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ABSTRACT

The premise of this study is that a correlation exists between organizational commitment and job satisfaction with low job absenteeism rates. Research in this area seems to confirm such a correlation. To establish the existence of such a correlation in the Riverside County Department of Mental Health Administration, a survey instrument was designed and distributed to employees, requesting their assistance to complete said survey and return to me for analysis.

Various statistical analyses were performed on the data extracted from the survey instrument. The results did not confirm any correlation between absenteeism and organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and number of years employed with the County. A weak correlation was shown between job classification and low absenteeism.

Clearly, other factors have a strong influence on individual attendance statistics. Further study with a more comprehensive research instrument would be necessary to establish the contributing factors to workplace absenteeism.
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Managers and supervisors in the public sector are faced constantly with employee absenteeism, which adversely affects the productivity of the organization. An important component of absenteeism is sick leave usage. This research project focuses on that component. Aside from being costly, absenteeism is a drain on productivity (Garcia, 1987, p.45). For example, between 2 and 4 percent of Americans fail to show up for work daily (Kleinback, Quast, Thierry, and Stackelhaus, 1990, p.157). Although the percentage does not appear high, the annual cost of absenteeism in the United States is estimated to be over $26 billion (Johns, 1983, p.114). According to Kopelman et al. (1981), there are several costs associated with absenteeism:

1. Absence of employees results in direct expense for the organization for such items as paid overtime, hiring of part-time employees or over-staffing;
2. Absent employees continue to get paid benefits thereby contributing to organizational operating costs;
3. Controlling and administering absent employees results in cost to the organization;
4. More supervisory costs are incurred due to changes in unit scheduling to compensate for absent employees;
5. Although hard to quantify, there are other cost associated with absenteeism:
   a. workers who have to cover for absent employees may tend to have lower morale;
   b. requiring workers to cover for absent employees could result in high turnover, grievances and tardiness;
   c. the situation could also result in low productivity due to lack of knowledge about the work.

In view of the high cost (and adverse impact on productivity) of absenteeism, the problem to be explored in this study is as follows:

1. To determine if employee organizational commitment influences employee absenteeism in the public sector;
2. To determine if employee job satisfaction influences employee absenteeism in the public sector;
3. To determine if number of years employed with the County influences employee absenteeism; and
4. To determine if job classification influences employee absenteeism.
CHAPTER 2
THEORY OVERVIEW

According to Johns (1980, p. 112-113), "If you have to spend eight hours a day five days a week on the job, it would obviously be worthwhile for you to have favorable attitudes toward that job. Thus, job satisfaction is an attitude worthy of interest in and of itself. However, job satisfaction also has important personal and organizational consequences beyond mere happiness with the job." These consequences will be discussed below. Indeed, according to Feldman and Arnold (1983), job satisfaction has been found to be related to such employee behaviors as absenteeism.

Many people, particularly managers, have strong feelings about absenteeism (Rhodes and Steer, 1990, p.1). In the United States alone, it has been estimated that 400 million workdays per year are lost to absenteeism. Researchers have attached a dollar value to this factor which is estimated to be between $26 to $46 billion per year (Steer and Rhodes, 1978; Goodman and Atkin, 1984). The effect of this dollar value is that every 1/2 percent change in national absence rate causes a $10 billion
change in the National Gross Product of the United States (Steer and Rhodes, 1978, p.6).

Managers place too much emphasis on the cost of absenteeism and too little on how organizations can reduce absenteeism. One possible solution discussed is that organizations should offer incentives for good attendance (Steer and Rhodes, 1978, p.164). This is a much more positive approach than focusing on absenteeism. According to a study conducted by Garcia (1987), absenteeism and its related costs are increasing in the public sector, yet the causes and consequences are poorly understood. Garcia (1987, p.45) further states that "Absences from work due to illness or injury are a reality that all managers must anticipate, confront, and manage. Employee absenteeism is a drain in productivity." As noted by Garcia (1987) and other researchers, effective absenteeism remedies attempt to balance the need for increased productivity and efficiency with employee job satisfaction (Alain-Daniel, 1969; Chadwich-Jones, Nicholson, and Brown, 1982; Steer and Rhodes, 1978). The next step is to look at assorted definitions used by various researchers.
What is Job Satisfaction?

According to one researcher, there is only a modest relationship between absence and job satisfaction (Johns, 1983). Johns (1983, p.114) points out that the "link between attitudes and behavior is not always strong, and the relationship between satisfaction and absence is an example of this." As various researchers have defined job satisfaction in a lot of ways as "any combination of physiological, psychological and environmental circumstances that causes a person truthfully to say, 'I am satisfied with my job.'" (Hopkins, 1983, p.21).

Another common definition are those that "assume existence of needs (in varying forms and generally view job satisfaction as resulting from the fit between these individual needs and the job and its environment "(Hopkins, 1983, p.22). Another definition provided by Locks, 1969 is that job satisfaction is the "pleasurable emotional state resulting from gratification or satisfaction about one's job." As previously illustrated, job satisfaction can be defined in various ways by different researchers which results in having the
difficulty of obtaining consensus among them as to how job satisfaction should be defined.

In this research project, job satisfaction is defined as the collection of attitudes that employees have about their job and their response to their work environment (Hopkins, 1983, p.32.) One of the things we need to keep in mind is that individuals have different needs and values in work environments. Further, according to Hopkins, (1983, p.32) the objective is to "define and understand job satisfaction sufficiently so that the process of how individuals perceptions of their work interact with their values to produce job satisfaction." Therefore, it can be assumed that if individuals are satisfied with their jobs, then they will be less likely to use up their sick leave benefits and will be in attendance most of the time at their work place.

Clearly managers need to "have a broad perspective on potential means of promoting job satisfaction." (Hopkins, 1983, p.126).

Further, according to Johns (1983, p.114), the following factors probably reduce the relationship between job satisfaction and absence:
° Some absence is simply unavoidable because of illness, weather conditions, or other pressing matters.

° Opportunities for off-the-job satisfaction on a missed day may vary. (Thus, you may love your job, but love skiing or sailing even more. In this case, you might skip work, while a dissatisfied worker who has nothing better to do shows up.)

° Some organizations have attendance control policies that can influence absence more than satisfaction does.

Now that job satisfaction has been discussed in relation to absenteeism, this research project will then evaluate organizational commitment as it pertains to absenteeism.
What is Organizational Commitment?

Researchers are also having difficulty in agreeing what is meant by organizational commitment. Stevens, Byer, and Trice (1978) reveal ambiguity and overlap regarding the definitions of organizational commitment. Words such as occupational commitment, organizational loyalty, organizational identification, professional commitment, work involvement, job commitment, organizational involvement, role commitment or organizational attraction have been used interchangeably with no agreement as to how they should be interpreted (Sharafinski, 1988, p.2). Others have defined organizational commitment as "involving an individual's identity, loyalty, giving of energy, attachment to social relations, spontaneous contribution merging goals, etc." (Mowday, Porter, & Steers, 1982, p.20).

O'Reilly and Chatman (1986) speculate that the confusion over the definition of organizational commitment has to do with the lack of strong findings linking organizational commitment to absenteeism. Mowday, Porter, and Steers (1982) offer the most widely accepted definition of organizational commitment, "the relative strength of an individual's identification
with and involvement in a particular organization."

This definition has developed slowly and consistently over time as individuals have tried to determine their relationship to their employer (Sharafinski, 1988, p.3). There are three factors that characterize this definition: (a) a strong belief in and acceptance of the organization's values and goals; (b) a willingness to exert considerable effort on behalf of the organization; and (c) a strong desire to maintain membership in the organization. This definition has been accepted and used by many researchers. Nevertheless, "what is still needed are the theoretical and operational definitions that clearly differentiate commitment and its relationship to absenteeism."

According to Metzner and Floyd (1976, p.229), "organizations having high employee absence rates are commonly thought to be less efficiently managed organizations than those which have low rates of absence." One theory is that employees who are contented with their jobs and supervisors as well as the opportunities of their job, such as pay, self-expression, promotion, and associations, will take less sick leave compared with those employees who are dissatisfied with their jobs and who will tend to take more sick leave (Metzner and Floyd,
Further, Metzner and Floyd (1976, p. 229) state that "while the relationship between employees' work attitudes and absences is commonly assumed, it has not been quantitatively demonstrated very often." Few researchers have attempted to relate absence rates to employee attitudes, perceptions, and personal characteristics (Metzner and Floyd, 1976, p. 229).

The more managers know about cultivating these psychological ties, the better the employers' chances of retaining high quality employees. One such way for managers to cultivate these psychological ties is to recruit individuals who "fit in" the organization (Romzek, 1990, p. 378). Romzek (1990, p. 377-378) further observes that "for employees to feel committed to their work organizations, those agencies must have cultures that allow commitment to develop.... Because employee commitment is two-way street, agencies and supervisors must demonstrate commitment to get commitment." Other researchers have studied factors influencing public retention (Blackburn and Bruce, 1989; Lovrich, 1987; Perry and Wise, 1990; Posner and Schmidt, 1989; Romzek, 1985; Schay, 1988) For example, Perry and Wise (1990, p. 372) state that "understanding the motives of public servants
and the way to stimulate public service motivation are, at best, at a preliminary stage."

In addition, Perry and Wise (1990, p.371) observe that public service motivation "is likely to be positively related to an individual's organizational commitment;" and, "...may change an employee's willingness to stay with a public organization."

There have been several studies on the influence of factors (such as organizational commitment and job satisfaction) on employee absenteeism. The research is divided, especially with regards to public sector employees. Thus, there is a need for further research to understand the factors influencing absenteeism among public sector employees.
CHAPTER 3
HYPOTHESES

This study focuses on Riverside County Department of Mental Health Administration. In this case the following operational hypotheses, developed according to the criteria in Young (1991, p.8), will be tested:

1. Differences in the amount of organizational commitment (as measured by the Organizational Commitment Scale from the Inventory of Work Investment by Maehr and Braskamp [1986]) will be associated with differences in sick leave usage (as measured by the total number of hours absent from scheduled work for an individual employee).

2. Differences in the amount of job satisfaction (as measured by the Brayfield and Rothe Index of Job Satisfaction [1992]) will be associated with differences in sick leave usage (as measured by the total number of hours absent from scheduled work for an individual employee).

3. Differences in the number of years employed with the County as measured by the responses on the survey will be associated with differences in sick leave usage.
4. Differences in job classification with the County as measured by the responses on the survey will be associated with differences in sick leave usage.
CHAPTER 4
OPERATIONAL DEFINITION

In order to provide a better understanding of terminology used, the following key terms are defined to clarify their meaning:

Absenteeism: unscheduled absence from work. Note that Garcia (1987, p.46-49) defines sick time as unscheduled absence from work due to illness or injury other than that sustained while performing one’s duties.

Employee Organizational Commitment: According to Romzek (1990, p.377), employee organizational commitment is the "degree to which individuals share an agency’s values and have a personal sense of importance about the agency’s mission." Romzek (1990, p.380) further classifies employee commitment into the following five categories: zealots (highest possible level), highly committed, moderately committed, marginally committed, and the alienated (lowest possible level).

Job Satisfaction: Johns (1983, p.106) defines job satisfaction as "...a collection of attitudes which workers have about their job." In other words, job satisfaction is the tendency for an employee to be more or less satisfied with various facets of the job.
Organizational Culture: Maehr and Braskamp (1986, p.131) define organizational culture as "shared perceptions of purposes and desired ends" by the employees themselves, particularly with regards to organizational "values and goals."

Organizational Fit: Romzek (1990, p.378) defines organizational fit as the acceptance of the basic assumptions of an organization and already holding key organizational values as one's own personal values.
CHAPTER 5
RESEARCH DESIGN

Variables

This study has two independent variables. The first independent variable is employee organizational commitment and the second independent variable is job satisfaction. The dependent variable is absenteeism. Using the categorization of variables from Baker (1988, p.128-131) and Young (1991, p.19-22), employee organization commitment and job satisfaction are interval variables. Absenteeism is a ratio variable (the zero value is no time absent from work). In addition this study involves many extraneous variables such as age, sex, minority status, education, marital status, children, job tenure, years left to retirement, job level, distance to work, pay, fringe benefits, promotional opportunity, job involvement, pay-performance link and organizational climate (Garcia, 1987, p.52-53; Schay, 1988, p.24).
Unit of Analysis

The unit being studied is the Riverside County Department of Mental Health Administration Division which has approximately 76 employees. Participants included managers, supervisors, professionals, technical, and clerical employees who have been employed with the county for periods of time ranging between 20 years to less than one year.
Methodology

The methods used for this research project included the following:

I. An analysis of the professional and academic literature germane to absenteeism, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment.

II. A survey of employees in the Riverside County Department of Mental Health Administration Division.

Setting

The Riverside County Department of Mental Health provides activities such as mental health treatment and administration, alcohol and drug abuse services, and probate conservatorship. There are five cost centers within the Department of Mental Health with approximately 700 employees. This study focuses on the Administration Division because 37% of employees in this division have used at least two to three weeks of sick leave in the past year. In addition, graphs have been prepared to illustrate the results of the organizational commitment (OC) and job satisfaction (JS) by job classification.
The graph in Appendix A shows that employees in the management/supervisor job classification have the highest average organizational commitment of 4.44 compared to the rest of the population. The second highest, an average score of 3.94 is the technical group. On the other hand, the graph in Appendix B shows that average job satisfaction was comparable for all job classification groups.

As manager of Fiscal Services, Material Management and Program Support, which represent the largest part of Mental Health Administration, this research project will hopefully provide me with insights as to why employees are using their sick leave as soon as they earn it, instead of accumulating these benefits in reserve for when catastrophic events take place such as surgery, maternity leave, accident, and long term illness.
Instruments

The research questionnaire was developed using Brayfield and Rothe's index of job satisfaction (1992, p.466-467) and Maehr and Braskcamp's Organizational Commitment Scale from the Inventory of Work Investment (1986, p.82-91). A total of 15 questions were asked of the participants, the first four questions pertain to organizational commitment and the remaining 11 questions pertain to job satisfaction (see Appendix C). This study presumes that employees will use less sick leave if they are satisfied with their jobs and are committed to their work. (Brayfield and Rothe, 1951, p.307-11).

Brayfield and Rothe (1992, p. 466) stated that "the present index contains 18 items with Thurstone scale values ranging from 1.2 to 10.0 with approximately .5 step intervals. The items are not arranged in the order of magnitude of scale values. The Likert scoring system consisting of five categories of agreement-disagreement was applied to each item, and the Thurstone scoring system of five categories is applied to the items".

The Thurstone scale value gives the direction of scoring method so that a low total score would represent the dissatisfied end of the scale and a high total score
the satisfied one. The items are selected so that the satisfied end of the scale was indicated by "strongly agree" and "agree," and "disagree" and "strongly disagree" for the other half. The neutral response is "undecided." The Likert scoring values weight for each item range from 1 to 5. "The range of possible total score is 15 to 75 with 45 (undecided) the neutral point".

Brayfield and Rothe (1992, p.466) have measured the reliability of the instrument by administering it as part of a study of 231 female office employees. The blanks were signed along with the other tests. One of the investigators personally administered the test to employees in small groups. The range of job satisfaction scores for this sample was 35-87. The mean score was 63.8, with an Standard Deviation (S.D.) of 9.4. The odd-even product-moment reliability coefficient computed with this sample was .77, which was corrected by the Spearman-Brown formula to a reliability coefficient of .87."

Brayfield and Rothe (1992, p.466) also measured the validity of the instrument since the "evidence for the high validity of the index rests upon the nature of the items, the method of construction, and its differentiating power when applied to two groups that could reasonably be
assumed to differ in job satisfaction. The nature of the individual items is partial, although not crucial, evidence for the validity of the scale. This is an appeal to face validity. Additional evidence is furnished by the method of construction. The attitude variable of job satisfaction is inferred from the verbal reactions to a job expressed along a favorable-unfavorable continuum. The job satisfaction index was administered to 91 adult night school students in classes in personnel psychology at the University of Minnesota during 1945 and 1946. The range of job satisfaction scores for this sample was 29-89. The mean score was 70.4, with S.D. of 13.2. The assumption was made that those persons employed in occupations appropriate to their expressed interest should, on the average, be more satisfied with their jobs than those members of the class employed in occupations inappropriate to their expressed interest in personal work. The 91 persons accordingly were divided into two groups (personnel and nonpersonnel) with respect to their employment in a position identified by payroll title as a personnel functions."

"The mean of the personnel group was 76.9 with S.D. of 8.6, compared with a mean of 65.4 with S.D. of 14.02 for the nonpersonnel group. This difference of 11.5
points is significant at the 1% level; the difference between the variances also is significant at the 1% level. It might also be mentioned that scores on this index correlated .92 with scores on the Hoppock job satisfaction scale."

Survey Instrument Procedure

The survey instrument was provided to 76 employees of Riverside County Department of Mental Health Administration by another employee during a unit staff meeting. In order to avoid appearance of bias, the researcher used the method of having another person conduct the survey instrument. Participants were instructed to first read the letter and to answer each question (see Appendix D). The individual conducting the survey remained at the meeting until each participant completed the survey. There were occasions when the individual had to leave the questionnaires with the supervisors who, in turn, gave them to each employee. Some surveys were received at the meeting while others were forwarded to the individual conducting the survey at a later date.
The individual was available to answer questions regarding the survey. Some employees were very enthusiastic in responding to the survey while others had a very negative attitude. Some employees did not even participate for fear that the answers to the survey could be traced to them.
CHAPTER 6
THE DATA

A total of 61 out of 76 employees responded to the survey, a response rate of 80%. After reviewing the data, only 51 surveys were sufficiently complete to use in the data analysis (see Appendix E). The remaining 10 surveys were incomplete. Respondents were full-time employees ranging from managers/supervisors, professional, technical and clerical personnel.
CHAPTER 7
DATA ANALYSIS

Between the dependent variable of sick leave; the three independent variables of organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and years employed with the County.

The variables of sick leave, organizational commitment, job satisfaction and years employed with the County can be characterized as interval variables. Applying Norusis (1990, p.331) for the case of interval variables, "The most commonly used measure (of the strength of linear association) is the Pearson correlation coefficient which is abbreviated as \( r \)." In particular, "Pearson \( r \) is a test of the null hypothesis that there is no linear correlation in the population (that \( r=0 \)) (Baker, 1988, p.403)". Furthermore, analysis of variance can "be used to test the null hypothesis that there is no linear relationship between the two variables (Norusis, 1990, p.363)." Specifically, an \( F \) statistic can be evaluated where "\( F \) is the ratio of the mean square for regression to the main square the residual (Norusis, 1990, p.363)." In other words, large values of the \( F \)
statistic "suggest that there is a linear relationship between the two variables (Norusis, 1990, p. 363)." Thus, the statistical data analysis for this research project involves an evaluation of the Pearson correlation coefficient (r) and the F statistics.

Applying Fitz-Gibbon & Morris (1978, p.93), if a 95% confidence interval on r includes the zero point, the obtained correlation on r "is not significantly different from zero." In such a case, the data does not support a statistically significant linear correlation between the two variables in question.

Table 1 below, summarizes the results of the statistical tests on the strength of the relationships between the three independent variables and the dependent variable of sick leave. Notice from Table 1 that the three 95% confidence intervals for r each include the zero point. As a result, the data does not suggest a statistically significant linear correlation between each of these three independent variables and the dependent variable of sick leave. Furthermore, the F-test values are relatively small, with significant levels greater than 0.05. Based on the F-test results, the data was insufficient for rejecting the null hypothesis that there is no linear relationship between each of the independent
variables and sick leave.

Stated another way, the data does not support a finding that a statistically significant linear relationship existed between:

1. organizational commitment and sick leave
2. job satisfaction and sick leave
3. years employed with the County and sick leave.

Interestingly, the R-squared estimate showed that the independent variables of organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and year employed with the County each contributed less than 5% to the variability that was observed in sick leave. Thus, as an aggregate the three independent variables appear to be very poor predictors of sick leave usage.
### TABLE 1

**Descriptive Statistics by Independent Variable**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Correlation Coefficient</th>
<th>F-Test</th>
<th>R-Squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dep. Indep. Value</td>
<td>95% Conf. Interval</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Sig. Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/L OC</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>(-0.08, 0.49)</td>
<td>2.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/L JS</td>
<td>0.082</td>
<td>(-0.19, 0.35)</td>
<td>0.346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/L YRS</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>(-0.46, +0.06)</td>
<td>2.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Footnote:**

1 95% Confidence Interval was calculated using Figures 14a and 14b in Fitz-Gibbon & Morris (1978, p.116-118).
Between dependent variable of sick leave and the independent variable of job classification.

Sick leave and job classification are categorized, respectively, as ratio and ordinal variables. Applying Fitz-Gibbon & Morris (1978, p.91), an appropriate correlation coefficient for use with these two variables is the Spearman's Rank Order Correlation Coefficient (rs). The result of the Spearman Rank correlation coefficient is provided by Table 2, below.

Notice that an rs value of zero is not contained within the 95% confidence interval. Furthermore, the significance level is below 5%. Thus, the data supports a finding that a statistically significant negative correlation exists between job classification and sick leave. Nevertheless, the 95% confidence interval of (-0.54, -0.10) shows that the data only support, at best, a finding that there is a weak negative correlation between the independent variable of job classification and the dependent variable of sick leave.
### TABLE 2

**Descriptive Statistics by Dependent Variable**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Spearman's Rank Order Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dep. Indep. Value</td>
<td>95% Conf. Interval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/L JC</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Footnote:**

1 95% Confidence Interval was calculated using Figures 14a and 14b in Fitz-Gibbon & Morris (1978, p.116-118).
As previously discussed, this research project involves four hypotheses. The first three hypothesis was tested using Pearson r because the variables involved were interval. The fourth hypothesis was tested using Spearman's Rank Order Correlation instead of Pearson r since this hypothesis involved a relationship between a ratio variable and interval variable.

The significance level used was 5% in all cases. Based on the data analysis, three hypotheses were not supported at the 5% level, whereas, the fourth hypothesis was supported. Nevertheless, the data for the testing the fourth hypothesis only supported a finding that there was a weak correlation (r $\leq -0.10$) between the variable of job classification and sick leave usage.
CHAPTER 9
FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The results of the survey proved to be interesting in the sense that they revealed that even though employees have lower sick leave balances, the majority of them are still committed to the organization and satisfied with their jobs. The most interesting of all is that those employees who have been employed with the County over 10 years revealed that they are extremely committed to the organization as well as extremely satisfied with their jobs even though their sick leave balances are less than eight weeks. The only factors that have any relevance on this survey are that technical and clerical employees are the heaviest users of sick leave, whereas managers, supervisors, and professionals tend to accumulate their sick leave benefits.

Thus, it would seem that further study could be done to examine other factors which were not included as part of this project. In particular, this research could be expanded to include demographics data such as age, sex, minority status, years left to retirement, distance to work, pay, fringe benefits, and job level.
CHAPTER 10
CONCLUSIONS

This study attempted to prove that employees with a high sick leave balance are committed to the organization as well as satisfied with their jobs. In addition, this study attempted to prove that employees who have been with the County for over five years should have a significant sick leave balance, demonstrating that they are committed to the organization and satisfied with their jobs.

The present findings do not support the major premises of the study, but rather, indicate that there is no correlation between organizational commitment and job satisfaction with that of sick leave usage. However, data analysis shows that there is a weak negative correlation between job classification and sick leave usage.

Finally, further study could be done to enhance the survey instrument to add additional questions on organizational commitment and to include demographic information such as age, sex, pay, job level, minority status, years left to retire, distance to work, and fringe benefits. This might provide a different result than what this research study has shown.
COMPARISON OF AVG OC BY JOB CLASSIFICATION

- Professional
- Mgt/Supv
- Clerical
- Technical

KeyChart 2000
COMPARISON OF AVG JS
BY JOB CLASSIFICATION

KeyChart 2000
January 20, 1993

Dear Fellow Workers:

In order for me to complete my Master’s Program in Public Administration at the California State University in San Bernardino, I have chosen to do a research project. My research project will focus on what factors influence employee absenteeism. I am interested in knowing the most common causes for absenteeism in the work place.

The attached survey was developed to capture data necessary to complete my research project. For your information this survey will be treated anonymously and the results will not be identified to a specific individual. Further, I have asked Jacqueline Van Sickle to conduct this survey so that there will be no appearance of a bias.

I want to thank you in advance for taking the time to fill out the survey. It is important that I receive the survey from you so that I can complete my research project by February. I will provide you with a copy of the survey results after they have been compiled.

Again, thank you for your participation.

Sincerely yours,

Sally A. Beavan
Administrative Manager
Department of Mental Health
Appendix D

RESEARCH PROJECT SURVEY IN CONJUNCTION WITH
CALIFORNIA STATE SAN BERNARDINO
MPA PROGRAM

Please circle the number that best describes how you feel about your present job. Your honest opinion on each statement is greatly appreciated.

1 = Strongly Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Undecided; 4 = Agree; 5 = Strongly Agree

1. I have a sense of loyalty to the organization. 1 2 3 4 5
2. I identify with this organization. 1 2 3 4 5
3. It would take very little for me to move to another organization. 1 2 3 4 5
4. I feel a sense of ownership in this organization. 1 2 3 4 5
5. There are some conditions concerning my job that could be improved. 1 2 3 4 5
6. My job is like a hobby to me. 1 2 3 4 5
7. My job is usually interesting enough to keep me from getting bored. 1 2 3 4 5
8. It seems that my friends are more interested in their jobs. 1 2 3 4 5
9. I consider my job rather unpleasant. 1 2 3 4 5
10. I enjoy my work more than my leisure time. 1 2 3 4 5
11. I am often bored with my job. 1 2 3 4 5
12. I feel fairly well satisfied with my job. 1 2 3 4 5
13. Most of the time I have to force myself to go to work. 1 2 3 4 5
14. I am satisfied with my job for the time being. 1 2 3 4 5
15. I feel that my job is no more interesting than others that I could get. 1 2 3 4 5

Classification: Clerical: ___ Technical: ___ Professional: ___ Sup./Mgt: ___

Number of years worked with the County of Riverside ___
Approximately what is your current sick leave bal. ___
Approximately how many days of sick leave have you taken last Calendar Year?
Less than: 1 week: ___; 2 weeks: ___; 3 weeks: ___
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### Summary of Survey Response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Doc. No.</th>
<th>AVG. OC</th>
<th>AVG. JS</th>
<th>Pos. Class</th>
<th>No. of Years Est.</th>
<th>S/L Days</th>
<th>Days Taken</th>
<th>S/L Based on Ben to Last Year</th>
<th>Ben. % of S/L</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>Prof.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1456</td>
<td>54.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>Prof.</td>
<td>3 blank</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>14.42%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>Prof.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1040</td>
<td>31.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>Prof.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>55.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>Prof.</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>980</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1768</td>
<td>86.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>Prof.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>86.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>Prof.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>86.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>Prof.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>94.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>Prof.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>832</td>
<td>16.83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>Prof.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>44.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>Prof.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>86.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>Prof.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>36.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>Prof.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>38.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>Prof.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>832</td>
<td>40.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>Prof.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>832</td>
<td>36.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>Prof.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1278</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2184</td>
<td>58.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>Prof.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>22.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>Sup./Mgt</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>19.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>Sup./Mgt</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>11.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>Sup./Mgt</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>80.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>Sup./Mgt</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1144</td>
<td>69.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>Sup./Mgt</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1195</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1352</td>
<td>88.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>Sup./Mgt</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1040</td>
<td>33.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>Sup./Mgt</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>42.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>Sup./Mgt</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1560</td>
<td>44.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>Sup./Mgt</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1560</td>
<td>7.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>Sup./Mgt</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1117</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>89.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>Sup./Mgt</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>60.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>Sup./Mgt</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1456</td>
<td>41.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>blank</td>
<td>blank</td>
<td>blank</td>
<td>blank</td>
<td>blank</td>
<td>ERR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>blank</td>
<td>blank</td>
<td>blank</td>
<td>blank</td>
<td>blank</td>
<td>ERR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>blank</td>
<td>blank</td>
<td>blank</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>blank</td>
<td>ERR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>blank</td>
<td>blank</td>
<td>1352</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>blank</td>
<td>blank</td>
<td>blank</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>ERR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doc. No.</td>
<td>AVG. OC</td>
<td>AVG. JS</td>
<td>Pos. Class</td>
<td>No. of Years</td>
<td>S/L Est.</td>
<td>Days Taken</td>
<td>S/L Ben.</td>
<td>% of S/L Ben. to # of Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>7.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1664</td>
<td>3.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>35.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>936</td>
<td>10.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1560</td>
<td>0.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>702</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2080</td>
<td>33.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>44.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>40.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>2.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>76.92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>936</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>4.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1144</td>
<td>13.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>ERR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>81.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>22.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>32.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>16.83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1040</td>
<td>22.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1040</td>
<td>40.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>34.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>Technica</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>19.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>Technica</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>57.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>Technica blank</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>ERR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>Technica</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100 blank</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>24.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>Technica</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>8.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>Technica</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>3.21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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