(.13)	.06				
SIS - CW	-.09(.15)	-.05				
K6	.20(.16)	.08				
VIA	.46***(.14)	.23				

Note. Listwise $N = 334$. VIA = Voluntary intent to be absent (short scale: 7 items); ONA = Perceived occupational norms absence (per year); GNA = Perceived group norms absence (per year); SRA = Self-reported absence (per year); CA = Comparison of absences (overall); Job Sat = Job satisfaction; SIS – Sup = Straightforward incivility scale supervisor incivility; SIS – CW = Straightforward incivility scale co-worker incivility; K6 = Kessler psychological distress scale. Self-reported past absences = Self-reported number of voluntary absences in the past three months. All variables were measured at Time 1 with the exception of self-reported past absences measured at Time 2.
*$p \leq .05$.** $p \leq .01$.***$p \leq .001$

Discussion

VIA Scale's Factor Structure

VIA's factor structure was examined by conducting a PAF, which clearly revealed a one-factor structure, as expected. Thus, item reduction was done based on the strength of PAF factor loadings and by deleting items that were too similar to one another. In this matter, PAFs were conducted for the 18, 15, 14, and 7 items VIA scale all revealing a one-factor solution. Given that the 7-item scale accounted for a similar percentage of variance than the longer versions, and to reduce the negative impact the number of items can have on a scale's coefficient alpha, the 7-item VIA scale was subject to a CFA. The CFA revealed that the one-factor solution was a good fit to the data. Two of the seven final VIA scale items were created by the author whilst the others were created by the SMEs.

VIA Scale's Psychometrics Properties

The psychometric properties of the VIA scale were examined using the 7-item scale and are reported in the main text. In addition, each analysis was conducted using the 14-item VIA scale (i.e., full version) to examine if there are significant differences between the two versions. Results in each case yielded very similar results, and thus, practitioners should not hesitate to use the shorter VIA scale as it has comparable psychometric properties to the longer version.

Construct Validity

Convergent Validity. Although Martocchio's (1992) 8-item absence intentions scale has its shortcomings (e.g., limited number of reasons for being absent), as discussed before, it was

used to examine VIA scale's convergent validity as these two concepts are theoretically related. Bivariate correlations suggest that the two scales are correlated, which was expected as both measure one's intent to be absent, but not to the extent that would suggest multicollinearity or redundancy. Moreover, a CFA conducted including items from both scales revealed that a two-factor solution was a better fit than a one-factor solution. As such, it appears that both scales measure different constructs. Specifically, Martocchio's (1992) absence intentions scale can be used to examine one's absence intentions when it comes to eight specific reasons – taking care of dependent children, doing a hobby or leisure activity, family responsibilities other than children, religious commitments, community activities, leisure with family, relief from a dissatisfying work situation, and any reason other than illness, holidays, vacation or civic duties – whereas, as intended, the VIA scale can be used to measure employees' overall VIA proclivity without focusing on specific reasons for absences. Seeing that Martocchio's scale focuses only on eight specific reasons for which one can be absent, which may not apply to all employees, this scale's relevance and broad application are limited. As such, arguably, the VIA scale is best suited for widespread use and application, and thus would be more beneficial for organizations.

Discriminant Validity. Two scales – intent to turnover and intrinsic work motivation – were used to examine VIA scale's discriminant validity. Both measures, especially the intrinsic work motivation scale, had low correlations with the VIA scale. As was done by Djurdjevic et al. (2017), a CFA was conducted to further examine discriminant validity. The CFAs revealed that two-factor solutions where the VIA and the intent to turnover, and the VIA and the intrinsic work motivation constructs were modeled as two separate factors was a better fit to the data than when the they were modeled as one factor. Thus, these results indicate that the VIA scale

assesses a different construct than do the intent to turnover and intrinsic work motivation measures, thus providing support for discriminant validity of the VIA scale.

Criterion Validity

VIA scale's postdictive validity was investigated using employees' self-reported number of voluntary absences in the past three months. Bivariate correlations revealed a moderate positive association between employees' past absences (i.e., the number of times employees reported being absent in the past three months knowing that they were full capable of going to work) and their VIA proclivity. Considering that past absences have been found to predict (Cohen & Golan, 2007) and correlate to (Gupta & Beehr, 1979; Ivancevich, 1985) subsequent absences, the correlations obtained in the current study are in line with past research results. Specifically, given that the VIA scale was designed to measure one's intent to be absent in the future, which in itself relates to one's subsequent or future absences, it is not surprising that employees' self-reported number of voluntary absences in the past three months was correlated with their VIA proclivity. Moreover, given that past behaviour is a good predictor of future behaviour – absence-related behaviour in this case – it should go without saying that VIA's predictive validity would be achieved as well. In fact, predictive validity of the short VIA scale was demonstrated in that employees' VIA tendency measured at Time 1 predicted their self-reported voluntary absences in the past three months, as reported at Time 2. Hence, based on these results the VIA scale can be used to predict employees' voluntary absences, to a certain extent, in the three months following the administration of the VIA measure. The criterion-related results obtained using the full VIA scale are comparable to the aforementioned ones, which, once again, indicates that the short VIA scale is as valid as the full version.

Scale Reliability

The reliability of the VIA scale was explored using coefficient alpha. The newly developed 7-item VIA measure not only met the acceptable reliability cut-off but also had a higher coefficient alpha than Martocchio's (1992) absence intentions scale, thus suggesting that the VIA's scale is more reliable than the existing scale when it comes to measuring one's voluntary absence intentions.

Additionally, the short VIA scale had test-retest reliability in that a level of agreement between employees' Time 1 and Time 2 VIA tendency was achieved. Although, based on the Pearson correlations, the VIA scale's test-retest reliability coefficient is considered moderate this can still be seen in a positive light considering that, typically, absence measures are not reliable. In fact, Huse and Taylor (1962) found that total absence frequency had the highest reliability (r = .61) as compared to attitudinal absences (r = .52), severity absences (r = .23), and medical absences (r = .19) over a two-year period. Similarly, in their replication of Huse and Taylor's study, Chadwick-Jones, Brown, Nicholson, and Sheppard's (1971) examination of three of the four indices (i.e., medical absences were not included), amongst other absence indicators, revealed that the highest correlation for absences measured one year apart was for the frequency index (r = .43). Although this correlation was lower than the one in the previous study, it was still significant whereas the other ones, with the exception of attitudinal index, were not. Thus, in light of the lower reliabilities reported in the past, as related to absence measurements, one can argue that the VIA scale has achieved as good of reliability as one could expect (i.e., r = .64), and thus it can be considered as a reliable measure.

Although absenteeism has been said to be an inconsistent behaviour and in constant flux (Atkin & Goodman, 1984), the stability of participants' VIA scores from Time 1 to Time 2 suggests that one's VIA tendency could be a consistent behaviour. As Fridhandler (1986) explains, temporal duration is the most often used characteristic to differentiate between trait and state. In fact, Costa, McCrae, and Arenberg (1980) describe traits as enduring dispositions. They further explain that, in order to be considered a trait, the disposition must "endure over extended periods of time" (p. 794). These authors' study of the stability of personality traits over 6 and 12-year intervals revealed high retest coefficients ranging from .59 to .87. In light of this, due to its demonstrated stability across a 3-month timeframe (r = .64) – a correlation coefficient that falls within the range obtained in Costa, McCrae and Arenberg's (1980) study – one's VIA tendency could perhaps be seen as a trait versus a state. However, before making definite conclusions, the stability of one's VIA's tendencies should be examined over longer periods of time.

VIA Scale's Nomological Network

Based on a literature review of theoretical concepts related to absenteeism, the relationship between four constructs – perceived absence norms, job satisfaction, workplace incivility and psychological distress – and employees' VIA tendency was examined.

Perceived Absence Norms

Results of the current study revealed weak to moderate significant positive correlations between the four perceived absence norm items and one's VIA tendency. Although Johns (1994) found that underreporting of one's own absences occurs when self-reports are used, as such

questions pose a threat, he also showed that self-reported (r = .59) and subjective comparison of one's absence with those of other employees (r = .56) correlated the highest with actual absences, as compared to occupational norms (r = .15) and group estimates (r = .20). Similarly, results of the current study revealed highest correlations between the VIA measure and the two self-report items (i.e., self-reported number of times employees absented themselves from work in the past three months knowing that they were fully capable and able of going to work, and self-reported number of days missed in a typical year due to absenteeism) followed by comparison of absences. Differently from Johns' (1994b) results, perceived occupational norms had a slightly higher correlation with one's VIA tendency than perceived group norms. Self-reported absences also had the strongest association to Martocchio's (1992) absence intentions as compared to the other three norms. Unlike for the VIA scale, group norms had the second strongest correlation followed by perceived occupations norms and comparisons of one's absences to others' which had the same correlations. Hence, given that self-reported absences had the strongest association with both absence intentions-related measures, this suggest that when it comes to voluntary absences relaying on self-reports could be fruitful.

Lastly, the examination of correlations suggest that the VIA scale could be a more effective scale for measuring and predicting ones' absence intentions than Martocchio's (1992) absence intentions scale due to VIA's significantly stronger relationship with the variables examined, with the exception of group norms for which the test of dependent correlations was not significant.

Job Satisfaction

Employees' job satisfaction had a weak negative relationship with their VIA tendency, supporting hypothesis 7a. This relationship was also observed with the absence intentions scale, but to a lesser extent. The significant test of dependent correlations suggests that the VIA scale would be more effective in examining the relationship between employees' job satisfaction and one's voluntary absence intentions due to the stronger association. Although in their review of 29 studies Nicholson et al. (1976) found that job satisfaction, for the most part, did not have a significant relationship with absences, whether it be "sickness" or "casual" absences, in the current study this was only the case for Martocchio's (1992) absences intentions measure. In fact, job satisfaction was not significantly correlated to employees' absence intentions; however, there was a weak, but significant, negative correlation between job satisfaction and one's VIA tendency. The latter results are on par with Nicholson, Wall and Lischeron (1977) negative correlations ranging from -.13 to -.37, the highest correlation being for dissatisfaction with the work itself, observed between job satisfaction, as measured with the Worker Opinion Survey, and absences – self-reported using a single item enquiring about the number of one-day absences within the past year. Similarly, Sagie (1998) found that job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and their interaction were significantly correlated to voluntary absences, but not to involuntary absences. Based on these results, Sagie argues that work attitudes, such as job satisfaction, impact discretionary behaviour, which is what the VIA scale was designed to measure. Considering these conflicting results as they pertain to job satisfaction and voluntary absenteeism, and based on the results of the current study, one can argue that although job satisfaction may not significantly impact employees' absence intentions, which are based on specific reasons, it would, however, impact their VIA tendency, which looks at voluntary

absences from a broader perspective. Lastly, in their meta-analysis examining the longstanding inconsistencies of findings regarding the relationship between job satisfaction and voluntary absenteeism, Scott & Taylor's (1985) found that absence frequency and overall job satisfaction had one of the top three highest correlations. Therefore, the results of the current study coupled with Scott & Taylor's (1985) findings highlight the need for further research examining these constructs, which should, perhaps, be conducted with measures used herein.

Workplace Incivility

As hypothesised, employees' reported experiences with supervisor or co-worker incivility (in the past week) were positively and moderately correlated to their VIA in the next three months, which is in line with previous findings related to workplace incivility and withdrawal behaviours. In fact, workplace incivility, in the past six months, was found to have a positive and significant association ($r = .36$), and a significant main effect ($\beta = .29$, $p < .01$) with withdrawal behaviour in the past 30 days, such as taking longer breaks or leaving work earlier than one is allowed to (Welbourne & Sariol, 2017). Knowing that approximately half the targets of incivility decrease time at work (Porath & Pearson, 2010) studying workplace incivility in conjunction with one's VIA tendency becomes relevant as this approach would give organization an opportunity to address employees' intents before they turn into action, which, in turn, can be detrimental to the organization. Contrary to hypothesis 8b, the association between supervisor incivility or co-worker incivility and one's VIA tendency was exactly the same. These results suggest that employees' experience with supervisor and co-worker incivility have the same negative impact on employees' voluntary intent to be absent, and thus organization should strive to decrease these deviant behaviours within the workplace.

Furthermore, given that the correlation between one's experience with workplace incivility was stronger with the VIA scale than with Martocchio's (1992) absence intentions measure and that the test of dependent correlations was significant for both types of incivility this suggests that the VIA measure may, perhaps, be more effective in examining voluntary absenteeism, in conjunction with workplace incivility, than the absence intentions measure.

Psychological Distress

As hypothesized, employees distress level in the past 30 days had a significant positive, but weak, correlation with one's VIA tendency, which is in line with Hardy et al.'s (2003) findings linking psychological distress, as measured with the 12-item General Health Questionnaire, and subsequent days of absences, as recorded in the organizational database. Furthermore, these results are in the same direction, but stronger, as Gupta and Beehrs' (1979) significant positive correlations, ranging between .13 to .16, obtained between job stressors – role ambiguity, role overload, underutilization of skills, and resource inadequacy –, measured during an interview, and subsequent absenteeism, measured using records data one month following the interview. In their study, correlations were not significant for past absenteeism and job stress, and thus, the authors suggest a causal relationship between job stress and subsequent absences. Although job stress was not measured in my study, when comparing the current study and Gupta and Beerhs' (1979) study, one could argue that, one's distress level could be causally related to one's VIA tendency, and, perhaps a more appropriate construct to study in conjunction with absenteeism. Contrary to Gupta and Beehrs' (1979) non-significant correlation between past absenteeism and job stress, Darr's (2004) meta-analysis found a significant association between

past absences and stress when self-report method of time lost measure was used. Similarly, the correlations obtained between the distress and absence-related measures of my study are stronger but in the same direction as Darr's (2004) meta-analysis findings of a small, but significant, positive association between absenteeism and stress. As discussed by Darr (2004), employees reporting stress are more likely to "escape" from the workplace by being absent, a tendency that was also found in the current study. Past research has, at times, failed to support the association between stress and absenteeism, as discussed previously, and thus the current findings and focus on psychological distress versus job stress suggests that instead of focusing on job stress' role in one's absenteeism we should shift our attention to the role of psychological distress. Additionally, the test of dependent correlations was significant, thus suggesting that the relationship between employees' psychological distress level and their VIA tendency is significantly stronger than the relationship between distress levels and absence intentions. This suggest the K6 measure of distress and the VIA scale could be a more effective combination of measures for examining voluntary absenteeism.

The relationships between one's VIA and the four work attitudes examined further highlight VIA's trait-like characteristics. In fact, Fridhandler (1986) explains Spielbergers notion that traits are not continuously manifested, but they are a "stable proneness to react" (p. 170) to given circumstances, as opposed to states which are continuous. In this sense, given that one's VIA tendency seems to be correlated more with certain work attitudes than others this may be indicative of one's VIA being a (stable) reaction to certain work attitudes. However, Fridhandler's summary of previous research also highlights that states are caused by situations whereas traits are caused by personal and distant factors. Thus, further research is required to

confirm if one's VIA tendency results from work attitudes (e.g., experience with workplace incivility) or if it is primarily influenced by individual factors, such as one's personality, which could be the underlying factor that dictates how an individual reacts or copes in a specific situation. In fact, personality traits have been found to positively (i.e., Extraversion and Openness) and negatively (i.e., Agreeableness) relate to one's intent to be absent by choice (ABCh) (Darviri & Woods, 2006), and thus these traits could have a similar relationship with employee's VIA proclivity which, like ABCh, is concerned with absences within one's control. Considering that personality traits were not studied herein, further research is required to examine one' VIA tendency in conjunction with personality traits to determine whether one's VIA proclivity would be a trait in itself or if its driven by one's personality.

The last dimension by which Fridhandler (1980) differentiates traits and states is by describing traits as abstract entities as compared to states being concrete ones. In this sense, one's VIA tendency could, once again, be characterised as a trait as it is concerned with one's intent to perform a behaviour, which does not revolve around a "here-and-now" referent that activate states.

Considering that certain personality traits have been associated with absence intentions for reasons that are within one's control, and that no significant associations were found with absence intentions for reasons relating to matters outside one's control (Darviri & Woods, 2006), the relationship between personality and one's VIA could be examined, as the VIA items also measure one's intent to be absent. Specifically, examining whether one's VIA tendency will have a positive relationship with Openness and Extraversion and a negative relationship with Agreeableness, as was the case with Darviri and Woods (2006) measure, can provide further empirical evidence for the discussion about whether VIA tendency would be considered a trait or

a state. In fact, the investigation of these relationships could provide further indication whether one's VIA tendency is a result of their personality traits or if it could be a trait in itself. Although Darviri and Woods (2006) obtained a negative relationship with Conscientiousness and absence intent based on reasons within one's control, as hypothesized, it was not significant; however, this relationship should, nonetheless, be examined with the VIA scale as it measures one's absences intent using more general items than Darviri and Woods' (2006) measure.

VIA Scale's Incremental Value

A hierarchical regression analysis revealed the added value of the VIA scale in predicting voluntary absenteeism over and above Martocchio's (1992) absence intentions scale. Although Marthocchio's scale also measures one's absence intentions it may leave some gaps in measurement which could be covered by the VIA scale. Thus, given the added value of the VIA scale and the fact that it measures one's voluntary absenteeism intent without focusing on specific and limited reasons, it should, in turn, be more generalizable than the existing scale. Specifically, although the added value of the VIA scale may, at first, seem trivial due to it contributing to 4% of variance, its moderate effect size suggests that its incremental value is not negligible. Additionally, considering its sound psychometric properties, the short 7-item VIA measure could, perhaps, be the measure of choice to predict ones' voluntary intent to be absent.

Furthermore, results from the hierarchical linear regressions showed that the VIA measure added value in predicting one's future voluntary absences (i.e., self-reported voluntary absences in the past three months – measured at Time 2), over and above the four work attitudes, which were also hypothesized antecedents of one's VIA tendency. In fact, one's VIA tendency, which accounted for an addition 3% of variance over and above the work attitudes, was the only

significant predictor in the regression analysis. The moderate effect size highlight, once again, the importance and strength of one's VIA tendency in predicting future behaviour when it comes to voluntary absenteeism.

In essence, considering its incremental value, practitioners should consider using the VIA scale when examining voluntary absenteeism because absences impact organizational productivity and competitiveness, and thus, even small to moderate effects may have financial impacts, for example, on organizations. Also, results revealing that one's VIA tendency was the only significant predictor when included in a regression analysis with the four work attitudes may suggest that one's VIA proclivity, which I suggest may be a trait, is better suited for predicting future voluntary absences than circumstantial factors such as work attitudes.

General Discussion

The aim of the current research was to create and validate a scale to measure one's voluntary intent to be absent. In line with Hackett and Guion's (1985) definition of voluntary and involuntary absences, an overall measure of one's VIA proclivity was created based on Fishbein and Ajzen's (1975) theory of reasoned action. Although a scale of absence intentions exists, which revealed that absence intentions significantly predict paid absences but not unpaid absences (Martocchio, 1992), it focuses solely on 8 specific reasons for absenteeism.

Despite the fact that absenteeism has been researched for decades, the low reliability of measures (Chadwick-Jones et al., 1971; Huse & Taylor, 1962) and its erratic measurement have been a contentious issue, which, as stated by Steers and Rhodes (1978), leads to our inability to interpret findings adequately. For instance, Birioukov (2016) study of student absenteeism highlights the high reliance of the excused/unexcused categorization for absences. This

framework of excused (i.e., parental consent) and unexcused (i.e., without parental consent) absences assumes that the latter are always the students' voluntary decision – seen as deviant behaviour–, which may not be the case as some students miss school due to other factors, such as their socio-economic status. Thus, he argues that a voluntary/involuntary absence framework would be more relevant as it focuses on one's motivation to attend school and acknowledges that there may be factors (e.g., school conditions – irrelevant course curriculum, unjust behavioural punishments) that could lead to students' voluntary absences. In this framework, voluntary absences are not seen as deviant behaviours due to its consideration of conditions which may impact attendance. Furthermore, contrary to other definitions of absenteeism, Birioukov (2016) emphasized that the voluntary/involuntary framework recognizes students' decisions regarding their own school attendance.

Due to the important limitations of the existing absence intentions scale, the creation and validation of a broader measure for predicting one's voluntary intent to be absent was deemed necessary. Additionally, in line with the aforementioned discussion and definitions provided in the introduction, the VIA scale was designed to measure voluntary intent to be absent (i.e., intention of not going to work knowing that one is fully capable of going). Following Crawford and Kelder (2019), and Hinkin's (1995; 1998) recommendations for item generation, and Hardesty and Bearden (2004), Hinkin (1998) and Zaichkowksy's (1985) methods and recommendations for item reduction, an 18-item VIA scale was created and administered to participants. The PAFs revealed that a one-factor solution and a 7-item VIA scale was optimal. The sound psychometric properties of the 7-item VIA scale and its relationship with various constructs within its nomological network support VIA scale's value in examining employee's voluntary intent to be absent. Additionally, the VIA scale's demonstrated incremental value in

predicting future voluntary absences over-and above Martocchio's (1992) absence intentions scale, and over-and-above the four work attitudes further highlight its value in measuring one's intent to be absent.

Lastly, although social desirability had a weak negative correlation with one's VIA tendency it was the strongest relationship observed. This association may be indicative of employees' tendency to tailor their answers to what they believe is an acceptable level of absenteeism instead of providing factual responses. This response patter may, perhaps, be influenced by employees' perceived absence norms and the absence culture within their organization. Thus, socially desirable absence-related response patterns should be examined in conjunction with absence norms as employees who perceive that their organization has strict absence norms where absenteeism is less tolerated may be more prone to providing socially desirable answers than employees who perceive their work environment to be more permissive of absenteeism.

Practical Implications

Results of this study suggest that voluntary absenteeism is related to conscious decision making (i.e., one's intent), which is in line with previous findings (see Martocchio, 1992). Given the sound psychometric properties of the VIA scale, its stronger relationships with the variables examined than those with the existing absence intentions scale, and its added value in predicting voluntary absences over and above the absence intentions scale the VIA scale seems best suited for examining voluntary absences. In addition, given that employees' intentions of being absent in the future, as measured with the VIA scale, were most strongly related to their self-reported number of absences and comparison of absences, organizations would be best advised to prevent absenteeism instead of reacting to or managing it. Moreover, given the positive relationship these

variables had with one's VIA researchers could explore whether one's VIA would be impacted if absence norms were discussed more openly within the organization in an attempt to influence employee's attendance behaviour.

Lastly, considering the aforementioned results and discussion surrounding job satisfaction, workplace incivility and psychological distress, organizations should strive to reduce the negative impact these work-related attitudes can have on employees' absenteeism. For instance, the prevention and reduction of workplace incivility in working environments is important for organizations due to incivility's positive association with one's VIA tendency. Providing training programs on civility or training employees and supervisors how to recognize and detect workplace incivility are two ways organizations can promote civil behaviours (Porath & Pearson, 2010). Also, considering that individuals in highly socially integrated teams have lower tendencies of being absent (ten Brummelhuis et al., 2016), organizations could provide team building training.

Limitations

Given the prevalence of, and consequences related to, absenteeism, this behaviour will most likely still be of interest to researchers and organizations in the future, and thus a number of limitations of my study should be noted. Firstly, although a large sample was collected using TurkPrime, Paolacci and Chandler (2014) caution researchers against the use of convenience samples collected using MTurk due to its non-representativeness of the population, which can limit generalizability. Conversely, other researchers argue that this online data source is neither inferior nor superior to other sources of convenience sampling, but rather different (Landers & Behrend, 2015). In fact, MTurk convenience sample participants' problematic responding

behaviours (Necka, Cacioppo, Norman, & Cacioppo, 2016) and results (Mullinix, Leeper, Druckman, & Freese, 2015) were comparable to those of population-based (i.e., traditional) samples. Moreover, MTurk participants' attention was not found to be lesser than that of other convenience samples and participants' buy-in into the experiment is comparable to that of participants in field experiments, as long as the experiment is well designed, which contributes to the internal validity of such experiments (Thomas & Clifford, 2017). Similarly, Buhrmester, Kwang, & Gosling (2011) found that data gathered using MTurk was of high-quality and more demographically diverse than the Internet sample and traditional American college samples. In light of these results, in order to increase chances of obtaining quality data and a sample reflective of the population of interest, the sample should include individuals similar to those for who the measure will be used (Gorsuch, 1997). To increase chances of obtaining quality data for my study, two attention check items were included in two of the measures used (i.e., the VIA and K6 measures). Also, considering that for my study I only recruited participants who are employed on a full-time basis (i.e., 26 hours or more per week) results obtained should be generalizable.

Secondly, the sample collected at Time 1 was split into two random subsamples to conduct the EFA and CFA, a method discussed by Armstrong and Soelberg (1968), and Tinsley and Tinsley (1987), which has been used in previous factor analyses (see Kupeli, Chilcot, Schmidt, Campbell, & Tropp, 2013; Norris, Carpenter, Eaton, Guo, Lassche, Pett, & Blumenthal, 2015; Percy, McCrystal, & Higgins, 2008). Although, naturally, this resulted in smaller EFA and CFA subsamples, the subsamples sizes were considered to be "good" and close to "fair", respectively, for factory analyses according to Comrey (1973). Although this method is

acceptable, future research should strive to confirm the factor structure of the VIA scale using a different representative sample.

Lastly, although Johns' (1994b) found that individuals tend to underreport their absences in that the number of actual absences was approximately two times higher than the number of self-reported ones, and thus advises against the replacement of recorded absences by self-reported absences, he further explains that if self-reported measures of absences are used methods, such as aided recall, attendance diaries and shorter recalls timeframes can be put in place to increase accuracy. The latter option was used in my study as employees reported their voluntary absences in the past three months, hence recall should not have negatively impacted accuracy. Nonetheless, even with these shortcomings, self-reported absences had the highest correlation with actual absences (John, 1994b). However, employees may not be comfortable providing honest answers regarding their intent to be absent as absenteeism has a negative connotation and voluntary absenteeism is considered to be a form of counterproductive work behaviour. As previously mentioned, the reluctance to provide honest answers may be even more prominent in environments where absences are less tolerated, such as within the military, and thus this aspect could be examined in future research. To reduce concerns related to the use of self-reported absences one's VIA tendency should also be studied in conjunction with recorded absences. Additionally, the VIA scale could, perhaps, be administered during exit interviews or exit surveys as employees may be less inclined to lie when they are leaving the organization because they will no longer be part of it and would not fear potential consequences. At that time employees may also be more forthcoming with their self-reported number of past voluntary absences, which could then be compared with the self-reported number they had disclosed whilst they were still working for their employer. Thus, the next step in furthering our knowledge in

this area could be to compare the predictive ability of the VIA scale when it comes to self-reported frequency of absences versus absences documented in personnel records, and administer the scale when employees exit the organization as they may be more forthcoming with their future and past voluntary absence tendencies.

Conclusion

This study provides promising results for the use of the 7-item VIA measure to predict employees' voluntary intent to be absent. The sound psychometrics properties of the scale and its potential of contributing to the prediction of voluntary absenteeism, over-and-above the existing absence intentions measure, affirm its value. Future research should, thus, endeavour to use the VIA measure to further examine potential antecedents of voluntary absenteeism and to confirm causal relationships.

References

Altman, D. G., & Bland, J. M. (1983). Mesurement in medicine: the analysis of method comparison studies. *The Statistician, 32*, 307-317. doi: 10.2307/2987937

Antón, C. (2009). The impact of role stress on workers' behaviour through job satisfaction and organizational commitment. *International Journal of Psychology*, *44*(3), 187-194. doi: 2048/10.1080/00207590701700511

Antonakis, J., Fenley, M., & Liechti, S. (2011). Can charisma be taught? Test of two interventions. *Academy of Management Learning & Education 10*(3), 374-396. doi: 10.5465/amle.2010.0012

APA Dictionary of Psychology (n.d.). In *APA Dictionary of Psychology*. Retrieved from https://dictionary.apa.org/retrospective-validity

Armstrong, J. S., & Soelberg, P. (1968). On the interpretation of factor analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, *70*(5), 361. doi: 2048/10.1037/h0026434

Atkin, R. S., & Goodman, P. S. (1984). Methods of defining and measuring absenteeism. In P. S. Goodman, R. S. Atkin, & Associates (Eds), *Absenteeism: New approaches to understanding, measuring, and managing employee absence* (pp. 47-109). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Bakker, A. B. (2008). The work-related flow inventory: Construction and initial validation of the WOLF. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *72*(3), 400-414. doi:204 8/10.1016/j.jvb. 2007.11.007

Ballard, R. (1992). Short forms of the Marlowe-Crown social desirability scale. *Psychological Report, 71*(8), 1155-1160. doi: 2048/10.2466/PR0.71.8.1155-1160

Birioukov, A. (2016). Beyond the excused/unexcused absence binary: Classifying absenteeism through a voluntary/involuntary absence framework. *Educational Review, 68*(3), 340-357. doi:2048/10.1080/00131911.2015.1090400

Biron, M., & Bamberger, P. (2012). Aversive workplace conditions and absenteeism: Taking referent group norms and supervisor support into account. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 97*(4), 901-912. doi: 2048/10.1037/a0027437

Breaugh, J. A. (1981). Predicting absenteeism from prior absenteeism and work attitudes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *66*(5), 555-560. doi: 2048/10.1037/0021-9010.66.5.555

Brown, T. S. (2006). *Confirmatory factor analysis for applied research*. New York, NY: The Gulford Press.

Buhrmester, M., Kwang, T., & Gosling, S. D. (2011). Amazon's Mechanical Turk: A new source of inexpensive, yet high-quality data? *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 6*(1), 3-5. doi: 2048/10.1177/1745691610393980

Chadwick-Jones, J. K., Brown, C. A., Nicholson, N., & Sheppard, C. (1971). Absence measures: Their reliability and stability in an industrial setting. *Personnel Psychology*, *24*(3), 463-470. doi: 2048/10.1111/j.1744-6570.1971.tb00368.x

Chadwick-Jones, J. K., Nicholson, N., & Brown, C. (1982). *Social psychology of absenteeism*. New York, NY: Praeger Publishers.

Clark, L. A., & Watson, D. (1995). Constructing validity: Basic issues in objective scale development. *Psychological Assessment*, *7*(3), 309-319. doi: 2048/ 10.1037/14805-012

Cohen, J. (1992). A power primer. *Psychological Bulletin*, *112*(1), 155-159. doi: 10.1037/14805-018

Cohen, A., & Golan, R. (2007). Predicting absenteeism and turnover intentions by past absenteeism and work attitudes: An empirical examination of female employees in long term nursing care facilities. *Career Development International*, *12*(5), 416-432. doi: 2048/10.1108/13620430710773745

Comrey, A. L. (1973). *A first course in factor analysis*. New York, NY: Academy Press.

Conway, J. M., & Huffcutt, A. I. (2003). A review and evaluation of exploratory factor analysis practices in organizational research. *Organizational Research Methods*, *6*(2), 147-168. doi: 2048/10.1177/1094428103251541

Cortina, J. M. (1993). What is coefficient alpha? An examination of theory and applications. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *78*(1), 98-104. doi: 2048/10.1037/0021-9010. 78.1.98

Costa, P. T., McCrae, R. R., & Arenberg, D. (1980). Enduring dispositions in adult males. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *38*(5), 793. doi: 2048/10.1037/0022-3514.38.5.793

Costello, A. B., & Osborne, J. (2005). Best practices in exploratory factor analysis: Four recommendations for getting the most from your analysis. *Practical Assessment, Research, and Evaluation*, *10*(1), 1-9. doi: 10.7275/jyj1-4868

Crawford, J. A., & Kelder, J. A. (2019). Do we measure leadership effectively? Articulating and evaluating scale development psychometrics for best practice. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *30*(1), 133-144. doi: 2048/10.1016/j.leaqua. 2018.07.001

Crowne, D. P., & Marlowe, D. (1960). A new scale of social desirability independent of psychopathology. *Journal of Consulting Psychology*, *24*(4), 349-354. doi: 2048/10. 1037/h0047358

Darr, W. A. (2004). Examining the relationship between stress and absenteeism: A research synthesis (Doctoral dissertation, Concordia University, Montreal, Canada). Retrieved from https://spectrum.library.concordia.ca/8354/

Darr, W., & Johns, G. (2008). Work strain, health, and absenteeism: a meta-analysis. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, *13*(4), 293-318. doi: 2048/ 10.1037/a0012639

Darviri, S. V., & Woods, S. A. (2006). Uncertified absence from work and the Big Five: An examination of absence records and future absence intentions. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *41*(2), 359-369. doi: 2048/10.1016/j.paid. 2006.02.003

Djurdjevic, E., Stoverink, A. C., Klotz, A. C., Koopman, J., da Motta Veiga, S. P., Yam, K. C., & Chiang, J. T. J. (2017). Workplace status: The development and validation of a scale. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *102*(7), 1124-1147. doi: 2048/10.1037/apl0000202

Dolan, S. L., & Léonard, C. (1991). *Survey on absenteeism in the Canadian Pulp and Paper industry* (ISBN: 2-921142-33-3). Montreal, QC: Canadian Pulp and Paper Association.

Dolbier, C. L., Webster, J. A., McCalister, K. T., Mallon, M. W., & Steinhardt, M. A. (2005). Reliability and validity of a single-item measure of job satisfaction. *American Journal of Health Promotion*, *19*(3), 194-198. doi: 2048/10. 4278/0890-1171-19.3.194

Driver, R. W., & Watson, C. J. (1989). Construct validity of voluntary and involuntary absenteeism. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, *4*(1), 109-118. doi: 2048/10.1007/ BF01023041

Elshout, R., Scherp, E., & van der Feltz-Cornelis, C. M. (2013). Understanding the link between leadership style, employee satisfaction, and absenteeism: A mixed methods design study in a mental health care institution. *Neuropsychiatric Disease and Treatment*, *9*, 823-837. doi: 10.2147/NDT.S43755

Ferketich, S. (1991). Focus on psychometrics aspects of item analysis. *Research in Nursing and Health, 14* (2), 165-168. doi: 2048/10.1002/nur.4770140211

Fichman, M. (1984). A theoretical approach to understanding employee absence. In P. S. Goodman, R. S. Atkin, & Associates (Eds), *Absenteeism: New approaches to understanding, measuring, and managing employee absence* (pp. 1-46). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Fishbein, M., & Ajzen. I. (1975). *Belief, attitude, intention, and behavior: An introduction to theory and research*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Fleischer, A., Mead, A. D., & Huang, J. (2015). Inattentive responding in MTurk and other online samples. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, *8*(2), 196-202. doi: 2048/ 10.1017/iop.2015.25

Flora, D. B., & Flake, J. K. (2017). The purpose and practice of exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis in psychological research: Decisions for scale development and validation. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science*, *49*(2), 78-88. doi: 2048/ 10.1037/cbs0000069

Fridhandler, B. M. (1986). Conceptual note on state, trait, and the state–trait distinction. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *50*(1), 169. doi: 2048/10.1037/0022-3514.50.1.169

Frooman, J., Mendelson, M. B., & Murphy, J. K. (2012). Transformational and passive avoidant leadership as determinants of absenteeism. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, *33*(5), 447-463. doi: 2048/10.1108/014377312112 41247

Gadourek, I. (1965). *Absences and well-being of workers: Social matrix of absence-behaviour, satisfaction and some other attitudes in contrasted groups of workers from large industrial plants in the Netherlands*. Assen.

Gorsuch, R. L. (1997). Exploratory factor analysis: Its role in item analysis. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, *68*(3), 532-560. doi: 10.1207/s15327752jpa6803_5

Guadagnoli, E., & Velicer, W. F. (1988). Relation of sample size to the stability of component patterns. *Psychological Bulletin*, *103*(2), 265-275. doi: 2048/10.1037/0033-2909.103.2.265

Gupta, N., & Beehr, T. A. (1979). Job stress and employee behaviors. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, *23*(3), 373-387. doi: 2048/10.1016/0030-5073(79)90004-7

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. doi: 2048/10.1016/0749-5978(85)90028-7

Haig, B. D. (2005). Exploratory factor analysis, theory generation, and scientific method. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, *40*(3), 303-329. doi: 2048/10.1207/s15327906mbr4003_2

Hardesty, D. M., & Bearden, W. O. (2004). The use of expert judges in scale development: Implications for improving face validity of measures of unobservable constructs. *Journal of Business Research*, *57*(2), 98-107. doi: 2048/10.1016/ S0148-2963(01)00295-8

Hardy, G. E., Woods, D., & Wall, T. D. (2003). The impact of psychological distress on absence from work. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 88*(2), 306-314. doi: 048/10.1037/0021-9010.88.2.306

Harrison, D. A. (1995). Volunteer motivation and attendance decisions: Competitive theory testing in multiple samples from a homeless shelter. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *80*(3), 371-385. doi: 2048/10.1037/0021-9010.80.3.371

Harrison, D. A., & Shaffer, M. A. (1994). Comparative examinations of self-reports and perceived absenteeism norms: Wading through Lake Wobegon. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *79*(2), 240-251. doi: 2048/10.1037/0021-9010.79.2.240

Hicks Morley Hamilton Stewart Storie (1995). *Handbook on absenteeism and absenteeism management*. Toronto: ON. Canadian Manufacturers' Association.

Hinkin, T. R. (1995). A review of scale development practices in the study of organizations. *Journal of Management*, *21*(5), 967-988. doi: 2048/10.1177/014920639502100509

Hinkin, T. R. (1998). A brief tutorial on the development of measures for use in survey questionnaires. *Organizational Research Methods*, *1*(1), 104-121.

Horwitz, A. V. (2007). Distinguishing distress from disorder as psychological outcomes of stressful social arrangements. *Health: An Interdisciplinary Journal for the Social Study of Health, Illness, and Medicine*, *11*(3), 273-289. doi: 10.1177/1363459307077541

Hu, L. T., & Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, *6*(1), 1-55. doi: 2048/10.1080/10705519909540118

Huczynski, A. A., & Fitzpatrick, M. J. (1989). *Managing employee absence for a competitive edge*. London, GB: Pitman.

Huse, E. F., & Taylor, E. K. (1962). Reliability of absence measures. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *46*(3), 159-160. doi: 2048/10.1037/h0041263

Ivancevich, J. M. (1985). Predicting absenteeism from prior absence and work attitudes. *Academy of Management Journal*, *28*(1), 219-228. doi: 2048/10.2307/256070

Johns, G. (1994b). Absenteeism estimates by employees and managers: Divergent perspectives and self-serving perceptions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *79*(2), 229-239. doi: 2048/10.1037/0021-9010.79.2.229

Johns, G. (2003). How methodological diversity has improved our understanding of absenteeism from work. *Human Resource Management Review*, *13*(2), 157-184. doi: 2048/10.1016/ S1053-4822(03)00011-1

Kelloway, E. K., & Day, A. L. (2005). Building healthy workplaces: what we know so far. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science/Revue Canadienne des Sciences du Comportement*, *37*(4), 223-235. doi: 2048/10.1037/ h0087259

Kessler, R. C., Andrews, G., Colpe, L. J., Hiripi, E., Mroczek, D. K., Normand, S. L., Walters, E. E., & Zaslavsky, A. M. (2002). Short screening scales to monitor population prevalences and trends in non-specific psychological distress. *Psychological Medicine*, *32*(6), 959-976.

Kung, F. Y., Kwok, N., & Brown, D. J. (2018). Are attention check questions a threat to scale validity? *Applied Psychology*, *67*(2), 264-283. doi: 10.1111/apps.12108

Kupeli, N., Chilcot, J., Schmidt, U. H., Campbell, I. C., & Troop, N. A. (2013). A confirmatory factor analysis and validation of the forms of self-criticism/reassurance scale. *British Journal of Clinical Psychology*, *52*(1), 12-25. doi: 2048/10.1111/j.2044-8260.2012.02042.x

Landers, R. N., & Behrend, T. S. (2015). An inconvenient truth: Arbitrary distinctions between organizational, Mechanical Turk, and other convenience samples. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, *8*(2), 142-164. doi: 2048/10.1017/iop.2015.13

Landy, F. J., Vasey, J. J., & Smith, F. D. (1984). Methodological problems and strategies in predicting absence. In P. S. Goodman, R. S. Atkin, & Associates (Eds), *Absenteeism: New*

approaches to understanding, measuring, and managing employee absence (pp. 110-157). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Lee, I. A., & Preacher, K. J. (2013, September). *Calculation for the test of the difference between two dependent correlations with one variable in common* [Computer software]. Retrieved from http://quantpsy.org

Leiter, M. P. (2012). *The Straightforward Incivility Scale*. Technical Document. Centre for Organizational Research & Development, Acadia University, Wolfville, NS.

Lussier, P., Corrado, R., Healey, J., Tzoumakis, S., & Deslauriers-Varin, N. (2011). The Cracow instrument for multi-problem violent youth: Examining the postdictive validity with a sample of preschoolers. *International Journal of Child, Youth and Family Studies*, *2*(2.1), 294-329. doi: 10.18357/ijcyfs22.120117709

Magee, C., Gordon, R., Robinson, L., Caputi, P., & Oades, L. (2017). Workplace bullying and absenteeism: The mediating roles of poor health and work engagement. *Human Resource Management Journal*, *27*(3), 319-334. doi: 2048/10. 1111/1748-8583.12156

Martocchio, J. J. (1992). The financial cost of absence decisions. *Journal of Management*, *18*(1), 133-152. doi: 2048/10.1177/014920639201800109

Martocchio, J. J., & Judge, T. A. (1994). A Policy-Capturing Approach to Individuals′ Decisions to Be Absent. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *57*(3), 358-386. doi: 2048/10.1006/obhd.1994.1020

Matsunaga, M. (2010). How to Factor-Analyze Your Data Right: Do's, Don'ts, and How-To's. *International Journal of Psychological Research*, *3*(1), 97-110. doi: 10.21500/ 20112084.854

Mills, J. F., & Kroner, D. G. (1997). The Criminal Sentiments Scale: Predictive validity in a sample of violent and sex offenders. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, *53*(4), 399-404. doi: 10.1002/(SICI)1097-4679(199706)53:4<399::AID-JCLP13>3.0.CO;2-B

Mowday, R. T., Porter, L. W., & Steers, R. M. (1982). *Employee-organization linkages: The psychology of commitment, absenteeism, and turnover*. New York, NY: Academic Press.

Mundfrom, D. J., Shaw, D. G., & Ke, T. L. (2005). Minimum sample size recommendations for conducting factor analyses. *International Journal of Testing*, *5*(2), 159-168. doi: 2048/ 10.1207/s15327574ijt0502_4

Mullinix, K. J., Leeper, T. J., Druckman, J. N., & Freese, J. (2015). The generalizability of survey experiments. *Journal of Experimental Political Science*, *2*(2), 109-138. doi: 10.1017/XPS.2015.19

Nagy, M. S. (2002). Using a single-item approach to measure facet job satisfaction. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, *75*(1), 77-86. doi: 2048/10.1348/ 096317902167658

Necka, E. A., Cacioppo, S., Norman, G. J., & Cacioppo, J. T. (2016). Measuring the prevalence of problematic respondent behaviors among MTurk, campus, and community participants. *PloS One*, *11*(6). doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0157732

Negrini, A., Perron, J., & Corbiere, M. (2014). The predictors of absenteeism due to psychological disability: a longitudinal study in the education sector. *Work*, *48*(2), 175-184. doi: 0.1037/t01069-000

Nicholson, N. (1977). Absence behaviour and attendance motivation: A conceptual synthesis. *Journal of Management Studies*, *14*(3), 231-252. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-6486.1977.tb00364.x

Nicholson, N., Brown, C. A., & Chadwick-Jones, J. K. (1976). Absence from work and job satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *61*(6), 728-737. doi: 2048/10.1037/0021-9010.61.6.728

Nicholson, N., & Johns, G. (1985). The absence culture and psychological contract—who's in control of absence? *Academy of Management Review*, *10*(3), 397-407. doi: 2048/ 10.2307/258123

Nicholson, N., Wall, T., & Lischeron, J. (1977). The predictability of absence and propensity to leave from employees' job satisfaction and attitudes toward influence in decision-making. *Human Relations*, *30*(6), 499-514. doi: 2048/10.1177/001872677703000602

Norris, J., Carpenter, M. J. G., Eaton, M. J., Guo, J. W., Lassche, M. M., Pett, M. A., & Blumenthal, D. K. (2015). Development and construct validation of the interprofessional attitudes scale. *Academic Medicine: Journal of the Association of American Medical Colleges*, *90*(10), 1394-4000. doi: 10.1097/ACM.0000000000000764

Nunnally, J. C. (1978). *Psychometric Theory* (2nd ed). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Ouellette, J. A., & Wood, W. (1998). Habit and intention in everyday life: The multiple processes by which past behavior predicts future behavior. *Psychological Bulletin*, *124*(1), 54-74. doi: 2048/10.1037/0033-2909.124.1.54

Paolacci, G., & Chandler, J. (2014). Inside the Turk: Understanding Mechanical Turk as a participant pool. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, *23*(3), 184-188.doi: 10.1177/0963721414531598

Pearson, C. M., Andersson, L. M., & Porath, C. L. (2000). Assessing and attacking workplace incivility. *Organizational Dynamics*, *29*(2), 123-137. doi: 2048/10.1016/S0090-2616(00)00019-X

Pearson, C. M., Andersson, L. M., & Wegner, J. W. (2001). When workers flout convention: A study of workplace incivility. *Human Relations*, *54*(11), 1387-1419. doi: 2048/10.1177/00187267015411001

Pearson, C. M., & Porath, C. L. (2005). On the nature, consequences and remedies of workplace incivility: No time for "nice"? Think again. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, *19*(1), 7-18. doi: 10.5465/ame.2005.15841946

Peltier, J. W., Cummins, S., Pomirleanu, N., Cross, J., & Simon, R. (2014). A parsimonious instrument for predicting students' intent to pursue a sales career: Scale development and validation. *Journal of Marketing Education*, *36*(1), 62-74. doi: 2048/10.1177/0273475313520443

Percy, A., McCrystal, P., & Higgins, K. (2008). Confirmatory factor analysis of the adolescent self-report Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment*, *24*(1), 43-48. doi: 2048/10.1027/1015-5759.24.1.43

Peters, S., Barbier, M., Faulx, D., & Hansez, I. (2012). Learning and motivation to transfer after an e-learning programme: impact of trainees' motivation to train, personal interaction and satisfaction. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, *49*(4), 375-387. doi: 2048/10.1080/14703297.2012.728878

Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2012). Sources of method bias in social science research and recommendations on how to control it. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *63*, 539-569. doi: 2048/10.1146/annurev-psych-120710-100452

Porath, C. L., & Pearson, C. M. (2010). The cost of bad behavior. *Organizational Dynamics, 39*(1), 64-71. doi: 10.1016/j.orgdyn.2009.10.006

Porath, C. L., & Pearson, C. M. (2012). Emotional and behavioral responses to workplace incivility and the impact of hierarchical status. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 42*(Suppl 1), E326-E357. doi: 2048/10.1111/j.1559-1816.2012.01020.x

Porter, L. W., & Steers, R. M. (1973). Organizational, work, and personal factors in employee turnover and absenteeism. *Psychological Bulletin*, *80*(2), 151-176. doi: 2048/10.1037/h0034829

Roter, A. B. (2019). *The Dark Side of the workplace: Managing incivility*. Abingdon, OX: Routledge.

Sagie, A. (1998). Employee absenteeism, organizational commitment, and job satisfaction: Another look. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *52*(2), 156-171.doi: 2048/10.1006/jvbe.1997.1581

Scott, K. D., & Taylor, G. S. (1985). An examination of conflicting findings on the relationship between job satisfaction and absenteeism: A meta-analysis. *Academy of Management Journal*, *28*(3), 599-612. doi: 2048/10.2307/256116

Schroeder, M. A., Lander, J., & Levine-Silverman, S. (1990). Diagnosing and dealing with multicollinearity. *Western Journal of Nursing Research*, *12*(2), 175-187. doi: 0.1177/019394599001200204

Sliter, M. T. (2018). *But we're here to help! Positive buffers of the relationship between victim incivility and employee outcomes in firefighters*. Dissertation Abstract International: Section B: The Sciences and Engineering. ProQuest Information & Learning. Retrieved from: http://gateway.proquest.com.library.smu.ca:2048/openurl?url_ver=Z39.88-2004&rft_val_fmt=info:ofi/fmt:kev:mtx:dissertation&res_dat=xri:pqm&rft_dat=xri:pqdiss:10631268

Spencer, D. G., & Steers, R. M. (1980). The influence of personal factors and perceived work experiences on employee turnover and absenteeism. *Academy of Management Journal*, *23*(3), 567-572. doi: 2048/10.2307/255522

Statistics Canada (2019). *Work absence of full-time employees by geography, annual* (Table 14-10-0190-01). Retrieved from https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/t1/tbl1/en/tv.action?pid=1410019001

Steel, R. P., & Ovalle, N. K. (1984). A review and meta-analysis of research on the relationship between behavioral intentions and employee turnover. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *69*(4), 673-686. doi: 2048/10.1037/0021-9010.69.4.673

Steers, R. M., & Rhodes, S. R. (1978). Major influences on employee attendance: A process model. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *63*(4), 391-407. doi: 2048/10.1037/0021-9010.63.4.391

Stevens, J. P. (1984). Outliers and influential data points in regression analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, *95*(2), 334-344. doi: 10.1037/0033-2909.95.2.334

Stewart, N. (2013). *Absenteeism trends in canadian organizations: Missing in action* (Publication 14-100). Ottawa, ON: The Conference Board of Canada. Retrieved from http://www.conferenceboard.ca/e-library/abstract.aspx?did=5780

Taylor, R. (1990). Interpretation of the correlation coefficient: a basic review. *Journal of Diagnostic Medical Sonography*, *6*(1), 35-39.

ten Brummelhuis, L. L., Johns, G., Lyons, B. J., & ter Hoeven, C. L. (2016). Why and when do employees imitate the absenteeism of co-workers? *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *134*, 16-30. doi: 2048/10.1016/ jobhdp.2016.04.001

Tharenou, P. (1993). A test of reciprocal causality for absenteeism. *Journal of Organizational*

Behavior, *14*(3), 269-287. doi: 2048/10.1002/job. 4030140306

Thomas, K. A., & Clifford, S. (2017). Validity and Mechanical Turk: An assessment of exclusion methods and interactive experiments. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *77*, 184-197. doi: 2048/10.1016/j.chb.2017.08.038

Tinsley, H. E., & Tinsley, D. J. (1987). Uses of factor analysis in counseling psychology research. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *34*(4), 414-424. doi: 2048/10.1037/0022-0167.34.4.414

U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics (2018). *4.2 million workers have illness-related work absences in January 2018*. Retrieved from https://www.bls.gov/opub/ted/2018/4-point-2-million-workers-have-illness-related-work-absences-in-january-2018.htm

U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics (2018). *Labor Force Statistics from the Current Population Survey*. Retrieved from https://data.bls.gov/timeseries/LNS12300000

U.S. Census Bureau (2018). *Annual Estimates of the Resident Population: April 1, 2010 to July 1, 2018.* Retrieved from https://factfinder.census.gov/faces/tableservices/jsf/pages/productview.xhtml?src=CF

Warr, P., & Bunce, D. (1995). Trainee characteristics and the outcomes of open learning. *Personnel Psychology*, *48*(2), 347-375. doi: 2048/10.1111/j.1744-6570.1995.tb01761.x

Warr, P., Cook, J., & Wall, T. (1979). Scales for the measurement of some work attitudes and aspects of psychological well-being. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, *52*(2), 129-148. doi: 2048/10.1111/j.2044-8325.1979.tb00448.x

Welbourne, J. L., & Sariol, A. M. (2017). When does incivility lead to counterproductive work behavior? Roles of job involvement, task interdependence, and gender. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, *22*(2), 194-206. doi: 2048/ 10.1037/ocp0000029

Ybema, J. F., Smulders, P. G., & Bongers, P. M. (2010). Antecedents and consequences of employee absenteeism: A longitudinal perspective on the role of job satisfaction and burnout. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, *19*(1), 102-124. doi: 2048/10.1080/13594320902793691

Zaichkowsky, J. L. (1985). Measuring the involvement construct. *Journal of Consumer Research*, *12*(3), 341-352. doi: 10.1086/208520

Zainodin, H. J., & Yap, S. J. (2013). Overcoming multicollinearity in multiple regression using correlation coefficient. *i AIP Conference Proceedings, 1557*(1), 416-419. doi: 10.1063/ 1.4823947

Appendix A – Initial 18-Item Voluntary Intent to be Absent Scale

1. …I intend to be absent even if I am fully capable of going to work.
2. …I intend to call in sick even if I am not actually sick.
3. …It is likely that I will decide to not go to work even if I am fully capable of going to work.
4. …If I do not feel like working, I will not show up.
5. …I will often ask myself if I should call in sick to work even if I am not actually sick.
6. …I intend to be absent from work if non-work alternatives are more attractive than work.
7. …I intend to be absent from work if it serves me best.
8. …I will actively search for reasons to not go to work.
9. … I intend to call in sick to work without a valid reason.
10. … I intend to skip work without a valid reason.
11. …I intend to take the day off just because.
12. …I intend to take a sick day because I feel like it.
13. …I intend to call in sick because I have plans the night before my work shift.
14. … I intend to call in sick to do a recreational activity.
15. … I intend to be absent from work to participate in an activity that I view as being more fun.
16. … I intend to be absent from work to avoid unfavourable work activities.
17. …I intend to be absent from work to complete other life activities that I did not complete during non-work hours.
18. … I intend to be absent from work to extend my weekend/other time off.

Appendix B – Screening Questions

A Captcha will be included before the below questions are asked.

1. **Are you 18 years or older?**
   - Yes
   - No

2. **Where do you reside?**
   - Canada
   - United States of America
   - Other

Appendix C – Demographic Questions

How old are you? Please enter whole numbers (e.g., 21):_____years

How do you self-identify?

- Male
- Female
- Other, please specify if you wish:_____

What is your ethnicity?

- White
- African Canadian / African American
- East Asian (e.g. Chinese, Japanese, Korean)
- South Asian (e.g. Indian, Pakistani, Sri Lankan)
- Hispanic / Latino
- Middle Eastern
- Native / Aboriginal / Indigenous
- Mixed
- Other:_____

What is the highest level of education you have completed?

- Elementary School
- High School
- College / Post-Secondary
- Trade / Vocational / Technical Degree
- University - Associate's degree
- University - Bachelor's degree
- University - Master's degree
- University – Advanced degree (e.g., Ph.D., M.D., etc)
- Other:_____

Which category best describes your current position?

- Employee/Worker (i.e., without subordinates)
- Supervisor/Manager
- Director/CEO/President
- Other:_____

In which industry do you currently work in?

- Accommodations and Food Services
- Administrative and Support Services
- Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing, and Hunting
- Arts, Entertainment, and Recreation
- Construction
- Educational Services
- Finance and Insurance
- Government
- Health Care and Social Assistance
- Information
- Management and Companies and Enterprises
- Manufacturing
- Mining, Quarrying, and Oil and Gas Extraction
- Other Services (Except Public Administration)
- Professional, Scientific, and Technical Services
- Real Estate and Rental and Leasing
- Retail Trade
- Transportation and Warehousing
- Utilities
- Wholesale Trade
- Other

How long (in months) have you been in your current position?

How long (in months) have you been in your current organization?

Do you have any paid sick days at work?

- Yes
- No

Do you have any paid personal days at work (e.g., family days)?

- Yes
- No

Appendix D – 18-Item Voluntary Intent to be Absent Scale

There are times when all of us have to take some time off of work (excluding statutory holidays, illnesses, etc.). This said, please rate your level of agreement with each statement below.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree

In the <u>next 3 months</u>…

1. …I intend to be absent even if I am fully capable of going to work.
2. …I intend to call in sick even if I am not actually sick.
3. …It is likely that I will decide to not go to work even if I am fully capable of going to work.
4. …If I do not feel like working, I will not show up.
5. …I will often ask myself if I should call in sick to work even if I am not actually sick.
6. …I intend to be absent from work if non-work alternatives are more attractive than work.
7. …I intend to be absent from work if it serves me best.
8. …I will actively search for reasons to not go to work.
9. … I intend to call in sick to work without a valid reason.
10. … I intend to skip work without a valid reason.
11. …I intend to take the day off just because.
12. …I intend to take a sick day because I feel like it.
13. …I intend to call in sick because because I have plans the night before my work shift.
14. … I intend to call in sick to do a recreational activity.
15. … I intend to be absent from work to participate in an activity that I view as being more fun.
16. … I intend to be absent from work to avoid unfavourable work activities.
17. …I intend to be absent from work to complete other life activities that I did not complete during non-work hours.
18. … I intend to be absent from work to extend my weekend/other time off.

Appendix E – Absences Intentions Items

Please indicate how likely it is that you will be absent <u>in the next 3 months</u> based on the following reasons. Answer these questions without considering sick days, holidays, or scheduled vacation as absences.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Highly likely	Likely	Somewhat likely	Neither likely nor unlikely	Somewhat unlikely	Unlikely	Highly unlikely

1. To take care of your dependent children in need. If you do not have children, leave blank.
2. When you feel like doing a hobby or leisure activity (not work-related, family-related, or community-related).
3. Attending to family responsibilities other than children.
4. To fulfill religious commitments.
5. Involvement in community activities other than religion, family, or work.
6. To spend leisure time with family.
7. To get relief from a dissatisfying work situation.
8. For any reason other than illness, holidays, vacation, or civic duties.

Appendix F – Past Voluntary Absences Question

In the past 3 months, how many times did you absent yourself from work knowing that you were fully capable and able of going to work?

Appendix G – Turnover Intention Scale

Please indicate your degree of agreement with the following items.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree

1. I think a lot about leaving the organization.
2. I am actively searching for an alternative to the organization.
3. As soon as it is possible, I will leave the organization.

Appendix H – Intrinsic Work Motivation Subscale

The following statements refer to the way in which you experienced your work during the last two weeks. Please indicate how often you experienced each of the statements.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Never	Almost never	Sometimes	Regularly	Often	Very often	Always

1. I would still do this work, even if I received less pay.
2. I find that I also want to work in my free time.
3. I work because I enjoy it.
4. When I am working on something, I am doing it for myself.
5. I get my motivation from the work itself, and not from the reward for it.

Appendix I – Perceived Absence Norms Questions

Occupational Norm

1. All things considered, how many days do you think it would be "normal" or "typical" for someone doing your kind of work to be absent during one year?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30

Click to write Choice 1

Group Norm

1. Currently about how many days a year does the average employee in your work group miss due to absenteeism?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30

Click to write Choice 1

Self-Report

1. In a typical year, how many days do *you personally* miss work due to absenteeism?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30

Click to write Choice 1

Comparison of Absences

1. In comparison to other employees in your company how does your number of absences compare to theirs?

My number of absences is…

1	2	3	4	5
Much less than average	Less than Average	Average	More than average	Much more than average

Appendix J – Job Satisfaction Question

Taking everything into consideration, how do you feel about your job as a whole?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Extremely dissatisfied	Mostly Dissatisfied	Somewhat dissatisfied	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	Somewhat satisfied	Mostly Satisfied	Extremely satisfied

Appendix K – Straightforward Incivility Scales (SIS)

Supervisor Incivility – SIS

0	1	2	3	4	5	6
Never	Sporadically	Now and then	Regularly	Often	Very often	Daily

In the **past week**, how often have your **supervisors** behaved in the following ways?

1. Ignored you.
2. Excluded you.
3. Spoke rudely to you.
4. Behaved rudely to you (e.g., gestures, facial expressions etc.).
5. Behaved without consideration for you.

Co-workers Incivility – SIS

0	1	2	3	4	5	6
Never	Sporadically	Now and then	Regularly	Often	Very often	Daily

In the **past week**, how often have your **co-workers** behaved in the following ways?

1. Ignored you.
2. Excluded you.
3. Spoke rudely to you.
4. Behaved rudely to you (e.g., gestures, facial expressions etc.).
5. Behaved without consideration for you.

Appendix L – Kessler Psychological Distress Scale (K6)

The following questions are about how you have been feeling during the past 30 days. Please select one of the 5 answer choices that best represents how you have been.

0	1	2	3	4
Never	A little of the time	Some of the time	Most of the time	All of the time

During the last 30 days…

1. …About how often did you feel nervous?
2. …About how often did you feel hopeless?
3. …About how often did you feel restless or fidgety?
4. …About how often did you feel so sad that nothing could cheer you up?
5. …About how often did you feel that everything was an effort?
6. …About how often did you feel worthless?

Appendix M – Attention Checks

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree

1. For this question, please answer "Agree". *(embedded in VIA measure)*
2. Please answer "A little of the time" for this question. *(embedded in K6 measure)*

Appendix N – Short Form of the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale

Listed below are a number of statements concerning personal attitudes and traits. Read each item and decide whether the statement is *true* of *false* as it pertains to your personally.

1. I sometimes feel resentful when I don't get my way.
2. On a few occasions, I have given up doing something because I thought too little of my ability.
3. There have been times when I felt like rebelling against people in authority even though I knew they were right.
4. No matter who I'm talking to, I'm always a good listener.
5. I can remember "playing sick" to get out of something.
6. There have been occasions when I took advantage of someone.
7. I'm always willing to admit it when I make a mistake.
8. I sometimes try to get even rather than forgive and forget.
9. I am always courteous, even to people who are disagreeable.
10. I have never been irked when people expressed ideas very different from my own.
11. There have been times when I was quite jealous of the good fortune of others.
12. I am sometimes irritated by people who ask favors of me.
13. I have never deliberately said something that hurt someone's feelings.

Appendix O – Short Voluntary Intent to be Absent Scale

There are times when all of us have to take some time off of work (excluding statutory holidays, illnesses, etc.). This said, please rate your level of agreement with each statement below.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree

In the <u>next 3 months</u>…

1. …I will often ask myself if I should call in sick to work even if I am not actually sick.
2. …I intend to be absent from work if it serves me best.
3. … I intend to take the day off just because.
4. …I intend to call in sick because I have plans the night before my work shift.
5. …I intend to be absent from work to participate in an activity that I view as being more fun.
6. …I intend to be absent from work to complete other life activities that I did not complete during non-work hours.
7. …I intend to be absent from work to extend my weekend/other time off.

Appendix P – Full Voluntary Intent to be Absent Scale

There are times when all of us have to take some time off of work (excluding statutory holidays, illnesses, etc.). This said, please rate your level of agreement with each statement below.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree

In the <u>next 3 months</u>…

1. …I intend to be absent even if I am fully capable of going to work.
2. …I intend to call in sick even if I am not actually sick.
3. …It is likely that I will decide to not go to work even if I am fully capable of going to work.
4. …I will often ask myself if I should call in sick to work even if I am not actually sick.
5. …I intend to be absent from work if non-work alternatives are more attractive than work.
6. …I intend to be absent from work if it serves me best.
7. …I intend to skip work without a valid reason.
8. …I intend to take the day off just because.
9. …I intend to take a sick day because I feel like it
10. …I intend to call in sick because I have plans the night before my work shift.
11. …I intend to call in sick to do a recreational activity.
12. …I intend to be absent from work to participate in an activity that I view as being more fun.
13. …I intend to be absent from work to complete other life activities that I did not complete during non-work hours.
14. …I intend to be absent from work to extend my weekend/other time off.

Appendix Q – Bi-Variate Correlations for Time 1 and Time 2 Using Full VIA Scale

Table 10

Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlations for all Study Variables and Measures for Time 1 and Time 2 Using the Full VIA Scale

	Measure	*M*	*SD*	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	*M*	*SD*
1.	Age	39.55	10.42	–	.46**	.47**	.03	.05	-.07	-.12*	-.10	-.13*	-.06	41.06	10.76
2.	Tenure Pos	65.33	61.10	.43**	–	.73**	-.09	-.06	-.10	.00	-.05	-.02	.01	70.94	58.88
3.	Tenure Org	86.61	75.32	.45**	.70**	–	-10	-.11	-.05	-.05	-.05	-.10	-.04	97.13	76.99
4.	Paid SD	1.23	.42	-.02	-.09*	-.09	–	.56**	.06	-.06	-.08	-.11*	.02	1.21	.41
5.	Paid PD	1.23	.42	.07	-.05	-.10*	.48**	–	-.02	-.09	-.15*	-.13*	-.02	1.23	.43
6.	PVAQ	1.08	2.22	-.07	-.10*	-.04	.01	-.03	–	.27**	.28**	.39**	.31**	.77	1.95
7.	ONA	7.51	5.61	-.13**	-.07	-.04	-.08	-.08	.41**	–	.69**	.69**	.16**	6.97	5.20
8.	GNA	7.95	5.56	-.07	-.12*	-.04	-.08	-.09*	.38**	.60**	–	.64**	-.05	7.43	5.39
9.	SRA	4.56	4.83	-.06	-.07	.01	-.12**	-.07	.57**	.64**	.58**	–	.42**	3.98	4.58
10.	CA	1.95	.93	-.04	.01	.01	-.03	.00	.38**	.24**	.08	.54**	–	1.83	.86
11.	Job Sat	5.00	1.61	.10*	.06	.07	-.11*	-.15**	-.01	-.06	-.05	-.02	-.01	5.08	1.57
12.	VIA	2.12	.98	-.10*	-.06	-.06	-.04	-.08	.58**	.34**	.30**	.51**	.41**	2.02	.98
13.	AI	2.80	1.35	-.06	.03	.04	-.05	-.08	.45**	.25**	.27**	.39**	.25**	2.70	1.37
14.	Turnover	2.35	1.29	-.12**	-.10*	-.12**	.15**	.10*	.26**	.11*	.11*	.15**	.12**	2.14	1.20
15.	IWM	3.24	1.39	.02	.07	.08	-.02	-.09	.17**	.08	.04	.10*	.01	3.21	1.34

16.	SIS – Sup	.61	1.11	-.07	-.02	-.06	.05	.04	.38**	.18**	.19**	.21**	.16**	.45	.91
17.	SIS- CW	.60	1.03	-.08	-.09*	-.09*	.02	.01	.38**	.20**	.23**	.19**	.16**	.51	.99
18.	K6	.93	.85	-.18**	-.13**	-.13**	.09*	.09*	.36**	.13**	.15**	.21**	.18**	.88	.83
19.	MCSD	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	5.80	3.46

Note. Listwise $N = 487$ for Time 1. Listwise $N = 332$ for Time 2. Coefficient alphas for the full VIA scale are reported in the Results section – Scale Reliability – and for all other scales they are reported in the Measures section. Age reported in years; Tenure Pos = Tenure in current position (in months); Tenure Org = Tenure in Organization (in months); Paid SD = Paid Sick Days (1 = *Yes*, 2 = *No*); Paid PD = Paid Personal Days (1 = *Yes*, 2 = *No*); PVAQ = Past voluntary absences question; ONA = Perceived occupational norms absence (per year); GNA = Perceived group norms absence (per year); SRA = Self-reported absence (per year); CA = Comparison of absences (overall); Job Sat = Job satisfaction; VIA = Voluntary intent to be absent scale (14-items); AI = Absence intentions scale; Turnover = Turnover intent scale; IWM = Intrinsic work motivation sub-scale; SIS – Sup = Straightforward incivility scale – Supervisor incivility; SIS – CW = Straightforward incivility scale co-worker incivility; K6 = Kessler psychological distress scale; MCSD = Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability scale.
* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$ (2-tailed).

Table 10

Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlations for all Study Variables and Measures for Time 1 and Time 2 Using the Full VIA Scale (continued)

	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19
1. Age	.15**	-.09	-.10	-.15**	.09	-.09	-.08	-.21**	.04
2. Tenure Pos	.05	-.02	-.02	-.08	.09	-.06	-.09	-.14**	-.03
3. Tenure Org	.11*	-.09	-.01	-.15**	.15**	-.01	-.01	-.13*	.04
4. Paid SD	-.15**	-.11	-.14*	.11*	-.12*	.06	.10	.09	.03
5. Paid PD	-.16**	-.14*	-.14**	.10	-.12*	.08	.11*	.16**	-.05
6. PVAQ	-.08	.40**	.28**	.15**	.06	.25**	.20**	.17**	-.06
7. ONA	-.17**	.32**	.24**	.20**	-.08	.15**	.07	.05	-.09
8. GNA	-.11*	.27**	.21**	.10	-.03	.12*	.13*	.10	-.06
9. SRA	-.09	.47**	.32**	.15**	-.05	.13*	.06	.07	-.18**
10. CA	-.08	.44**	.22**	.16**	-.09	.17**	.07	.13*	-.21**
11. Job Sat	–	-.28**	-.17**	-.79**	.60**	-.27**	-.28**	-.38**	.13*
12. VIA	-.24**	–	.55**	.44**	-.16**	.32**	.26	.32**	-.28**
13. AI	-.09	.56**	–	.26**	-.06	.21**	.20**	.22**	-.16**
14. Turnover	-.72**	.40**	.25**	–	-.45**	.37**	.35**	.42**	-.14*
15. IWM	.55**	-.08	.05	-.37**	–	-.01	-.02	-.18**	.20**

16.	SIS - Sup	-.31**	.36**	.26**	.44**	.05	–	.79**	.48**	.03
17.	SIS - CW	-.22**	.38**	.25**	.41**	.09*	.73**	–	.50**	.05
18.	K6	-.38**	.33**	.23**	.48**	-.05	.56**	.55**	–	-.21**
19.	MCSD	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–

Note. Listwise $N = 487$. Listwise $N = 332$ for Time 2 (above diagonal). Coefficient alphas for the full VIA scale are reported in the Results section – Scale Reliability – for all other scales they are reported in the Measures section. Age reported in years; Tenure Pos = Tenure in current position (in months); Tenure Org = Tenure in Organization (in months); Paid SD = Paid Sick Days (1 = *Yes*, 2 = *No*); Paid PD = Paid Personal Days (1 = *Yes*, 2 = *No*); PVAQ = Past voluntary absences question; ONA = Perceived occupational norms absence (per year); GNA = Perceived group norms absence (per year); SRA = Self-reported absence (per year); CA = Comparison of absences (overall); Job Sat = Job satisfaction; VIA = Voluntary intent to be absent scale (14-items); AI = Absence intentions scale; Turnover = Turnover intent scale; IWM = Intrinsic work motivation sub-scale; SIS – Sup = Straightforward incivility scale – Supervisor incivility; SIS – CW = Straightforward incivility scale co-worker incivility; K6 = Kessler psychological distress scale; MCSD = Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability scale.
* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$ (2-tailed).

Appendix R – Fit Indices Comparison Using the Full VIA Scale

Table 11

Model Fit Indices Comparisons Between the Full VIA and the AI, TI, and IWM Measures Using Time 1 Sample

	1-factor model					2-factor model					Difference
Measures	χ^2 (*df*)	RMSEA	SRMR	CFI	TLI	χ^2 (*df*)	RMSEA	SRMR	CFI	TLI	$\Delta\chi^2$ (*df*)
VIA and AI	1616(209)***	.13	.10	.77	.75	915.00(208)***	.10	.06	.88	.87	701.00(1)**
VIA and TI	1918.00(119)***	.18	.10	.76	.72	618.00(118)***	.09	.04	.93	.92	1300.00(1)**
VIA and IWM	1872.00(152)***	.15	.13	.76	.72	678.00(151)***	.09	.05	.93	.92	1194.00(1)**

Note. Listwise *N* for VIA and AI = 382; Listwise *N* for VIA and TI = 490; Listwise *N* for VIA and IWM = 487. Fixed parameter constraint used. VIA = Voluntary intent to be absence scale (full scale: 14 items); AI = Absence intentions scale; TI = Intent to turnover scale; IWM = Intrinsic work motivation sub-scale. χ^2 = Chi-squared; RMSEA = Root mean square error of approximation; SRMR = standard root-mean-square residual; CFI = Comparative fit index; TLI = Tucker Lewis index.
* $p < .05$, ** < .01, *** $p < .001$.

Appendix S – Regression of One's Absence Intentions Scale and VIA Tendency (Full Scale) on Future Voluntary Absences

Table 12

Regression of One's Absence Intentions and VIA Tendency on Future Voluntary Absences

	Self-Reported Past Absences					
Predictor	*b (SE)*	*β*	*F*	*df1/df2*	R^2	ΔR^2
Step 1			19.59	1/332	.06	
Constant	-.18(.24)					
Absence Intention	.35 ***(.08)	.24				
Step 2			16.94	2/331	.09	.04
Constant	-.62*(.26)					
Absence Intention	.15(.09)	.10				
VIA	.47***(.13)	.24				

Note. Listwise $N = 334$; VIA = Voluntary Intent to be Absent (full scale: 14 items, measured at Time 1); Self-reported past absences = self-reported number of voluntary absences in the past three months, measured at Time 2.
*$p \leq .05$. ** $p \leq .01$. *** $p \leq .001$

Appendix T – Regression of Work Attitudes and One's VIA Tendency (Full Scale) on Future Voluntary Absences

Table 13

Regression of Work Attitudes and One's VIA Tendency (Full Scale) on Future Voluntary Absences

	Self-Reported Past Absences					
Predictor	*b (SE)*	*β*	*F*	*df1/df2*	R^2	ΔR^2
Step 1			3.62	8/325	.08	
Constant	-.41(.52)					
ONA	.02(.03)	.07				
GNA	.02(.03)	.06				
SRA	.05(.04)	.11				
CA	.13(.15)	.06				
Job Sat	.03(.07)	.02				
SIS - Sup	.12(.13)	.06				
SIS - CW	-.03(.15)	-.01				
K6	.25(.16)	.11				
Step 2			4.69	9/324	.12	.03
Constant	-1.30*(.58)					
ONA	.02(.03)	.06				
GNA	.02(.03)	.07				
SRA	.01(.04)	.03				
CA	.03(.15)	.01				
Job Sat	.09(.07)	.08				
SIS - Sup	.12(.13)	.07				
SIS - CW	-.11(.15)	-.05				
K6	.22(.16)	.09				
VIA	.47***(.13)	.23				

Note. Listwise $N = 334$. VIA = Voluntary intent to be absent (full scale: 14 items); ONA = Perceived occupational norms absence (per year); GNA = Perceived group norms absence (per year); SRA = Self-reported absence (per year); CA = Comparison of absences (overall); Job Sat = Job satisfaction; SIS – Sup = Straightforward incivility scale; SIS – CW = Straightforward incivility scale co-worker incivility; K6 = Kessler psychological distress scale; Self-reported past absences = self-reported number of voluntary absences in the past three months. All variables were measured at Time 1 with the exception of self-reported past absences measured at Time 2.
*$p \leq .05$.** $p \leq .01$.***$p \leq .001$