

Povezanost zdravstvenega absentizma in temperamenta zaposlenih v javni upravi

Jernej Buzeti

Univerza v Ljubljani, Fakulteta za upravo, Slovenija
University of Ljubljana, Faculty of Public Administration, Slovenia
jernej.buzeti@fu.uni-lj.si

Marjan Bilban

Univerza v Ljubljani, Medicinska fakulteta, Slovenija
University of Ljubljana, Faculty of Medicine, Slovenia
marjan.bilban@zvd.si

Janez Stare

Univerza v Ljubljani, Fakulteta za upravo, Slovenija
University of Ljubljana, Faculty of Public Administration, Slovenia
janez.stare@fu.uni-lj.si

IZVLEČEK

Vzroki za nastanek zdravstvenega absentizma so številni in med eno od skupin vzrokov uvrščamo tudi skupino dejavnikov, ki so vezani na posameznika oziroma njegove osebnostne lastnosti. Članek se osredotoča na vidik povezanosti zdravstvenega absentizma s temperamentom in predstavlja rezultate raziskave v slovenski javni upravi. Rezultati raziskave (februar 2015) kažejo, da so bili v povprečju najmanj dni začasno odsotni z dela zaposleni, katerih prevladujoči temperament je kolerik (8,6 dni) in flegmatik (8,7 dni), ki jih je sicer tudi največ med zaposlenimi v javni upravi; nekoliko več dni so bili začasno odsotni zaposleni s temperamentom sangvinika (10,8 dni), največ pa melanholiki (15,8 dni). Na podlagi rezultatov raziskave ugotavljamo, da v skupnem številu dni zdravstvenega absentizma statistično značilnih razlik med posameznimi zaposlenimi glede na njihov temperament ne moremo potrditi. Lahko pa potrdimo statistično značilno povezanost v skupnem povprečnem številu pogostosti zdravstvenega absentizma med zaposlenimi glede na njihov temperament.

Ključne besede: zdravstveni absentizem, osebnostne značilnosti, temperament, javna uprava

JEL: Z00

Buzeti, J., Bilban, M., & Stare, J. (2015). Povezanost zdravstvenega absentizma in temperamenta zaposlenih v javni upravi [Correlation between Sickness Absenteeism and Temperament of Employees in the Public Administration]. *International Public Administration Review*, 13(3–4), 27–66.

1 Uvod

V delovno okolje vstopajo zaposleni z različnimi osebnostnimi značilnostmi (temperamentom), pričakovanji, potrebami, znanjem, sposobnostmi, itd. Na dogajanje oziroma na razmere v delovnem okolju se zaposleni tudi različno odzivajo, saj se nekateri na nekatere vplivne dejavnike prilagajajo in jih sprejemajo, drugi se lahko soočajo s težavami. Posledice slednjih se večkrat lahko odražajo tudi z zdravstvenim absentizmom oziroma začasno odsotnostjo zaposlenih z dela zaradi bolezni, poškodbe ali nege družinskih članov. Vzroki za zdravstveni absentizem so sicer različni – toda medsebojno povezani. Kljub temu, da raziskave¹ kažejo, da najbolj izrazito vplivajo na pojav zdravstvenega absentizma predvsem dejavniki delovnega okolja (npr. odnosi z vodilnim osebjem in sodelavci, fizični delovni pogoji, itd.), je potrebno poudariti, da se raziskovanja zdravstvenega absentizma osredotočajo tudi na dejavnike, ki se dotikajo posameznika kot osebe in izhajajoč iz tega povezanosti njegovih osebnostnih lastnosti z zdravstvenim absentizmom.

V tem članku se osredotočamo na proučevanje vzrokov (dejavnikov), ki so vezani na posameznika oziroma zaposlenega. Zanima nas namreč, ali osebnostne² značilnosti, ki se odražajo skozi temperament zaposlenih, vplivajo na zdravstveni absentizem zaposlenih v javni upravi. Osredotočenost na proučevanje povezanosti zdravstvenega absentizma v javni upravi s temperamentom zaposlenih v javni upravi je pomembna predvsem zato, ker (1) je na podlagi statističnih podatkov Nacionalnega inštituta za javno zdravje (v nadaljevanju: NIJZ) mogoče ugotoviti, da je delež zdravstvenega absentizma v javni upravi izrazito višji v primerjavi z deležem, ki velja za celotno³ Slovenijo, in (2) ker v slovenskem okolju nismo zasledili nobene raziskave, ki bi obravnavala vidik proučevanja problematike povezanosti zdravstvenega absentizma s temperamentom zaposlenih v javni upravi.

Na podlagi podatkov NIJZ (2015) lahko ugotovimo, da je delež zdravstvenega absentizma v javni upravi od primerjanega leta 2009 do vključno leta 2013, variiral. Tako je bilo leta 2009, 4,2 % izgubljenih koledarskih dni zaradi zdravstvenega absentizma v javni upravi, leta 2012 pa je bil delež že 8,5 % in se je nato v letu 2013 glede na leto 2012 znižal za 1,7 odstotne točke. Izraženo v številu koledarskih dni pomeni, da je bilo leta 2009 v javni upravi izgubljenih

1 Npr. Jensen & McIntosh (2007); Hilton, Sheridan, Cleary, & Whiteford (2009); Hoxsey (2010); Rantanen & Tuominen (2011).

2 Ones, Viswiesvaran in Schmidt (2003, str. 21) pojasnjujejo, da obstaja povezanost med tistimi, ki so vestni (skrbni) in zdravstvenim absentizmom. Evans in Palmer (2000, str. 22) menita, da so čustveno nestabilni in anksiozni bolj naklonjeni začasni odsotnosti z dela kot tisti, ki so čustveno stabilni in introvertirani. Tudi Allebeck in Mastekaasa (2004, str. 40) menita, da anksioznost in depresivnost povzročita takšno stanje pri zaposlenih, da se odločijo za začasno odsotnost z dela, saj v tem vidijo rešitev.

3 Podatki NIJZ (2015) kažejo, da se je odstotek izgubljenih koledarskih dni zaradi zdravstvenega absentizma v Sloveniji od leta 2007 do 2013 postopoma zniževal (izjema je samo leto 2012). Tako je bilo leta 2007 izgubljenih 4,4 % koledarskih dni in leta 2013 4,08 % koledarskih dni zaradi zdravstvenega absentizma.

825.786 koledarskih⁴ dni zaradi zdravstvenega absentizma. Največ izgubljenih koledarskih dni zaradi zdravstvenega absentizma v javni upravi pa je bilo med primerjanimi leti zabeleženo v letu 2012, in sicer 1.580.814 koledarskih dni. Slednji podatki potrjujejo, da je v dejavnostih javne uprave veliko število izgubljenih koledarskih dni – toda takšen podatek ne preseneča, saj je tudi v drugih državah po svetu delež zdravstvenega absentizma večji v javnem sektorju (javni upravi) kot v zasebnem sektorju.

Temeljni namen članka je prikazati povezanost zdravstvenega absentizma in temperamenta zaposlenih v javni upravi in na podlagi teoretičnih ugotovitev ter rezultatov raziskave predstaviti vidik smiselnosti upoštevanja temperamenta zaposlenih v kontekstu zdravstvenega absentizma. Članek ima naslednja cilja: (1) predstaviti rezultate raziskave iz meseca februarja 2015 o povezanosti zdravstvenega absentizma in temperamenta zaposlenih v slovenski javni upravi ter (2) predstaviti rezultate povezanosti med pogostostjo (kolikokrat/število nizov) zdravstvenega absentizma zaposlenih in temperamentom zaposlenih v slovenski javni upravi.

Članek je strukturiran tako, da je v začetnem delu predstavljeno področje pojmovanja zdravstvenega absentizma in temperamenta. V nadaljevanju so nato predstavljeni rezultati raziskave, in sicer rezultati o povezanosti zdravstvenega absentizma in temperamenta zaposlenih v slovenski javni upravi. Predstavljeni so tako rezultati o številu dni zdravstvenega absentizma in pogostosti (število nizov) začasne odsotnosti zaposlenih z dela. V zadnjem delu članka je predstavljen razpravni vidik avtorjev o vsebini rezultatov raziskave.

2 Zdravstveni absentizem

Proučevanje zdravstvenega absentizma je večdimenzionalno in z njegovim raziskovanjem se ukvarjajo strokovnjaki različnih ved. Posledice tega so tudi različne opredelitve zdravstvenega absentizma. Po pregledu literature je mogoče ugotoviti, da se za pojmovanje zdravstvenega absentizma uporabljajo številni sinonimi. Vučković (2010, str. 10) pojasnjuje, da se za pojem zdravstveni absentizem pojavljajo sinonimi kot so začasna zadržanost od dela iz zdravstvenih razlogov, bolniški stalež, bolniška. Zasledimo lahko tudi pojem absentizem. Cascio (2003, str. 45) meni, da gre pri absentizmu za nezmožnost delavca, da ostane na delovnem mestu kot je načrtovano, ne glede na razlog. Lokke, Eskildsen in Jensen (2007, str. 15) pa absentizem pojasnjujejo kot pomanjkanje fizične prisotnosti zaposlenega na določeni lokaciji in v času, ko se od zaposlenega pričakuje, da se bo pojavil na tisti lokaciji in v dogovorjenem času. Po mnenju Totha (1999, str. 20) pod pojmom

⁴ Na podlagi podatkov NIJZ (2015) ugotavljamo, da je bilo v primerjanem obdobju največ izgubljenih koledarskih dni na zaposlenega v javni upravi leta 2012, in sicer 30,9 koledarskih dni, najmanj pa leta 2011, in sicer 14,7 koledarskih dni. Leta 2009 je bilo izgubljenih 15,2 koledarskih dni na zaposlenega, leta 2010 16,5 dni in leta 2013 24,9 koledarskih dni na zaposlenega.

zdravstveni absentizem razumemo izgubljene delovne dneve oziroma čas, ko zaposleni začasno ne more delati zaradi bolezni ali poškodbe. V tem članku razumemo zdravstveni absentizem kot pojav začasne odsotnosti zaposlenih z dela zaradi lastnih bolezni, poškodb ali nege družinskih članov.

Okoliščine, ki nastopijo, ko se pojavi zdravstveni absentizem, se odražajo predvsem skozi negativni⁵ vidik, ki zadeva organizacijo (tudi delovni kolektiv zaposlenega, ki je začasno odsoten), državo in tudi začasno odsotnega zaposlenega. In glede na to, da ta pojav vpliva na številne akterje, je tudi iz zgodovine proučevanja zdravstvenega absentizma razvidno, da (1) se iz leta v leto namenja omenjeni problematiki vse več pozornosti in tudi finančnih sredstev in (2) so proučevanja pojava široko oziroma večdimenzionalno zasnovana, saj se osredotočajo na odkrivanje različnih vzrokov za nastanek zdravstvenega absentizma. Smiselno je namreč razumeti, da so razlogi za zdravstveni absentizem številni in kot kažejo raziskave⁶ so vzroki za odsotnost zaposlenih z dela tudi medsebojno povezani. Zaradi tega je včasih »prave« vzroke tudi težko ugotoviti, saj se zdravstveni absentizem vedno formalno kaže kot odsotnost zaradi zdravstvenih razlogov. Na podlagi opravljenih raziskav⁷ je bilo ugotovljeno, da zdravstveni absentizem ni smiselno pojasnjevati kot pojav, ki nastane zaradi »posamičnega« vzroka (teorija vpliva posameznega dejavnika na odsotnost zaposlenih z dela), ampak je potrebno zdravstveni absentizem interpretirati kot večdimenzionalni konstrukt. Vzroke za odsotnost zaposlenih z dela je zato težko ločiti in ugotoviti njihov posamični⁸ vpliv. V literaturi so vzroki za zdravstveni absentizem razvrščeni v tri skupine vzrokov oziroma dejavnikov, ki povzročajo zdravstveni absentizem, in sicer (1) dejavniki zunanjega okolja, (2) dejavniki organizacijskega okolja in (3) dejavniki, vezani na posameznika.

V literaturi⁹ je mogoče zaslediti, da na obseg zdravstvenega absentizma vplivajo zlasti dejavniki iz organizacijskega okolja – toda kljub temu nas v prispevku zanima vidik dejavnikov, ki so povezani z osebnostnimi značilnostmi zaposlenih oziroma z njihovim temperamentom, saj menimo, da je lahko tudi temperament slehernega posameznika tisti vplivni faktor, ki kaže na to, kako bo zaposleni nastopal v delovnem okolju, in ki lahko morebiti vpliva tudi na večjo ali manjšo odsotnost ali prisotnost zaposlenih na delovnem mestu.

5 Obstajajo tudi pozitivni vidiki zdravstvenega absentizma (npr. zaposleni, ki je odsoten ima čas za sebe in ni obremenjen z delovnimi obveznostmi in ni soočen z morebitnim delovnih stresom, delodajalci imajo možnosti za večjo fleksibilnost pri zaposlenih, itd.) – toda negativni vidiki so bolj izraziti.

6 Glej Evans & Palmer (2000); Ones et al. (2003); Lokke Nielsen (2008); itd.

7 Glej raziskave v literaturi Johns (1997); Evans & Palmer (2000); Allebeck & Mastekaasa (2004); itd.

8 S proučevanjem posamičnega vzroka za zdravstveni absentizem sta se ukvarjala predvsem Rhodes in Steers (1990).

9 Harrison & Martocchio (1998); Evans & Palmer (2000); Johns (2003); itd.

3 Temperament

Temperament predstavlja posebne karakteristike vedenja posameznika, po katerih je prepoznan od rojstva in v različnih življenjskih situacijah. Pri temperamentu gre torej za slog obnašanja posameznika oziroma njegov način odzivanja v različnih situacijah (Bates, v Matthews, Deary, & Whiteman, 2009, str. 70). Prve tipologije temperamenta je definirjal Hipokrat; izhajal pa je iz tega, da je temperament posledica razmerja med štirimi temeljnimi prvinami in njim ustrezajočimi telesnimi sokovi, ki so pri vsakem človeku pomešani in tvorijo temperament. Bolj kot so uravnoteženi, bolj je uravnovešeno in zdravo ravnanje, bolj kot pa kateri prevladuje nad drugimi, bolj se kažejo v vedenju posameznika določene poteze in če gre za prevlado enega soka, tedaj je to slabo in kaže na bolezen (po Musek, 1993, str. 116–117). V raziskovanju so se tipi temperamentov, ki jih je opredelil Hipokrat, uporabljali v različnih vidikih, iz katerih so se nato oblikovale tudi tipologije¹⁰. Med bolj uporabljene vsekakor spadata tipologiji Eysencka in Pavlova. Tipe temperamenta je Eysenck razvrstil v dveh dimenzijah, in sicer introvertiranost – ekstravertiranost in čustvena stabilnost – čustvena labilnost. Pavlov pa je pojasnjeval tipe temperamenta z značilnostmi živčnega sistema (glej Ruch, 1992, str. 1260–1263).

Posamezni tip temperamenta se prepozna po naslednjih značilnostih (po Littauer & Littauer, 1999, str. 59–98; po Ekstrand, 2014, str. 1–7; po Eysenck & Pavlov, v Ruch, 1992):

- **kolerik:** močni koleriki ne potrebujejo veliko prijateljev. Pravzaprav jih imajo zelo malo. Njihova prvinska želja je obvladovati situacijo in so rojeni za »šefe«. Da bi imeli kontrolo nad vsemi, potrebujejo ljudi, ki se prostovoljno prepustijo njihovem vodstvu. So zelo samozavestni, trmasti in imajo zelo malo strahov. Njihova močna stran je tudi njihova odločnost in organiziranost (vse si organizirajo v svojih glavah), radi imajo nove izzive in zato težko počivajo – enostavne stvari se jim zdijo dolgočasne. Kažejo močno samozaupanje in lahko vodijo katerikoli posel. Vendar je njihova stopnja samozaupanja neposredno povezana z nadzorom nad situacijo. Če niso glavni, njihovo samozaupanje hitro zbledi. V kolikor je »močni« kolerik preveč zaverovan v lastne sposobnosti, postane njegova samozavest pretirana in mu škoduje. Preveč samozavestni koleriki tvegajo, da se bodo utopili v lastnih slabostih, in to ravno zato, ker imajo običajno res prav. Kadar pa nimajo prav, so le redko oni krivi za to; ne marajo pa, da kdo njihove napake poudarja. Velika slabost kolerikov je, da so arogantni, živčni in svoj nadzor običajno ohranjajo s tem, da manipulirajo z ljudmi. Možno je, da delajo nekomu uslugo, toda samo zato, da bi si pridobili njegovo naklonjenost. Lahko gredo celo tako daleč, da na skrivaj zbirajo informacije o določenem posamezniku, tako da je vse skupaj videti že kot izsiljevanje. In da bi ohranili svoj položaj, potrebujejo ljudi, ki so jim

¹⁰ Hipokrata lahko štejejo kot tistega, ki je prvi opredelil pomembno tipologijo v zgodovini psiholoških spoznanj.

podrejeni, ali pa take, ki se bojijo odgovornosti. Nasilno se tudi polaščajo avtoritete in se ne znajo sprostiti, so neemocionalni (po Ekstrand, 2014, str. 1–7; Littauer & Littauer, 1999, str. 59–98).

- **sangvinik:** prvinska želja sangvinikov je zabavati se, saj so radi center zabave. So zelo ekstravertirani in imajo izjemno radi ljudi, hitro se spoprijateljujejo ter neverjetno očarajo ljudi. Obdarjeni so s sposobnostjo, da tudi o najenostavnejšem dogodku poročajo na zabaven način. Radi popolnoma ignorirajo delo, saj je delo le redko zabavno. Ker pa delati morajo, so najuspešnejši v službah, ki jim dopuščajo fleksibilnost in stike z ljudmi. Fleksibilnost je pomembna, ker se običajno ravna po svojih čustvih, ne pa po trezni presoji (po Littauer & Littauer, 1999, str. 59–98). Za sangvinike je pomembno, da imajo prijatelje in so všeč drugim. Zaradi tega včasih delajo več stvari hkrati. Tukaj se pokaže njihova slabost, da ne znajo reči »ne« in zato se včasih utapljajo v množici projektov, za katere se bojijo, da jih nikoli ne bodo uspeli dokončati. Med njihove slabosti štejemo, da iščejo opravičila, preveč govorijo, lahko jih je zmotiti, so brez občutka za čas in nimajo jasno opredeljenih ciljev (po Ekstrand, 2014, str. 1–7).
- **flegmatik:** za njih je značilna izjemna mirnost, ki pa je lahko prednost ali slabost (glej po Eysench & Pavlov, v Ruch, 1992). Na delovnem mestu ostanejo mirni flegmatiki zvesti in vztrajni sredi kaosa in krize. Zato se lahko na mirne flegmatike zanesemo, da bodo opravili delo, kljub razburjenosti. So zelo uravnovešeni in prijetni ter zelo zanesljivi. Skrivajo svojo »železno« voljo in z vsemi se bodo strinjali, da le ne bi prišlo do konflikta, v resnici pa si mislijo, da nimajo namena, da bi to kadarkoli naredili. Imajo zelo malo sovražnikov in se pogosto znajdejo na mestih, kjer imajo moč in avtoriteto, ker so dosledni in zanesljivi. Njihove pomembne prednosti so tudi pomirjanje, vztrajnost, doslednost, poslušnost, delegiranje nalog. Med slabosti pa lahko štejemo odlašanje, niso navdušeni, brezskrbnost, v nič se ne zapletajo, manjka jim pobud, ne marajo sprememb in težko jih je premakniti. Čeprav so mirni flegmatiki zelo dobri v pomirjanju, pa so včasih preveč umirjeni (po Littauer & Littauer, 1999, str. 59–98).
- **melanholik:** prvinska želja melanholikov je delati stvari popolno. Njihov cilj je urejeno življenje. Čeprav je popolnost nedosegljiva, popolni melanholiki stremijo k njej. Radi delajo sami – to ne pomeni, da so samotarji, pač pa cenijo zaseben delovni prostor brez hrupa ali prekinitev. Potrebujejo veliko časa, da bi izdelali projekt, pa tudi, da bi ga na novo naredili, če se izkaže, da ni popoln. Ne delajo dobro pod pritiskom. Imajo izjemno radi analitično delo in imajo naravno sposobnost, da vidijo, v čem je problem, in iznajdejo kompleksne rešitve ter se ob tem striktno držijo pravil. Med njihove močne strani spada še njihova poštenost, natančnost in organiziranost. Radi imajo tudi lepoto. Med slabosti lahko štejemo zlasti dejstva, da jih je težko zadovoljiti in lahko zaradi pritiska pri delu hitro zapadejo v depresijo. Ekstremno so

varčni, pretirano perfekcionistični in naivno idealistični (po Ekstrand, 2014, str. 1–7; po Littauer & Littauer, 1999, str. 59–98).

Značilnosti vseh štirih temperamentov nazorno predstavljajo nekatere osebnostne značilnosti, ki so značilne za ljudi in na podlagi katerih ljudje med seboj razlikujejo. Vprašanje, ki se v kontekstu našega članka pri tem zastavlja, pa je, ali je temperament zaposlenih v javni upravi povezan z zdravstvenim absentizmom zaposlenih. V tem kontekstu je smiselno razumeti tudi to, da se sleherni posameznik v okolju prepozna po svoji edinstveni osebnosti oziroma značilnem vedenju in izhajajoč iz lastnega temperamenta. To pa pomeni, da je vsak človek edinstven, neponovljiv in zato se ljudje razlikujejo med seboj. Razlikujejo se na podlagi »osebnosti«, kar povzroča oziroma vpliva na določeno vedenje, ki je značilno za slehernega posameznika v naši družbi in po katerem nas tudi drugi prepoznavajo. Maddi (1976, str. 15) meni, da je osebnost trajni niz značilnosti in tendenc, ki določajo tiste podobnosti in razlike v psihološkem vedenju ljudi (mišljenju, čustvovanju in akcijah), ki so kontinuirane v času in jih ne moremo zlahka razumeti kot zgolj rezultat socialnih in bioloških pritiskov v danem trenutku.

4 Raziskava o povezanosti zdravstvenega absentizma in temperamenta zaposlenih v javni upravi

V okviru proučevanja povezanosti zdravstvenega absentizma in temperamenta zaposlenih smo se osredotočili na štiri tipe temperamentov zaposlenih in v sklopu proučevanja opravili tudi raziskavo v slovenski javni upravi, ki je potekala v mesecu februarju 2015.

4.1 Metode raziskovanja

Z namenom, da bi odgovorili na postavljena raziskovalna vprašanja, dosegli zastavljene cilje in podrobneje raziskali opredeljeni problem proučevanja, smo uporabili kvantitativno metodo raziskovanja, s pomočjo katere smo želeli priti do zanesljivih, objektivnih, preverljivih in natančnih spoznanj. Ker je bil predmet raziskovanja kompleksen, smo se njegovega proučevanja lotili z vidika, kjer smo domnevali, da obstaja povezanost med zdravstvenim absentizmom in temperamentom zaposlenih v javni upravi.

Za empirično raziskovanje je bil izoblikovan lastni anketni vprašalnik, sestavljen iz naslednjih vsebinskih sklopov:

- prvi sklop vprašanj: zajema šest kratkih vprašanj odprtega in zaprtega tipa, ki se nanašajo na sociodemografske značilnosti anketirancev, kot je organizacija zaposlitve, njihovo delovno področje, spol, leto rojstva (starost), stopnja izobrazbe in delovna doba v organizaciji trenutne zaposlitve;
- drugi sklop vprašanj: obravnava začasno odsotnost zaposlenih z dela. Gre za sedem kratkih vprašanj, odprtega in zaprtega tipa, ki preverjajo

obstojčasne odsotnosti z dela v zadnjih 12 mesecih, razloge zanje ter pogostostčasne odsotnosti z dela v zadnjih 12 mesecih, izraženih v številu dnu in številu nizov odsotnosti (»kolikokrat«);

- tretji sklop vprašanj: zajema osemnajst parov osebnostnih¹¹ lastnosti, pri čemer vsak par sestoji iz dveh nasprotnih polov lastnosti. Anketiranci so na petstopenjski lestvici najprej ocenjevali, v kolikšni meri posamezni pol opiše njihovo osebnost, nato pa še osebnost njihovega vodje. Pari osebnostnih lastnosti so bili navedeni naključno.

Zbiranje podatkov je potekalo s pomočjo spletnega anketnega vprašalnika, ki smo ga ustvarili s spletnim orodjem 1ka. V raziskavi smo izhajali iz predpostavke,¹² da ima posameznik en prevladujoči temperament in en podtemperament. Izhajajoč iz tega smo zato v analizi raziskave oba temperameta določili na podlagi samoocene anketirancev, saj so anketiranci na petstopenjski lestvici izražali, v kolikšni meri jih posamezna osebnostna značilnost opisuje. Osebnostne značilnosti so bile opredeljene v parih nasprotujočih si polov, pri čemer lahko vsak pol sodi v eno izmed kategorij temperameta. Posamezna kategorija temperameta je opredeljena z osebnostnimi značilnostmi, ki posamezni tip temperameta tudi opredeljuje in skozi katerega je možno temperament slehernega posameznika tudi prepoznati. V tabeli 1 predstavljamo osebnostne značilnosti, ki so bile uporabljene v sklopu raziskave in s pomočjo katerih opredelimo posamezno kategorijo temperameta.

Tabela 1: Opis kategorije temperamentov

Temperament	Opis značilnosti temperamentov
sangvinik	nezanesljivost, brezskrbnost, neodločnost, neorganiziranost, odprtost, živahnost, zgovornost, radovednost, veselje, družabnost
kolerik	nemirnost, nepotrpežljivost, nevljudnost (v smislu arogantnosti), impulzivnost, odprtost, skrbnost, junaštvo, radovednost, odločnost, organiziranost, razburljivost, proaktivnost
flegmatik	pasivnost, neradovednost, (ne)odločnost, apatičnost, odlašanje, zanesljivost, skrbnost, mirnost, potrpežljivost, vljudnost, zbranst, treznost
melanholik	depresivnost, strah, molčečnost, zamišljenost, žalost, zadržanost, organiziranost, treznost

Vir: lastni

Pri razumevanju osebnostnih značilnosti moramo biti pozorni tudi na vidik, da lahko posamezne osebnostne značilnosti opredeljujejo več kot en temperament (npr. odprtost je značilna tako za sangvinika kot tudi za kolerika). Izhajajoč iz tega v prispevku obravnavamo določitev prevladujočega temperameta in podtemperameta z dveh vidikov, in sicer: osnovnega in podpornega. Gledano z osnovnega vidika je prevladujoči temperament

11 Nabor osebnostnih lastnosti smo pripravili na podlagi opisov značilnosti tipov temperamentov, ki so jih oblikovali Eysenck in Eysenck (1985), Littauer in Littauer (1999, str. 99), Ekstrand (2014, str. 1–7).

12 Slednje pojasnjuje tudi Ekstrand (2014, str. 6–7).

tisti, katerega osebnostne značilnosti v povprečju v največji meri opisujejo posameznika; podtemperament pa je opredeljen kot temperament, ki takoj za prevladujočim v največji meri opisuje posameznika. V primeru, ko ni možno določiti bodisi prevladujoči temperament, bodisi podtemperament, vpeljemo podporni vidik, ki prevladujoči temperament opredeljuje tako, da osebnostne značilnosti, ki veljajo izključno za ta temperament, v povprečju v največji meri opisujejo posameznika. Podporni vidik je tako v funkciji dopolnitve osnovnega vidika, saj obravnava le osebnostne značilnosti, ki opisujejo izključno en posamezni vidik, hkrati pa razjasnjuje prevladujoče osebnostne značilnosti primerjalno le med dvema temperamentoma.

4.2 Ciljna skupina (vzorec) raziskovanja

Raziskovana oziroma proučevana ciljna skupina zajema zaposlene v javni upravi, ki jo razumemo kot vse tiste organizacije, ki so del procesa odločanja o javnih zadevah, oziroma sodelujejo pri upravljanju javnih zadev. V javno upravo tako uvrščamo državno upravo, uprave lokalne samouprave in nosilce javnih¹³ pooblastil. V sklopu postopka pridobivanja podatkov naše raziskave smo pridobili odgovore/podatke od 3.220 anketirancev. To pomeni, da smo v vzorec naše raziskave zajeli 3.220 zaposlenih v javni upravi, kar predstavlja 8,1 % delež celotne populacije zaposlenih¹⁴ v javni upravi. Ker je bil glavni kriterij stratificiranega vzorčenja oziroma izbora enot v vzorec, organizacija zaposlitve, je struktura vzorca naše raziskave po organizaciji zaposlitve podobna populacijski strukturi zaposlenih v javni upravi. V vzorec raziskave smo tako zajeli 69,7 % zaposlenih v državni upravi, 11,1 % zaposlenih v lokalni samoupravi in 19 % zaposlenih pri nosilcih javnih pooblastil.

Najvišji delež v strukturi vzorca naše raziskave imajo uradniki¹⁵ (58,9 %), ki so najmočneje zastopani v državni upravi (60,5 %). Naslednje najpogosteje zastopano delovno področje je strokovno tehnično osebje (26,7 %), ki zajema najvišji delež v lokalni samoupravi (33,2 %), najnižji pa v državni upravi (24,7 %). Nekaj manj kot desetina (9,1 %) anketiranih je uradnikov na položaju (vodje) organizacijske enote z do vključno 30 neposredno podrejenimi. Preostala delovna področja v celotni strukturi vzorca zajemajo deleže, manjše od 2 %.

Analiza vzorca raziskave po spolu pokaže, da je v vzorcu več kot tri četrtine oseb ženskega spola (76,1 %) in manj kot četrtina (23,9 %) oseb moškega spola. V raziskavi je sodelovalo največ anketirancev oziroma zaposlenih v vzorcu starih med 35 in 44 let (36,9 %) oziroma med 45 in 54 let (34,7 %). Anketiranci so v povprečju stari 45 let, hkrati pa je ta vrednost tudi srednja vrednost, ki anketirance v vzorcu razdeli na dve enakomerno zastopani polovici.

¹³ Nosilci javnih pooblastil so fizične in pravne osebe; med tiste, ki jih uvrščamo v javno upravo, spadajo javne agencije, javni skladi, nekateri javni zavodi (npr. Zavod za pokojninsko in invalidsko zavarovanje, Zavod za zaposlovanje Republike Slovenije, Centri za socialno delo, itd.), zbornice z obveznim članstvom (po Tičar & Rakar, 2011, str. 225–230).

¹⁴ Po podatkih AJ PES (2014) je bilo v mesecu decembru 2014 v javni upravi zaposlenih 39.723 oseb, od tega 73,7 % v državni upravi in 12,1 % v lokalni samoupravi. 14,1 % pa je bilo zaposlenih pri nosilcih javnih pooblastil.

¹⁵ Z uradniki v tem primeru mislimo na skupino uradnikov, ki ne opravljajo nalog vodenja oziroma niso na položaju vodje organizacijskih enot.

4.3 Rezultati raziskovanja

V sklopu analize rezultatov o povezanosti zdravstvenega absentizma in temperamenta zaposlenih v javni upravi je potrebno predhodno poudariti, da imamo na eni strani pri obravnavi temperamenta opravka z opisnimi spremenljivkami, na drugi strani pa spremenljivke, s katerimi smo operacionalizirali zdravstveni absentizem. Izhajajoč iz tega zato pri analizi vpliva temperamenta na zdravstveni absentizem uporabimo (izvedemo) Kruskal Wallisov test, pri seriji post-hoc testov pa uporabimo Mann-Whitney-ev U test.

Tabela 2: Prevladujoči temperamenti in podtemperamenti pri zaposlenih

	PREVLADUJOČI TEMPERAMENT		PODTEMPERAMENTI							
			sangvinik		kolerik		flegmatik		melanholik	
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
sangvinik	41	2 %			15	36,6 %	26	63,4 %	0	0,0 %
kolerik	1065	40 %	195	18,3 %			785	73,7 %	85	8,0 %
flegmatik	1404	53 %	131	9,3 %	1046	74,5 %			227	16,2 %
melanholik	130	5 %	2	1,5 %	31	23,8 %	97	74,6 %		
SKUPAJ	2640		328	12,4 %	1092	41,4 %	908	34,4 %	312	11,8 %

Vir: lastni

Na podlagi samoocene anketirancev raziskave v javni upravi (tabela 2) lahko ugotovimo, da prevladujejo zaposleni, katerih prevladujoči temperament je flegmatik, ki je značilen za več kot polovico anketirancev (53 %), visok delež pa je tudi kolerikov (40 %). V bistveno manjši meri so zastopani zaposleni, katerih temperament je melanholik (5 %) ali sangvinik (2 %). Med podtemperamenti prav tako prevladujeta kolerik (41 %) in flegmatik (34 %). Najpogosteje se tako pri zaposlenih v javni upravi pojavi kombinacija flegmatika kot prevladujočega temperamenta, s podtemperamentom kolerika.

V nadaljevanju članka preverjamo in predstavljamo, ali se temperament zaposlenih pojavlja kot vplivni dejavnik na zdravstveni absentizem, ko je le-ta operacionaliziran s številom dni začasne odsotnosti, kasneje pa še s številom nizov začasne odsotnosti.

V povprečju so bili najmanj dni začasno odsotni z dela zaposleni (tabela 3), katerih prevladujoči temperament je kolerik (8,6 dni) in flegmatik (8,7 dni), ki jih je sicer tudi največ med zaposlenimi v javni upravi; nekoliko več dni so bili začasno odsotni zaposleni s temperamentom sangvinika¹⁶ (10,8 dni), največ pa melanholiki (15,8 dni). V skupnem številu dni zdravstvenega absentizma statistično značilnih razlik med posameznimi zaposlenimi glede na njihov temperament ne moremo potrditi ($p > 0,05$) – toda smiselno je upoštevati, da gre pri tem za res minimalno odstopanje od meje, ki jo upoštevamo pri določanju razlik kot statistično značilnih ($p < 0,05$).

¹⁶ Zaradi nizkega numerusa sangvinikov v vzorcu je potrebna posebna previdnost pri interpretaciji rezultatov za ta temperament.

Tabela 3: Deskriptivne statistike povprečnega števila dni odsotnosti in rezultati Kruskal Wallisovega testa glede na temperament zaposlenih in po posameznem razlogu za zdravstveni absentizem

		N	AS	SD	Kruskal Wallis test		
					χ^2	df	<i>p</i>
nega oziroma bolezen vzdrževanega družinskega člana	S	24	3,21	8,49	12,32	3	0,006
	K	589	3,67	8,03			
	F	825	2,43	5,59			
	M	66	2,55	5,12			
lastna bolezen ali poškodba (pri in izven dela)	S	34	10,24	22,03	4,61	3	0,202
	K	831	7,40	17,93			
	F	1181	7,82	19,54			
	M	109	14,45	35,58			
duševni pritiski in stres v delovnem okolju	S	17	0,06	0,24	23,91	3	0,000
	K	394	1,37	7,31			
	F	585	1,15	9,69			
	M	52	5,21	17,89			
drugi vzrok odsotnosti, ki ni povezan z boleznijo, poškodbami, pritiski	S	18	0,94	3,76	14,32	3	0,002
	K	379	0,78	3,94			
	F	573	0,49	4,71			
	M	46	0,87	3,95			
SKUPAJ	S	41	10,80	25,19	7,74	3	0,052
	K	1065	8,59	18,95			
	F	1404	8,69	19,82			
	M	130	15,80	34,78			

N – število odgovorov; AS – aritmetična sredina; SD – standardni odklon; χ^2 – hi-kvadrat; df – stopinje prostosti; *p* – stopnja statistične značilnosti;
S – sangvinik; K - kolerik; F - flegmatik; M – melanholik

Vir: lastni

Kljub temu, da ne moremo potrditi statistično značilnih razlik v skupnem številu dni zdravstvenega absentizma med posameznimi zaposlenimi glede na njihov temperament, se kot statistično značilne izkažejo razlike (glej tabela 3) med zaposlenimi glede na njihov temperament pri začasni odsotnosti zaradi nege oziroma boleznijo vzdrževanega člana ($\chi^2 = 12,32$; $p < 0,01$), zaradi česar so bili najdlje začasno odsotni koleriki (3,7 dni) in sangviniki (3,2 dni), v nekoliko manjši meri pa melanholiki (2,6 dni) in flegmatiki (2,4 dni). Do statistično značilnih razlik ($\chi^2 = 23,91$; $p < 0,01$) prihaja tudi pri začasni odsotnosti zaposlenih z dela zaradi izpostavljenosti duševnim pritiskom in stresu v delovnem okolju, zaradi česar so bili melanholiki najdlje začasno odsotni z dela (5,2 dni), medtem ko so bili koleriki statistično značilno manj (tabela 3) začasno odsotni z dela iz tega razloga (1,4 dni), a statistično značilno več kot flegmatiki (1,2 dni). Zaradi duševnih pritiskov in stresa v delovnem okolju so bili najmanj dolgo odsotni sangviniki (0,1 dni). Zaradi drugih vzrokov noben zaposleni v zadnjih 12 mesecih ni bil začasno odsoten dlje kot en dan, a med zaposlenimi glede na njihov temperament obstajajo statistično značilne razlike ($\chi^2 = 14,32$; $p < 0,01$).

Na podlagi prikazanega v tabeli 4 ugotavljamo, da se koleriki in flegmatiki statistično značilno ($p < 0,01$) razlikujejo pri začasni odsotnosti z dela zaradi nege oziroma bolezni vzdrževanega družinskega člana, duševnih pritiskov in stresa v delovnem okolju ter drugih vzrokov odsotnosti, ki niso povezani z boleznijo, poškodbami, pritiski.

Tabela 4: Serija post-hoc testov (Mann-Whitney U test) med pari temperamentov zaposlenih glede na povprečno število dni zdravstvenega absentizma

	S – K		S – F		S – M		K – F		K – M		F – M	
	U	p	U	p	U	p	U	p	U	p	U	p
A	nega oziroma bolezen vzdrževanega družinskega člana											
	6434	0,402	9870	0,976	756	0,700	220249	0,000	18330	0,393	26123	0,513
B	duševni pritiski in stres v delovnem okolju (tudi zaradi obnašanja/vedenja vodij)											
	3124	0,399	4959	0,961	369	0,124	107826	0,000	9230	0,047	12799	0,000
C	drugi vzrok odsotnosti, ki ni povezan z boleznijo, poškodbami, pritiski											
	3322	0,698	4759	0,082	414	0,989	103063	0,001	8510	0,590	12194	0,012

U – vrednost Mann-Whitneyevega testa; p – statistična značilnost;

S – sangvinik; K – kolerik; F – flegmatik; M – melanholik,

A – nega oziroma bolezen vzdrževanega družinskega člana; B – duševni pritiski in stres v delovnem okolju (tudi zaradi obnašanja/vedenja vodij); C – drugi vzrok odsotnosti, ki ni povezan z boleznijo, poškodbami, pritiski

Vir: lastni

Kot statistično značilne (tabela 4) se izkažejo tudi razlike med koleriki in melanholiki pri trajanju začasne odsotnosti z dela zaradi duševnih pritiskov in stresa v delovnem okolju ($U = 9.230$; $p < 0,05$), v čemer se statistično značilno razlikujejo tudi flegmatiki in melanholiki ($U = 12.799$; $p < 0,01$), ki se hkrati razlikujejo tudi v začasni odsotnosti zaradi drugih vzrokov odsotnosti ($U = 12.194$; $p < 0,05$).

Ugotavljamo, da kaže analiza rezultatov o povezanosti temperamenta zaposlenih in števila dni zdravstvenega absentizma v javni upravi, da so največ dni začasno odsotni z dela melanholiki in sangviniki ter so melanholiki največ dni začasno odsotni z dela zaradi lastnih bolezni, stresa, pritiskov na delovnem mestu. Slednji rezultat nakazuje na to, da je z vidika zdravstvenega absentizma delovno okolje javne uprave očitno manj primerno za zaposlene, pri katerih prevladuje temperament melanholika.

V tabeli 5 so prikazani rezultati raziskave o pogostosti (kolikokrat je nekdo začasno odsoten z dela) zdravstvenega absentizma glede na temperament zaposlenih. Ugotavljamo, da v skupnem povprečnem številu nizov začasne odsotnosti z dela med zaposlenimi prihaja do statistično značilnih razlik glede na njihov temperament ($\chi^2 = 8,07$; $p < 0,05$).

V povprečju so bili največkrat začasno odsotni z dela zaposleni (tabela 5), katerih prevladujoči temperament je sangvinik (2,2 krat), sledijo jim melanholiki (1,7 krat) in koleriki (1,6 krat), medtem ko so bili flegmatiki začasno odsotni z dela najmanjkrat (1,4 krat). Kot statistično značilne se izkažejo tudi razlike med zaposlenimi (tabela 5) glede na njihov temperament v številu nizov začasne

odsotnosti zaradi nege oziroma bolezni vzdrževanega člana ($\chi^2 = 11,51$; $p < 0,01$), zaradi česar so bili v povprečju v zadnjih 12 mesecih največkrat odsotnosti sangviniki (2 krat), v manjši meri so bili začasno odsotni koleriki (1,3 krat) in melanholiki (1,1 krat), najmanjkrat pa flegmatiki (0,9 krat). Prav tako se kot statistično značilne izkažejo tudi razlike v začasni odsotnosti z dela zaradi duševnih pritiskov in stresa v delovnem okolju ($\chi^2 = 24,6$; $p < 0,01$) ter drugih vzrokov odsotnosti ($\chi^2 = 12,26$; $p < 0,01$), zaradi česar so bili v povprečju najpogosteje odsotni melanholiki in koleriki.

Tabela 5: Deskriptivne statistike povprečnega števila nizov odsotnosti in rezultati Kruskal Wallisovega testa glede na temperament zaposlenih in po posameznem razlogu za zdravstveni absentizem

		N	AS	SD	Kruskal Wallis test		
					χ^2	df	p
nega oziroma bolezen vzdrževanega družinskega člana	S	24	2,00	3,43	11,51	3	0,009
	K	586	1,26	2,54			
	F	823	0,89	1,76			
	M	66	1,09	1,94			
lastna bolezen ali poškodba (pri in izven dela)	S	34	1,03	1,59	4,40	3	0,221
	K	825	0,97	1,40			
	F	1167	0,93	1,33			
	M	108	1,04	1,14			
duševni pritiski in stres v delovnem okolju	S	17	0,18	0,73	24,60	3	0,000
	K	394	0,20	0,67			
	F	584	0,09	0,48			
	M	52	0,52	2,11			
drugi vzrok odsotnosti, ki ni povezan z boleznijo, poškodbami, pritiski	S	18	0,11	0,32	12,26	3	0,007
	K	379	0,20	0,94			
	F	574	0,08	0,55			
	M	45	0,20	0,76			
SKUPAJ	S	41	2,15	3,81	8,07	3	0,045
	K	1065	1,59	2,63			
	F	1404	1,37	2,08			
	M	130	1,69	2,30			

N – število odgovorov; AS – aritmetična sredina; SD – standardni odklon; χ^2 – hi-kvadrat; df – stopinje prostosti; p – stopnja statistične značilnosti;
S – sangvinik; K - kolerik; F - flegmatik; M – melanholik

Vir: lastni

Natančnejši pregled razlik med pari temperamentov med zaposlenimi pokaže (tabela 5 in 6), da so bili v povprečju koleriki statistično značilno večkrat začasno odsotni z dela v skupni odsotnosti, zaradi nege oziroma bolezni vzdrževanega člana, duševnih pritiskov in stresa v delovnem okolju ter drugih vzrokov odsotnosti kot flegmatiki, medtem ko so slednji bili statistično značilno manjkrat začasno odsotni z dela od melanholikov v skupni povprečni odsotnosti ter zaradi duševnih pritiskov in stresa v delovnem okolju.

Tabela 6: Serija post-hoc testov (Mann-Whitney U test) med pari temperamentov zaposlenih glede na povprečno število nizov odsotnosti (zdravstvenega absentizma)

	S – K		S – F		S – M		K – F		K – M		F – M	
	U	p	U	p	U	p	U	p	U	p	U	p
A	nega oziroma bolezen vzdrževanega družinskega člana											
	7031	0,999	9163	0,468	772	0,828	219424	0,001	18731	0,637	25563	0,341
B	duševni pritiski in stres v delovnem okolju (tudi zaradi obnašanja/vedenja vodij)											
	3165	0,490	4916	0,858	379	0,183	107301	0,000	9321	0,070	12782	0,000
C	drugi vzrok odsotnosti, ki ni povezan z boleznijo, poškodbami, pritiski											
	3334	0,739	4781	0,100	398	0,834	103383	0,001	8485	0,909	12215	0,070
D	SKUPAJ											
	21320	0,789	28040	0,765	2477	0,478	709278	0,021	65532	0,298	81794	0,038

U – vrednost Mann-Whitneyevega testa; p – statistična značilnost;

S – sangvinik; K – kolerik; F – flegmatik; M – melanholik,

A – nega oziroma bolezen vzdrževanega družinskega člana; B – duševni pritiski in stres v delovnem okolju

(tudi zaradi obnašanja/vedenja vodij); C – drugi vzrok odsotnosti, ki ni povezan z boleznijo, poškodbami, pritiski; D – skupaj

Vir: lastni

Rezultati analize vpliva povprečnega števila pogostosti (nizov) zdravstvenega absentizma in temperamenta torej kažejo, da obstaja statistično značilen vpliv med obema konstruktoma. Slednja ugotovitev je za oblikovalce politike javne uprave uporabna predvsem z vidika, da so najbolj pogosto (glede na število nizov) začasno odsotni z dela v javni upravi tisti zaposleni za katere je značilna stalna potreba po pozornosti in družabnih stikih (tudi med sodelavci), energičnost, pozitivna naravnost, itd. Morebiti so torej zaposleni s takšnimi značilnostmi bolj pogosto odsotni z dela zato, ker vse to pogrešajo v okolju javne uprave.

4.4 Razprava

Temeljni namen prispevka je predstavitev rezultatov raziskave o povezanosti zdravstvenega absentizma in temperamenta zaposlenih v slovenski javni upravi. Na podlagi analize rezultatov raziskave smo ugotovili, da je temperament zaposlenih v javni upravi vpliven dejavnik pri zdravstvenem absentizmu, pri čemer je izjema le začasna odsotnost zaradi lastne bolezni ali poškodbe. V povprečju so bili največkrat in najdlje začasno odsotni z dela sangviniki in melanholiki, najmanjkrat in v najmanjši meri pa koleriki in flegmatiki.

Rezultate raziskave lahko razumemo in interpretiramo tako, da so bili z vidika števila dni največ začasno odsotni vsi tisti zaposleni, ki jih lahko opišemo z lastnostmi, kot so molčečnost, žalost, zadržanost, zamišljenost. Med njihove značilnosti lahko uvrščamo tudi pogosto prisotnost strahu (v veliko primerih lahko govorimo o stalnih vidikih tako imenovanega nepojasnjenega straha ali anksioznosti) in izpostavljen vidik povezanosti z njihovo depresivnostjo. Slednji rezultat ne preseneča, če takšen rezultat razumemo tako, da je okolje javne uprave v zadnjem obdobju vseskozi negativno izpostavljeno v javnosti in

prikazano kot »neučinkovito okolje« ter pod stalnim pritiskom racionalizacije delovanja in odpuščanja. V primeru, da gledamo na okolje javne uprave tako, da so odnosi med zaposlenimi zadržani in da med zaposlenimi morebiti ne prevladuje visoka stopnja zaupanja, niti pozitivna klima, ne preseneča niti rezultat, da so glede na število dni največ začasno odsotni z dela tudi tisti, za katere je značilna družabnost, zgovornost, odprtost, nujnost stika z ljudmi, stalna komunikacija in živahnost. Pri tem je smiselno vprašanje oziroma razmišljanje, ali morebiti takšen tip zaposlenih vse naštetu pogrša v okolju javne uprave in ali potem išče rešitev za nadomestitev tega pomanjkanja nekje drugje.

Rezultati raziskave tudi kažejo, da obstaja statistično značilen vpliv med temperamentom in pogostostjo (število nizov) zdravstvenega absentizma. Z analiziranjem povezanosti takšnih dveh konstruktov smo sledili in tudi realizirali enega izmed zastavljenih ciljev raziskave, in sicer, da se ugotovi ali obstaja povezanost med obema predstavljenima konstruktoma. V povprečju so bili največkrat začasno odsotni zaposleni, katerih prevladujoči temperament je sangvinik (2,2 krat), sledijo jim melanholiki (1,7 krat) in koleriki (1,6 krat), medtem ko so bili flegmatiki začasno odsotni z dela najmanjkrat (1,4 krat). Takšne rezultate raziskave lahko razumemo in interpretiramo tako, da je zdravstveni absentizem najbolj pogost med tistimi zaposlenimi, ki okolje javne uprave zaznavajo kot okolje v katerem (1) ne morejo zadovoljevati svoje čustvene potrebe po druženju s sodelavci, v katerem ne zaznavajo pozitivne klime, zaupanja med ljudmi, živahnosti, stalne »akcije« in (2) v katerem čutijo pritiske, strah, itd. Izhajajoč iz tega lahko slednje razumemo z dveh vidikov, in sicer:

- zaposleni v javni upravi pogršajo pozitivno klimo, bolj odprte in pristne stike s sodelavci in več »akcije« - ker tega v tem okolju očitno ne prejemajo, iščejo rešitve z bolj pogosto oziroma hitrejšo odsotnostjo z dela. V tem kontekstu velja poudariti, da so ravno takšni zaposleni najbolj pogosto odsotni z dela zaradi nege družinskih članov in morebiti v okolju družine najdejo tisto, česar v okolju javne uprave ne prejemajo oziroma kar pogršajo;
- zaposleni v okolju javne uprave čutijo preveč napetosti, pritiskov, strahu in slednje tako močno vpliva na njih, da se želijo takšnemu okolju izogniti oziroma poiskati okolje, kjer bodo revitalizirali svoj organizem in poiskali nove moči za vrnitev v delovno okolje javne uprave. Mogoče iščejo zaposleni rešitve za takšno stanje s pomočjo bolj pogoste začasne odsotnosti z dela. Takšno razmišljanje potrjuje tudi rezultat raziskave, ki kaže, da so bili med zaposlenimi v javni upravi najbolj pogosto odsotni z dela zaradi stresa in pritiskov v delovnem okolju tisti zaposleni za katere je značilna prisotnost depresije, strahu, molčečnosti, žalosti, zadržanosti, itd.

V kontekstu razumevanja rezultatov opravljene raziskave ugotovljamo, da na podlagi samoocene anketirancev raziskave v javni upravi prevladujejo

zaposleni, katerih prevladujoča temperameta sta flegmatik in kolerik. Kljub temu, da sta si takšna tipa temperameta diametralno nasprotna, je zanimiva ugotovitev raziskave, da je zdravstveni absentizem najmanjši ravno med zaposlenimi z osebnostnimi značilnostmi, s katerimi lahko opredelimo omenjena tipa temperameta (merjeno z povprečnim številom dni odsotnosti z dela in merjeno z povprečnim številom pogostosti odsotnosti z dela).

5 Zaključek

Javna uprava je zaradi ekonomskih, socialnih in tehnoloških sprememb vseskozi postavljena pred izzive sprememb oziroma reformiranja številnih področij dela. Izziv javni upravi je lahko tudi vprašanje, kako zmanjšati zdravstveni absentizem zaposlenih, saj statistični podatki kažejo, da je zdravstveni absentizem v javni upravi v primerjavi z drugimi dejavnostmi (sektorji) precej višji. Izhajajoč iz tega smo se zato odločili, da predstavimo rezultate raziskave, ki naj bi ugotovila, ali obstaja povezanost med zdravstvenim absentizmom in temperamentom zaposlenih v javni upravi. Zanimalo nas je torej, ali se zaposleni glede na svoj edinstven temperament statistično značilno med seboj razlikujejo glede na začasno odsotnost z dela.

Rezultati opravljene raziskave so potrdili, da je temperament zaposlenih v slovenski javni upravi vpliven dejavnik pri zdravstvenem absentizmu, pri čemer je izjema le začasna odsotnost zaradi lastne bolezni ali poškodbe. V povprečju so bili največkrat in najdlje začasno odsotni z dela sangviniki in melanholiki, najmanjkrat in v najmanjši meri pa koleriki in flegmatiki. Takšne ugotovitve kažejo na to, da je še kako smiselno namenjati pozornost upoštevanja osebnostnih značilnosti tistih zaposlenih, ki so največ dni in najbolj pogosto začasno odsotni z dela. Izhajajoč iz tega menimo, da je na eni strani s spremembo oziroma izboljšanjem odnosa vodilnega osebja do zaposlenih in oblikovanjem varnega ter z izzivi zasnovanega okolja javne uprave delež zdravstvenega absentizma mogoče zmanjšati (pri tem je smiselno pozornost namenjati individualni obravnavi zaposlenih). Z druge strani pa je z upoštevanjem pozitivne psihologije smiselno razmišljati in ukrepati tudi v tako, da se poišče vse tiste pozitivne elemente v okolju javne uprave, zaradi katerih so zaposleni s karakteristikami kolerikov in flegmatikov manj dni in manj pogosto začasno odsotni z dela v primerjavi s sangviniki in melanholiki. Izziv naj se torej osredotoča tudi na vprašanje, kako še izboljšati elemente, zaradi katerih je neki tip temperameta zaposlenih več prisoten na delovnem mestu. Na podlagi opravljene analize rezultatov raziskave in spoznanj ugotavljamo, da bi bilo smiselno v nadaljnjo raziskovanje vključiti tudi vidik ugotavljanja povezanosti temperameta vodstva organizacije z zdravstvenim absentizmom zaposlenih.

Dr. Jernej Buzeti je zaposlen kot asistent na Fakulteti za upravo Univerze v Ljubljani, kjer je leta 2010 uspešno zaključil magistrski študij in v letu 2015 uspešno zagovarjal doktorsko disertacijo z naslovom *Povezanost vedenja vodij zčasno odsotnostjo zaposlenih z dela v javni upravi*. Predmet raziskovanja, s katerim se ukvarja, je povezan s področjem vodenja in ravnanja s človeškimi viri oziroma z organizacijo javnega sektorja. Sodeluje tudi pri pripravi in izvedbi vaj ter seminarjev.

Dr. Marjan Bilban je zaposlen kot predstojnik Centra za medicino dela Zavoda za varstvo pri delu, Ljubljana. Je doktor medicinskih znanosti in specialist medicine dela, prometa in športa ter redni profesor medicine dela na Medicinski fakulteti Univerze v Ljubljani. Je tudi predstojnik Katedre za javno zdravje Medicinske fakultete Univerze v Ljubljani ter nosilec predmetov na nekaterih drugih fakultetah. Je prejemnik številnih nagrad in priznanj. Njegova področja raziskovanja in dela so povezana s področji: varnost in zdravje v delovnem okolju, proučevanje kazalnikov negativnega zdravja, prva pomoč v delovnem okolju, ocenjevanje delazmožnosti delavcev in invalidnih oseb, zdrava telesna aktivnost.

Dr. Janez Stare je zaposlen kot izredni profesor za področje organizacije javnega sektorja na Fakulteti za upravo Univerze v Ljubljani. Leta 1999 je zaključil podiplomski magistrski študij na kadrovsko-izobraževalni smeri na Fakulteti za organizacijske vede Univerze v Mariboru. Leta 2005 je s temo *Povezanost osebnostnega potenciala za vodenje z uspešnostjo vodenja v organih državne uprave* ubranil doktorsko disertacijo na Fakulteti za upravo Univerze v Ljubljani. Njegova raziskovalna področja so organizacija javnega sektorja, ravnanje s človeškimi viri in vodenje. Od oktobra 2013 je dekan Fakultete za upravo Univerze v Ljubljani.

Viri in literatura

- AJPES – Agencija Republike Slovenije za javnopravne evidence in storitve. (2014). Izplačane bruto plače pri pravnih osebah javnega sektorja – zbirni podatki za december 2014. Pridobljeno 12. 3. 2015, s http://www.ajpes.si/doc/Statistike/Place_javni_sektor/Porocila/DECEMBER_2014-redna_pass.pdf
- Allebeck, P., & Mastekaasa, A. (2004). Causes of sickness absence: research approaches and explanatory models. *Scandinavian Journal Public Health, 32*(63), 36–43. DOI: [10.1080/14034950410021835](https://doi.org/10.1080/14034950410021835)
- Cascio, W. F. (2003). *Managing Human Resources: Productivity, Quality of Work Life, Profits* (6th ed). Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill.
- Ekstrand, D. W. (2015). *The Four Human Temperaments*. Pridobljeno 20. 4. 2015, s http://corecanvas.s3.amazonaws.com/thetransformedsoul-0ecb7a56/media/original/512fb9e98d73c_Four%20Human%20Temperaments.pdf
- Evans, A., & Palmer, S. (2000). *From Absence to Attendance*. London: Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development – CIPD House.
- Eysenck, H. J., & Eysenck, M. W. (1985). *Personality and Individual Differences: A Natural Science Approach*. New York: Plenum.
- Harrison, D. A., & Martocchio, J. J. (1998). Time for Absenteeism: A 20-Year Review of Origins, Offshoots, and Outcomes. *Journal of Management, 24*(3), 305–350. DOI: [10.1177/014920639802400303](https://doi.org/10.1177/014920639802400303)
- Hilton, M. F., Sheridan, J., Cleary, C. M., & Whiteford, H. A. (2009). Employee absenteeism measures reflecting current work practices may be instrumental in a re-evaluation of the relationship between psychological distress/mental health and absenteeism. *International Journal of Methods in Psychiatric Research, 18*(1), 37–47. DOI: [10.1002/mpr.275](https://doi.org/10.1002/mpr.275)
- Hoxsey, D. (2010). Are happy employees healthy employees? Researching the effects of employee engagement on absenteeism. *Canadian Public Administration, 53*(4), 551–571. DOI: [10.1111/j.1754-7121.2010.00148.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1754-7121.2010.00148.x)
- Jensen, S., & McIntosh, J. (2007). Absenteeism in the workplace: results from Danish sample survey data. *Empirical Economics, 32*(1), 125–139. DOI: [10.1007/s00181-006-0075-4](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00181-006-0075-4)
- Johns, G. (1997). Contemporary research on absence from work: Correlates, causes and consequences. *International Review of Industrial and Organizational Psychology, 12*, 115–173.
- Johns, G. (2003). How methodological diversity has improved our understanding of absenteeism from work. *Human Resource Management Review, 13*(2), 157–184. DOI: [10.1016/S1053-4822\(03\)00011-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1053-4822(03)00011-1)
- Littauer, F., & Littauer, M. (1999). *Osebnostna sestavljanja: sestavljanje slike osebnosti ljudi na delovnem mestu*. Ljubljana: Lisac & Lisac.
- Løkke Nielsen, A.-K. (2008). Determinants of absenteeism in public organizations: a unit-level analysis of work absence in a large Danish municipality. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 19*(7), 1330–1348. DOI: [10.1080/09585190802110158](https://doi.org/10.1080/09585190802110158)
- Løkke, A.-K., Eskildsen, J. K., & Jensen, T. W. (2007). Absenteeism in the Nordic countries. *Employee Relations, 29*(1), 16–29. DOI: [10.1108/01425450710714450](https://doi.org/10.1108/01425450710714450)
- Maddi, S. R. (1976). *Personality Theories*. Homewood: Dorsey Press.
- Matthews, G., Deary, I. J., & Whiteman, M. C. (2009). *Personality Traits* (3rd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. DOI: [10.1017/CBO9780511812743](https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511812743)

- Musek, J. (1993). *Znanstvena podoba osebnosti*. Ljubljana: Educy d.o.o.
- NIJZ – Nacionalni inštitut za javno zdravje. (2015). Kazalniki bolniškega staleža. Pridobljeno 13. 3. 2015, s https://podatki.nijz.si/pxweb/sl/NIJZ%20podatkovni%20portal/NIJZ%20podatkovni%20portal_3%20Zdravstveno%20stanje%20prebivalstva_3f%20Bolni%C5%A1ki%20stale%C5%BE/BS_TB01_00_13.px/?rxid=25368e45-72e1-4ceb-b918-7afec3277ffd
- Ones, D. S., Viswesvaran, C., & Schmidt, F. L. (2003). Personality and absenteeism – A meta-analysis of integrity tests. *European Journal of Personality*, 17(S1), 19–39. DOI: [10.1002/per.487](https://doi.org/10.1002/per.487)
- Rantanen, I., & Tuominen, R. (2011). Relative magnitude of presenteeism and absenteeism and work-related factors affecting them among health care professionals. *International Archives of Occupational and Environmental Health*, 84(2), 225–230. DOI: [10.1007/s00420-010-0604-5](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00420-010-0604-5)
- Rhodes, S. R., & Steers, R. M. (1990). *Managing Employee Absenteeism*. Wesley Publishing Company.
- Ruch, W. (1992). Pavlov's types of nervous system, Eysenck's typology and the Hippocrates-Galen temperaments: An empirical examination of the asserted correspondence of three temperament typologies. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 13(12), 1259–1271. DOI: [10.1016/0191-8869\(92\)90168-O](https://doi.org/10.1016/0191-8869(92)90168-O)
- Tičar, B., & Rakar, I. (2011). *Pravo javnega sektorja*. Maribor: Inštitut za lokalno samoupravo in javna naročila.
- Toth, M. (1999). Kako se Evropa spopada z zdravstvenim absentizmom. *Evrobilten*, 6, 20–21. Dostopno na <http://www.arhiv.evropa.ukom.gov.si/fileadmin/dokumenti/dokumenti/publikacije/evrobilten/evrobilten-06.pdf>
- Vučkovič, R. (2010). Obvladovanje zdravstvenega absentizma – izziv za družbo. V *Zdravstveni absentizem v Sloveniji: zbornik primerov iz prakse 14 slovenskih podjetij* (str. 10–21).

Correlation between Sickness Absenteeism and Temperament of Employees in the Public Administration

ABSTRACT

The causes that lead to sickness absenteeism are numerous. Among the groups of the causes there is a set of factors tied to the individual or his/her personality traits. The article focuses on the aspect of the correlation between sickness absenteeism and temperament and presents the results of the research carried out in the public administration in Slovenia. The results of the research (February 2015) show that on average the employees who were temporarily absent from work for the fewest days were those with dominant temperament choleric (8.6 days) or phlegmatic (8.7 days), who also account for the largest number of employees in the public administration; those with a sanguine temperament were temporarily absent for slightly more days (10.8 days), while melancholics were absent for the largest number of days (15.8 days). On the basis of the results of the research, we find that in the total number of days of sickness absence we are unable to confirm statistically significant differences between individual employees with regard to their temperament. We can, however, confirm a statistically significant correlation in the overall average number of frequencies of sickness absenteeism among employees with regard to their temperament.

Keywords: sickness absenteeism, personality traits, temperament, public administration

JEL: Z00

1 Introduction

Employees who enter the working environment do so with different temperaments, expectations, needs, knowledge, abilities. Employees also react differently to events or conditions in the working environment: some adapt to factors of influence and accept them, while others are able to face difficulties. The consequences of the latter can be often also reflected in sickness absenteeism, in other words the temporary absence of employees from work because of sickness or injury or because they are caring for family members. While the causes of sickness absenteeism may vary – they are nevertheless related to each other. Although studies¹ show that factors within the working environment (e.g. relationships with management and

¹ E.g. Jensen & McIntosh (2007); Hilton, Sheridan, Cleary, & Whiteford (2009); Hoxsey (2010), Rantanen & Tuominen (2011).

co-workers, physical working conditions, etc.) have the clearest effects on the phenomenon of sickness absenteeism, it should be emphasised that research into sickness absenteeism also focuses on factors that relate to the individual as a person and, deriving from this, the correlation between his or her personality traits and sickness absenteeism.

In the article we focus on a study of the causes (factors) that are linked to the individual or employee. We are interested in the issue whether personality traits² that are reflected through the temperament of employees have an effect on the sickness absenteeism of employees in the public administration. This focus on the study of the correlation between sickness absenteeism in the public administration and the temperament of employees in the public administration is important above all because (1) it is possible to establish, on the basis of statistical data from the National Institute of Public Health (NIJZ) that the percentage of sickness absenteeism in the public administration is noticeably higher than the percentage for Slovenia as a whole,³ and (2) because we have not come across any research in the context of Slovenia covering the aspect of the correlation between sickness absenteeism and the temperament of employees in the public administration.

On the basis of NIJZ figures (2015) we have been able to establish that the percentage of sickness absenteeism in the public administration varied between 2009, the first year of the comparison, and 2013. In 2009, for example, 4.2% of calendar days were lost to sickness absence in the public administration, in 2012 the figure was 8.5%, and in 2013 the figure fell again by 1.7 percentage points in comparison to 2012. Expressed in terms of the number of calendar days, this means that in 2009 825,786 calendar days⁴ were lost in the public administration as a result of sickness absenteeism. The highest number of calendar days lost to sickness absence in the public administration was recorded in 2012, when the total amounted to 1,580,814 calendar days. These figures confirm a large number of calendar days in public administration – although this is no surprise, since in other countries around the world the share of sickness absenteeism is also larger in the public sector (the public administration) than in the private sector. The basic purpose of the article is to show the correlation between sickness absenteeism and the temperament of employees in the public administration and, on the basis

2 Ones, Viswesvaran, & Schmidt (2003, p. 21) explain that a correlation exists between those who are conscientious (careful) and sickness absenteeism. Evans & Palmer (2000, p. 22) believe that emotionally unstable and anxious individuals have a greater propensity for temporary absence from work and those who are emotionally stable and introverted. Allebeck & Mastekaasa (2004, p. 40) also believe that anxiety and depression cause a situation in employees where they see temporary absence from work as a solution.

3 NIJZ figures (2015) show that the percentage of calendar days lost to sickness absence in Slovenia fell gradually from 2007 to 2013 (with 2012 the one exception). Thus 4.4% of calendar days were lost because of sickness absenteeism in 2007 compared to 4.08% in 2013.

4 On the basis of NIJZ figures (2015) we find that in the period under comparison the largest number of calendar days lost per employee in the public administration was in 2012 (30.9 candidates), while the smallest number was in 2011 (14.7 calendar days). In 2009, 2010 and 2013 the number of lost calendar days per employee amounted to 15.2, 16.5 and 24.9 respectively.

of theoretical findings and research results, show why it makes sense to take employee temperament into account in the context of sickness absenteeism. The article has the following aims: (1) to present the results of the study carried out in February 2015 on the correlation between sickness absenteeism and temperament in employees in the public administration in Slovenia and (2) to present the results of the correlation between the frequency of sickness absence of employees (how often/number of periods of absence) and the temperament of employees in Slovenia's public administration.

The article is structured as follows: it begins by introducing the concept of sickness absenteeism and temperament. It then presents the results of the study – i.e. results regarding the correlation between sickness absenteeism and temperament in employees in the public administration in Slovenia. The results presented cover both the number of days of sickness absence and the frequency (number of periods) of temporary absence of employees from work. The final part of the article consists of a discussion of the content of the results of the study.

2 Sickness Absenteeism

The study of sickness absenteeism is multi-dimensional and research of the phenomenon involves experts from a variety of fields. A consequence of this is the existence of different definitions of sickness absenteeism. A review of the relevant literature reveals that numerous synonyms are used for the concept of sickness absenteeism. Vučković (2010, p. 10) explains that synonyms that appear for the concept of sickness absenteeism include temporary absence from work for medical reasons, sick leave, paid sick days, etc. We also come across the concept of absenteeism. Cascio (2003, p. 45) sees absenteeism as any failure of an employee to report for or to remain at work as scheduled, regardless of the reason. Lokke, Eskildsen and Jensen (2007, p. 15) explain absenteeism as an individual's lack of physical presence at a given location and time when there is a social expectation for him or her to be there. In the opinion of Toth (1999, p. 20), the concept of sickness absenteeism means the lost working days or the time in which an employee is temporarily unable to work because of sickness or injury. In this article, we understand sickness absenteeism as the phenomenon of the temporary absence of employees from work either because they themselves are sick or injured or because they are caring for family members.

The circumstances that arise when sickness absenteeism occurs are reflected above all through the negative⁵ aspect for the organisation (including the working collective of the employee who is temporarily absent), the country and also the temporarily absent employee. And in view of the fact that this

⁵ There are also positive aspects to sickness absenteeism (for example, employees who are absent have time for themselves and are not burdened by work obligations or faced with potential work-related stress; employers have the opportunity to be more flexible employees, etc.) – although the negative aspects are more pronounced.

phenomenon affects numerous actors, it is also evident from the history of the study of sickness absenteeism that (1) an increasing amount of attention and also financial resources are being dedicated to the issue, and (2) studies of the phenomenon are broadly or multi-dimensionally designed, since they focus on detecting the various causes of sickness absenteeism. It is in fact important to understand that the reasons for sickness absenteeism are manifold and, as is demonstrated by research,⁶ that the causes of the absence of employees from work are also mutually connected. For this reason it is sometimes difficult to identify the "true" causes, since sickness absenteeism always formally appears as absence on health grounds. It has been established by research⁷ carried out to date that it does not make sense to explain sickness absenteeism as a phenomenon that arises as the result of an "isolated" cause (the theory of the influence of an individual factor on the absence of employees from work), but instead that sickness absenteeism should be interpreted as a multi-dimensional construct. It is therefore difficult to separate the causes of the absence of employees from work and establish their isolated⁸ influence. Within the literature, the causes of sickness absenteeism are classified into three groups of causes or factors leading to sickness absenteeism. These are (1) factors of the external environment, (2) factors of the organisational environment and (3) factors linked to the individual.

Some authors⁹ suggest that the scale of sickness absenteeism is influenced above all by factors from the organisational environment. Even so, in this article we are interested in factors that are connected to the personality traits of employees or to their temperament, since we believe that the temperament of every individual can also be the factor of influence that indicates how an employee will act in the working environment and could potentially also affect an employee's rate of absence from or presence in the workplace.

3 Temperament

Temperament represents the particular behavioural characteristics of an individual by which he or she is recognised from birth and in different life situations. Thus temperament is a matter of the behavioural style of an individual, or the way he/she responds in different situations (Bates, in Matthews, Deary & Whiteman, 2009, p. 70). The first typologies of temperament were defined by Hippocrates, who proceeded from the idea that temperament is the consequence of the relationship between the four basic elements and the corresponding bodily fluids or "humours", which are mixed together in every human being and create the temperament. The more they are balanced, the more balanced and healthy the individual's behaviour,

⁶ See Evans & Palmer (2000); Ones et al. (2003); Lokke Nielsen (2008); etc.

⁷ See the studies by Johns (1997); Evans & Palmer (2000); Allebeck & Mastekaasa (2004); etc.

⁸ The idea of an isolated cause of sickness absenteeism has been studied in particular by Rhodes & Steers (1990).

⁹ Harrison & Martocchio (1998); Evans & Palmer (2000); Johns (2003); etc.

while the more one humour predominates over the others, the more specific traits will be apparent in the individual's behaviour. Where a single humour is dominant, this is negative and indicates sickness (taken from Musek, 1993, pp. 116–117). The types of temperament defined by Hippocrates have been used in various aspects of research, eventually leading to the formulation of typologies.¹⁰ Among the typologies the more commonly used are those of Eysenck and Pavlov. Eysenck classified types of temperament in two dimensions: introversion–extraversion and emotional stability–emotional lability (neuroticism). Pavlov, on the other hand, explained temperament types by characteristics of the nervous system (see Ruch, 1992, pp. 1260–1263).

An individual temperament type is identified by the following characteristics (Littauer & Littauer, 1999, pp. 59–98; Ekstrand, 2014, pp. 1–7; Eysenck & Pavlov, in: Ruch, 1992):

- **choleric:** powerful choleric do not need many friends. Actually they have very few of them. Their primary desire is to be in command of the situation and they are born to be “bosses”. To have control over everyone, they need people who voluntarily submit to their leadership. They are very self-assured and also stubborn, and they have very few fears. Their strength is also in their decisiveness and in being highly organised (they organise everything in their heads). They love new challenges and cannot bear to be idle – simple things seem boring to them. They display strong self-confidence and can take the lead in any job. However, the degree of self-confidence is directly connected to the control they have over the situation. If they are not the protagonists, their self-confidence wanes rapidly. When “powerful” choleric are too infatuated with their own abilities, their self-assurance becomes excessive and harms them. Excessively self-assured choleric risk drowning in their own weaknesses, precisely because they are usually right. When they are not right, they are rarely to blame for this; and they do not like anyone drawing attention to the mistakes. The great weakness of choleric is that they are arrogant and highly strung, and usually maintain control by manipulating people. They are capable of doing someone a favour, but only in order to win their favour. They can even go so far as to secretly gather information on an individual in a way that might look like blackmail. And in order to maintain their position, they need people who are subordinate to them, or those who are afraid of taking responsibility. They usurp authority, are unable to relax and are unemotional (Ekstrand, 2014, pp. 1–7; Littauer & Littauer, 1999, pp. 59–98).
- **sanguine:** the primary desire of those of sanguine temperament is to enjoy themselves and they like to be the centre of fun. They are highly

¹⁰ Hippocrates may be considered to have been the first to define a significant typology in the history of psychological knowledge.

extroverted and love people. They are quick to make friends and are very charming. They are gifted with the ability to talk about even the simplest incident in an entertaining way. They would like to ignore work completely, because work is only rarely fun. But since they have to work, they do best in jobs that allow them flexibility and contact with people. Flexibility is important, because they usually follow their emotions rather than sober judgement (taken from Littauer & Littauer, 1999, pp. 59-98). It is important to sanguines that they have friends and that others like them. For this reason they sometimes do several things simultaneously. This reveals one of their weaknesses: the fact that they do not know how to say "no" and sometimes find themselves drowning in a mass of projects that they are afraid they will never manage to finish. Their other weaknesses include looking for excuses, talking too much, being easily distracted, having no sense of time and not having clearly defined goals (Ekstrand, 2014, pp. 1-7).

- **phlegmatic:** characterised by remarkable composure, which can be an advantage or disadvantage (Eysenck & Pavlov, in: Ruch, 1992). In the workplace peaceful phlegmatics remain loyal and persistent in the midst of chaos and crisis. This means that we can rely on them to do their work despite the commotion. They are very balanced and friendly and very reliable. They hide their "iron" will and agree with everyone in order to avoid conflict, while in reality they are telling themselves that they have no intention of ever doing that. They have very few enemies and frequently find themselves in positions of power and authority, because they are consistent and reliable. Their important strengths include calm, perseverance, consistency, the ability to listen and the ability to delegate. Weaknesses include procrastination, lack of enthusiasm, unconcern, not getting involved in anything, lack of initiative, dislike of change and resistance to being moved. Although peaceful phlegmatics are very good at calming a situation down, they are sometimes too calm (Littauer & Littauer, 1999, pp. 59-98).
- **melancholic:** the primary desire of melancholics is to do things perfectly. Their goal is an orderly life. Although perfection is unattainable, perfect melancholics aspire to it. They like to work alone – this does not mean that they are loners, but they value a private workspace without noise or interruptions. They need a lot of time to prepare a project, and also to do it again if it turns out that it isn't perfect. They do not work well under pressure. They particularly enjoy analytical work and have a natural ability to see where the problem is and devise complex solutions, while sticking strictly to the rules. Their other strengths include honesty, precision and being organised. They also love beauty. Their weaknesses include in particular the fact that they are difficult to satisfy and the fact that they can quickly fall into depression as a result of pressure of work. They are extremely thrifty, excessively

perfectionist and naïvely idealistic (Ekstrand, 2014, pp. 1–7; Littauer & Littauer, 1999, pp. 59–98).

The characteristics of all four temperaments clearly represent certain personality traits that are characteristic of people and on the basis of which people differ from each other. The question that raises itself in the context of our article is whether the temperament of employees and the public administration is linked to the sickness absenteeism of employees. In this context it is also important to understand that every individual is recognised in the environment by their unique personality or characteristic behaviour, which derives from their own temperament. This means that every human being is unique and unrepeatable, and therefore that people differ from each other. They differ on the basis of “personality”, which causes or influences the specific behaviour that is characteristic of every individual in our society and by which others recognise us. Maddi (1976, p. 15) sees personality as a stable set of tendencies and characteristics determining those commonalities and differences in people’s psychological behaviour (thoughts, feelings and actions) that have continuity in time and that may not be easily understood as the sole result of the social and biological pressures of the moment.

4 Study of the Correlation between Sickness Absenteeism and the Temperament of Employees in the Public Administration

In the context of our study of the correlation between sickness absenteeism and employee temperament, we focused on four types of employee temperament and carried out a research within the Slovenian public administration in February 2015.

4.1 Research Methods

In order to answer the research questions, to achieve the goals set and research the defined problem in more detail, we used a quantitative method of research, with the help of which we hoped to obtain reliable, objective, verifiable and accurate findings. Since the subject of the research was a complex one, we tackled it from a point of view that assumed the existence of a correlation between sickness absenteeism and the temperament of employees and the public administration.

For the empirical part of the research, we designed our own questionnaire, which consisted of the following categories:

- the first set of questions: includes six short questions, some open and some closed, relating to the sociodemographic characteristics of the respondents such as the organisation of employment, area of work, sex, year of birth (age), educational qualifications and length of service in the organisation where they currently work;

- the second set of questions: covers employees' temporary absence from work; these are seven short questions, some open and some closed, which establish whether the employee has been temporarily absent from work in the last 12 months, the reasons for it and the frequency of temporary absence from work in the last 12 months expressed in the number of days and the number of periods of absence ("how often");
- the third set of questions: includes 18 pairs of personality traits,¹¹ where each pair consists of two opposite poles of personality traits. Respondents first indicated on a scale of one to five how well an individual pole describes their personality, and then did the same for their manager's personality. The pairs of personality traits were given randomly.

The collection of data took place with the help of an online questionnaire created using *1ka*, a one-click survey tool. In the study we proceeded from the assumption¹² that every individual has one dominant temperament and one secondary temperament or sub-temperament. Taking this as our starting point, in our analysis of the study we therefore determined both temperaments on the basis of the self-assessment of the respondents, where on a scale of one to five they expressed to what extent an individual personality traits describes them. Personality traits were defined in pairs of opposite poles, where each pole can only belong to one of the temperament categories. An individual temperament category is defined by personality traits, which also defines the individual temperament type and through which it is also possible to identify the temperament of every individual. Table 1 shows the personality traits that have been used in the study and with the help of which we have defined the individual temperament category.

Table 1: Description of temperament category

Temperament	Description of characteristics of temperaments
sanguine	unreliability, carelessness, indecisiveness, disorganisation, openness, vivacity, loquacity, curiosity, joyfulness, sociability
choleric	restlessness, impatience, incivility (in the sense of arrogance), impulsiveness, openness, carefulness, heroism, curiosity, decisiveness, organisation, excitability, proactiveness
phlegmatic	passivity, incuriousness, (in)decisiveness, apathy, procrastination, reliability, carefulness, peacefulness, patience, politeness, composure, sobriety
melancholic	despondency, fear, taciturnity, pensiveness, sadness, reticence, organisation, sobriety

Source: own data

¹¹ We have prepared the range of personality traits on the basis of the descriptions of characteristics of temperament types formulated by Eysenck & Eysenck (1985); Littauer & Littauer (1999, p. 99); Ekstrand (2014, pp. 1–7).

¹² The latter is also explained by Ekstrand (2014, pp. 6–7).

In our understanding of personality traits, we must also be aware of the fact that individual personality traits can define more than one temperament (for example: openness is a characteristic of both sanguine and choleric individuals). On this basis, the determination of the dominant temperament and the sub-temperament is dealt with in this article from two points of view: one basic and one supporting. Seen from the basic point of view, the dominant temperament is the one whose personality traits on average best describe the individual; the sub-temperament, on the other hand, is defined as the temperament that best describes the individual immediately after the dominant temperament. In cases where it is not possible to determine either the dominant temperament or the sub-temperament, we introduce the supporting point of view, which defines the dominant temperament by stating that the personality traits that apply exclusively to this temperament on average best describe the individual. The supporting point of view serves to complement the basic point of view, since it only deals with personality traits that exclusively describe one individual aspect, and at the same time clarifies the dominant personality traits in comparative terms between just two temperaments.

4.2 Target Group (Sample) of the Study

The study group includes employees in the public administration, meaning all those organisations that are part of the process of making decisions on public matters or that participate in the management of public matters. The public administration thus includes national government bodies, local administrative bodies and other bodies exercising public powers.¹³ During the process of obtaining data for our research, we obtained answers/data from 3,220 respondents. This means that our sample included 3,220 employees in the public administration, representing 8.1% of the total population of employees¹⁴ in the public administration. Since the main criterion of stratified sampling or the selection of units for the sample was the organisation of employment, the structure of the research sample was similar to the population structure of employees in the public administration. The research sample thus consisted of 69.7% of employees in national government bodies, 11.1% of employees in local administrative bodies and 19% of employees in other bodies exercising public powers.

The biggest share in the structure of the sample in our study consists of officials¹⁵ (58.9%), who are most strongly represented in national government

¹³ Bodies exercising public powers include natural and legal persons, while those that are considered part of the public administration include public agencies, public funds, certain other public institutions (e.g. the Pension and Disability Insurance Institute, the Employment Service of Slovenia, social services centres, etc.) and professional chambers with compulsory membership (taken from Tičar & Rakar, 2011, pp. 225–230).

¹⁴ According to AJPES figures (2014), in December 2014 39,723 people were employed in the public administration, of which 73.7% were employed in the national administration, 12.1% in local administration and 14.1% in other bodies exercising public powers.

¹⁵ By officials in this sense we are thinking of the group of officials who do not perform management tasks or do not occupy the position of head of an organisational unit.

bodies (60.5%). The next most frequently represented area of work is that of technical staff (26.7%), who account for the largest share in local government bodies (33.2%) and the lowest share in national government bodies (24.7%). Slightly under a tenth (9.1%) of respondents are officials in the position of head of an organisational unit with up to 30 direct subordinates. The other fields of work in the overall structure of the sample account for shares smaller than 2%.

Analysis of the research sample by sex shows that more than three quarters of respondents are women (76.1%) while less than a quarter (23.9%) are men. Employees aged between 35 and 44 accounted for the largest group of respondents in the study (36.9%), followed by those aged between 45 and 54 (34.7%). The average age of respondents was 45, while this is also the median value that divides respondents in the sample into two equally represented halves.

4.3 Results of the Study

Within the context of analysis of results regarding the correlation of sickness absenteeism and the temperament of employees in the public administration, it should first be emphasised that with regard to temperament we are dealing on the one hand – with descriptive variables, while on the other we are dealing with the variables by which we have operationalised sickness absenteeism. For this reason we use the Kruskal–Wallis test in our analysis of the influence of temperament on sickness absenteeism and the Mann–Whitney U test in the series of post-hoc tests.

Table 2: Dominant temperaments and sub-temperaments in employees

	DOMINANT TEMPERAMENT		SUB-TEMPERAMENTS							
			sanguine		choleric		phlegmatic		melancholic	
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
sanguine	41	2%			15	36.6%	26	63.4%	0	0.0%
choleric	1065	40%	195	18.3%			785	73.7%	85	8.0%
phlegmatic	1404	53%	131	9.3%	1046	74.5%			227	16.2%
melancholic	130	5%	2	1.5%	31	23.8%	97	74.6%		
TOTAL	2640		328	12.4%	1092	41.4%	908	34.4%	312	11.8%

Source: own data

On the basis of self-assessment by respondents in the public administration (Table 2), we find that employees whose dominant temperament is phlegmatic are the largest group, accounting for more than half of respondents (53%), while choleric also account for a high share (40%). Employees with a melancholic (5%) or sanguine (2%) temperament account for a significantly smaller share. In terms of sub-temperaments, the largest groups are once again choleric (41%) and phlegmatics (34%). The combination most frequently found in employees in the public administration is phlegmatic as dominant temperament and choleric as a sub-temperament.

Below we examine whether employee temperament appears as a factor of influence on sickness absenteeism, when this is operationalised by the number of days of temporary absence, and later on by the number of periods of temporary absences.

The employees who were on average temporarily absent from work for the fewest days (Table 3) were those whose dominant temperament is choleric (8.6 days) or phlegmatic (8.7 days), who also account for the largest number of employees in the public administration; those with a sanguine temperament¹⁶ were temporarily absent for slightly more days (10.8 days), while melancholics were absent for the largest number of days (15.8 days). In the total number of days of sickness absence we are unable to confirm statistically significant differences between individual employees with regard to their temperament ($p > 0.05$) – although it should be noted here that the distance from the threshold that is used in order to define differences as statistically significant ($p < 0.05$), is minimal.

Table 3: Descriptive statistics for the average number of days of absence and results of the Kruskal–Wallis test with regard to employee temperament and by individual grounds for sickness absenteeism

		N	AM	SD	Kruskal–Wallis test		
					χ^2	df	p
caring for or illness of dependent family member	S	24	3.21	8.49	12.32	3	0.006
	C	589	3.67	8.03			
	P	825	2.43	5.59			
	M	66	2.55	5.12			
own illness or injury (at or outside work)	S	34	10.24	22.03	4.61	3	0.202
	C	831	7.40	17.93			
	P	1181	7.82	19.54			
	M	109	14.45	35.58			
mental pressures and stress in the working environment	S	17	0.06	0.24	23.91	3	0.000
	C	394	1.37	7.31			
	P	585	1.15	9.69			
	M	52	5.21	17.89			
other cause of absence not related to illness, injury or pressure	S	18	0.94	3.76	14.32	3	0.002
	C	379	0.78	3.94			
	P	573	0.49	4.71			
	M	46	0.87	3.95			
TOTAL	S	41	10.80	25.19	7.74	3	0.052
	C	1065	8.59	18.95			
	P	1404	8.69	19.82			
	M	130	15.80	34.78			

N – number of responses; AM – arithmetic mean; SD – standard deviation; χ^2 – chi-squared; df – degree of freedom; p – degree of statistical significance;

S – sanguine; C – choleric; P – phlegmatic; M – melancholic

Source: own data

¹⁶ Owing to the low number of sanguines in the sample, particular caution is needed when interpreting the results for this temperament.

Despite the fact that we are unable to confirm statistically significant differences in the total number of days of sickness absence among individual employees with regard to their temperament, statistically significant differences do appear (see Table 3) among employees with regard to their temperament in the case of temporary absence from work due to caring for or illness of a dependent family member ($\chi^2 = 12.32$; $p < 0.01$), where choleric and sanguines were temporarily absent from work for the longest periods (3.7 days and 3.2 days respectively), while melancholics and phlegmatics were absent for slightly shorter periods (2.6 days and 2.4 days respectively). Statistically significant differences ($\chi^2 = 23.91$; $p < 0.01$) are also noted in the case of temporary absence of employees from work due to exposure to mental pressures and stress in the working environment, as a result of which melancholics were temporarily absent from work for longest (5.2 days). Choleric were temporarily absent from work on these grounds for statistically significantly less time (1.4 days) than melancholics, but statistically significantly more than phlegmatics (1.2 days), as can be seen in Table 3. Employees with a sanguine temperament were absent from work for the least time (0.1 days) as a result of mental pressures and stress in the working environment. Over the last 12 months no employee was temporarily absent from work for other reasons for longer than one day, but statistically significant differences do exist among employees with regard to their temperament ($\chi^2 = 14.32$; $p < 0.01$).

On the basis of the figures presented in Table 4, we can state that choleric and phlegmatics show a statistically significant difference ($p < 0.01$) in the case of temporary absence from work due to caring for or illness of a dependent family member, mental pressures and stress in the working environment and other causes of absence not related to illness, injury or pressure.

Table 4: Series of post-hoc tests (Mann–Whitney U test) between pairs of temperaments of employees with regard to the average number of days of sickness absence

	S – C		S – P		S – M		C – P		C – M		P – M	
	U	p	U	p	U	p	U	p	U	p	U	p
A	caring for or illness of dependent family member											
	6434	0.402	9870	0.976	756	0.700	220249	0.000	18330	0.393	26123	0.513
B	mental pressures and stress in the working environment (including management behaviour/conduct)											
	3124	0.399	4959	0.961	369	0.124	107826	0.000	9230	0.047	12799	0.000
C	other cause of absence not related to illness, injury or pressure											
	3322	0.698	4759	0.082	414	0.989	103063	0.001	8510	0.590	12194	0.012

U – Mann–Whitney test value; p – statistical significance;
 S – sanguine; C – choleric; P – phlegmatic; M – melancholic;
 A – caring for or illness of dependent family member; B – mental pressures and stress in the working environment (including as a result of management behaviour/conduct); C – other cause of absence not related to illness, injury or pressure

Source: own data

Statistically significant differences also appear (Table 4) between choleric and melancholics with regard to the duration of temporary absence from work due to mental pressures and stress in the working environment ($U = 9,230$; $p < 0.05$), where there are also statistically significant differences between phlegmatics and melancholics ($U = 12,799$; $p < 0.01$), who at the same time also differ with regard to temporary absence for other reasons ($U = 12,194$; $p < 0.05$).

Analysis of results on the correlation between employee temperament and the number of days of sickness absence in the public administration shows that melancholics and sanguines are temporarily absent from work for the largest number of days, and that melancholics are temporarily absent from work for the longest because of sickness (their own), stress and pressure in the workplace. The latter result indicates that, viewed from the point of view of sickness absenteeism, the public administration is clearly a less suitable working environment for employees in whom a melancholic temperament is dominant.

Table 5 shows the results of research into the frequency of sickness absence (how often someone is temporarily absent from work) with regard to employee temperament. Our findings show that in the total average number of periods of temporary absence from work, there are statistically significant differences among employees with regard to their temperament ($\chi^2 = 8.07$; $p < 0.05$).

Those employees who were on average most frequently temporarily absent from work (Table 5) were those whose dominant temperament is sanguine (2.2 times). They are followed by melancholics (1.7 times) and choleric (1.6 times), while phlegmatics were the least frequently temporarily absent from work (1.4 times). Differences among employees (Table 5) with regard to their temperament are also shown to be statistically significant in the number of periods of temporary absence due to caring for or illness of a dependent family member ($\chi^2 = 11.51$; $p < 0.01$). Sanguines were, on average, the most frequently absent from work on these grounds in the last 12 months (twice), followed by choleric (1.3 times) and melancholics (1.1 times), with phlegmatics the least frequently absent (0.9 times). Differences in temporary absence from work because of mental pressures and stress in the working environment ($\chi^2 = 24.6$; $p < 0.01$) and other causes of absence ($\chi^2 = 12.26$; $p < 0.01$), are also shown to be statistically significant, where melancholics and choleric were, on average, the most frequently absent on these grounds.

Table 5: Descriptive statistics for the average number of periods of absence and results of the Kruskal–Wallis test with regard to employee temperament and by individual grounds for sickness absenteeism

		N	AM	SD	Kruskal–Wallis test		
					χ^2	df	<i>p</i>
caring for or illness of dependent family member	S	24	2.00	3.43	11.51	3	0.009
	C	586	1.26	2.54			
	P	823	0.89	1.76			
	M	66	1.09	1.94			
own illness or injury (at or outside work)	S	34	1.03	1.59	4.40	3	0.221
	C	825	0.97	1.40			
	P	1167	0.93	1.33			
	M	108	1.04	1.14			
mental pressures and stress in the working environment	S	17	0.18	0.73	24.60	3	0.000
	C	394	0.20	0.67			
	P	584	0.09	0.48			
	M	52	0.52	2.11			
other cause of absence not related to illness, injury or pressure	S	18	0.11	0.32	12.26	3	0.007
	C	379	0.20	0.94			
	P	574	0.08	0.55			
	M	45	0.20	0.76			
TOTAL	S	41	2.15	3.81	8.07	3	0.045
	C	1065	1.59	2.63			
	P	1404	1.37	2.08			
	M	130	1.69	2.30			

N – number of responses; AM – arithmetic mean; SD – standard deviation; χ^2 – chi-squared; df – degree of freedom; *p* – degree of statistical significance;
S – sanguine; C – choleric; P – phlegmatic; M – melancholic

Source: own data

A closer look at the differences between pairs of temperaments among employees shows (Tables 5 and 6) that, on average, choleric were statistically significantly more frequently temporarily absent from work, in terms of overall absence, because of caring for or because of the illness of a dependent family member, because of mental pressures and stress in the working environment, and for other reasons, than phlegmatics were; while the latter were statistically significantly less frequently absent from work than melancholics, in terms of overall average absence, because of mental pressures and stress in the working environment.

Table 6: Series of post-hoc tests (Mann–Whitney U test) between pairs of temperaments of employees with regard to the average number of periods of absence (sickness absenteeism)

	S–C		S–P		S–M		C–P		C–M		P–M	
	U	<i>p</i>	U	<i>p</i>	U	<i>p</i>	U	<i>p</i>	U	<i>p</i>	U	<i>p</i>
A	caring for or illness of dependent family member											
	7031	0.999	9163	0.468	772	0.828	219424	0.001	18731	0.637	25563	0.341
B	mental pressures and stress in the working environment (including management behaviour/conduct)											
	3165	0.490	4916	0.858	379	0.183	107301	0.000	9321	0.070	12782	0.000
C	other cause of absence not related to illness, injury or pressure											
	3334	0.739	4781	0.100	398	0.834	103383	0.001	8485	0.909	12215	0.070
D	TOTAL											
	21320	0.789	28040	0.765	2477	0.478	709278	0.021	65532	0.298	81794	0.038

U – Mann–Whitney test value; *p* – statistical significance;
 S – sanguine; C – choleric; P – phlegmatic; M – melancholic;
 A – caring for or illness of dependent family member; B – mental pressures and stress in the working environment (including as a result of management behaviour/conduct); C – other cause of absence not related to illness, injury or pressure; D – total

Source: own data

Results of the analysis of the influence of the average number of frequencies (periods) of sickness absenteeism and temperament thus showed that a statistically significant influence exists between the two constructs. This finding is useful to those responsible for shaping public administration policy above all in the sense that those most frequently temporarily absent from work in the public administration (in terms of number of periods of absence) are those employees who are characterised by a constant need for attention and social contacts (including among co-workers), energy, a positive outlook, etc. It may be that employees with such characteristics are more frequently absent from work because they miss all this in the environment of the public administration.

4.4 Discussion

The essential purpose of this paper is to present the results of the research into the correlation between sickness absenteeism and the temperament of employees in the public administration in Slovenia. On the basis of our analysis of the results of the research, we have found that the temperament of employees in the public administration is a factor of influence in sickness absenteeism, where the only exception is temporary absence on the grounds of an employee’s own sickness or injury. On average, those who were the most frequently temporarily absent from work and absent for the longest, were employees with a sanguine or melancholic temperament, while employees with a choleric or phlegmatic temperament were the least frequently absent and absent for the least amount of time.

We can understand and interpret the results of the research as showing that those who were the most often temporarily absent in terms of the number of days were all those employees who may be described by characteristics such

as taciturnity, melancholy, reticence, pensiveness, etc. We can also include among their characteristics the frequent presence of fear (in many cases we can talk about permanent aspects of so-called unexplained fear or anxiety) and a clear correlation with depression. The latter result is unsurprising if we understand such a result in the sense that in recent years the environment of the public administration has always been characterised negatively in the public consciousness and presented as an “inefficient environment” and has been under the constant pressure of rationalisation and redundancies. If we view the environment of the public administration as somewhere where relations between employees are reserved and where there is perhaps not a high degree of trust among employees, or a positive climate, it is no surprise that those who are most often temporarily absent from work, in terms of number of days, should also be those who are characterised by sociability, talkativeness, openness, the need for contact with people, constant communication and vivacity. It is therefore reasonable to ask or consider whether employees of this type perhaps miss all of the above in the environment of the public administration, and whether they then seek a solution to compensate for this lack elsewhere.

The results of the research also indicate that a statistically significant influence exists between temperament and frequency (number of periods) of sickness absence. By analysing the correlation between two constructs of this kind, we followed and also realised one of the aims of the research, namely, to establish whether a correlation exists between the two constructs presented. All the employees who were on average most frequently temporarily absent from work were those whose dominant temperament is sanguine (2.2 times). They are followed by melancholics (1.7 times) and choleric (1.6 times), while phlegmatics were least frequently temporarily absent from work (1.4 times). We can understand and interpret these results as indicating that sickness absenteeism is the most common among those employees who perceive the environment of the public administration as an environment in which (1) they are unable to satisfy their emotional need to socialise with co-workers, in which they do not perceive positive climate, trust among people, vivacity, constant “action” and (2) in which they feel pressures, fear, etc. On this basis, we can understand the latter from two points of view, as follows:

- employees in the public administration miss a positive climate, more open and genuine contacts with co-workers and more “action” – since they evidently do not receive this in the environment, they seek solutions through more frequent or earlier absence from work. In this context it is worth emphasising that it is precisely these employees who are most frequently absent from work in order to care for family members, and perhaps they find in the environment of the family the things they do not receive and which they miss in the environment of the public administration;

- secondly, employees feel too much tension, pressure and fear in the environment of the public administration and this affects them so strongly that they wish to avoid such an environment or seek an environment where they can revitalise themselves and find the strength to return to the working environment of the public administration. Perhaps employees seek a solution to this situation with the help of more frequent temporary absences from work. This idea is also confirmed by the results of the research that shows that among employees and the public administration and those who are the most frequently absent from work because of stress and pressure in the working environment are those in whom depression, fear, taciturnity, sadness, reticence, etc. are typically present.

In the context of understanding the results of the performed research, we find on the basis of the self-assessment of respondents that employees whose dominant temperament is phlegmatic or choleric are predominant in the public administration. Despite the fact that these two temperament types are diametrically opposed to each other, it is an interesting issue of the research that sickness absenteeism is the lowest precisely among employees with the personality traits that we can use to define those two types of temperament (measured by average number of days absence from work and by the average number of frequencies of absence from work).

5 Conclusion

As a result of economic, social and technological changes, the public administration is constantly faced with the challenges of changes or reform in numerous fields of work. Another challenge for the public administration can be the question of how to reduce sickness absenteeism on the part of employees, since statistics indicate that sickness absenteeism in the public administration is considerably higher than in other sectors. We therefore decided to present the results of the research designed to establish whether a correlation exists between sickness absenteeism and the temperament of employees in the public administration. We were interested in the question whether employees with different temperaments differ from each other in a statistically significant manner when it comes to temporary absence from work.

The results of the research confirmed that the temperament of employees in the Slovenian public administration is a factor of influence in sickness absenteeism, where the only exception is temporary absence on the grounds of an employee's own sickness or injury. On average, those who were the most frequently temporarily absent from work and absent for longest were employees with a sanguine or melancholic temperament, while employees with a choleric or phlegmatic temperament were least frequently absent and absent for the least amount of time. Such findings indicate that there

is all the more reason to devote attention to the personality traits of those employees who are temporarily absent from work for the most days and the most frequently. On this basis, on the one hand, by changing or improving the attitude of management staff towards employees and developing a safe, challenge-based environment in the public administration it might be possible to reduce the share of sickness absenteeism (where attention should be devoted to the individual treatment of employees). On the other hand, it would be logical, taking into account positive psychology, to take steps to find and identify all those positive elements within the environment of the public administration as a result of which employees with choleric and phlegmatic temperaments are temporarily absent from work for fewer days and less frequently than those with sanguine and melancholic temperaments. The challenge should therefore also focus on the question of how to improve those elements as a result of which employees with a given type of temperament are more present in the workplace. On the basis of our analysis of the results of the research and our findings, we find that further research should also include the aspect of establishing a correlation between the temperament of the management of an organisation with sickness absenteeism among its employees.

Jernej Buzeti, PhD, is teaching assistant at the Faculty of Public Administration, University of Ljubljana, where he completed a master's degree in 2010 and, in 2015, successfully defended the doctoral dissertation entitled *Povezanost vedenja vodij z začasno odsotnostjo zaposlenih z dela v javni upravi* [Correlation between the conduct of management personnel and temporary absence from work by employees in the public administration]. His field of research relates to leadership and human resource management or the organisation of the public sector.

Marjan Bilban, PhD, is head of the Centre for Occupational Medicine at the Institute of Occupational Safety (ZVD) in Ljubljana. He is doctor of medical science and specialist in occupational, traffic and sports medicine, and full professor of occupational medicine at the Faculty of Medicine of the University of Ljubljana. He also holds the Chair of Public Health at the Faculty of Medicine of the University of Ljubljana and teaches subjects at a number of other faculties. He is the recipient of numerous awards and other distinctions. His fields of research and work are related to the fields of: health and safety in the working environment, the study of negative health indicators, first aid in the working environment, assessment of the fitness for work of workers and disabled persons, healthy physical activity.

Janez Stare, PhD, is associate professor of public sector organisation at the Faculty of Public Administration of the University of Ljubljana. In 1999 he completed master's degree in human resources and education at the Faculty of Organisational Sciences of the University of Maribor. In 2005 he defended the doctoral dissertation entitled *Povezanost osebnostnega potenciala za vodenje z uspešnostjo vodenja v organih državne uprave* [Correlation between personality-based leadership potential and leadership effectiveness in national government bodies] at the Faculty of Administration of the University of Ljubljana. His fields of research are the organisation of the public sector, human resource management and leadership. Since October 2013 he has been the Dean of the Faculty of Administration of the University of Ljubljana.

References

- AJPES – Agency of the Republic of Slovenia for Public Legal Records and Related Services. (2014). Gross salaries paid at public sector legal entities – aggregate figures for December 2014. Retrieved on 12 March 2015, from http://www.ajpes.si/doc/Statistike/Place_javni_sektor/Porocila/DECEMBER_2014-redna_pass.pdf
- Allebeck, P., & Mastekaasa, A. (2004). Causes of sickness absence: research approaches and explanatory models. *Scandinavian Journal Public Health*, 32(63), 36–43. DOI: [10.1080/14034950410021835](https://doi.org/10.1080/14034950410021835)
- Cascio, W. F. (2003). *Managing Human Resources: Productivity, Quality of Work Life, Profits* (6th ed). Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill.
- Ekstrand, D. W. (2015). *The Four Human Temperaments*. Retrieved on 20 April 2015, from http://corecanvas.s3.amazonaws.com/thetransformedsoul-0ecb7a56/media/original/512fb9e98d73c_Four%20Human%20Temperaments.pdf
- Evans, A., & Palmer, S. (2000). *From Absence to Attendance*. London: Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development – CIPD House.
- Eysenck, H. J., & Eysenck, M. W. (1985). *Personality and Individual Differences: A Natural Science Approach*. New York: Plenum.
- Harrison, D. A., & Martocchio, J. J. (1998). Time for Absenteeism: A 20-Year Review of Origins, Offshoots, and Outcomes. *Journal of Management*, 24(3), 305–350. DOI: [10.1177/014920639802400303](https://doi.org/10.1177/014920639802400303)
- Hilton, M. F., Sheridan, J., Cleary, C. M., & Whiteford, H. A. (2009). Employee absenteeism measures reflecting current work practices may be instrumental in a re-evaluation of the relationship between psychological distress/mental health and absenteeism. *International Journal of Methods in Psychiatric Research*, 18(1), 37–47. DOI: [10.1002/mpr.275](https://doi.org/10.1002/mpr.275)
- Hoxsey, D. (2010). Are happy employees healthy employees? Researching the effects of employee engagement on absenteeism. *Canadian Public Administration*, 53(4), 551–571. DOI: [10.1111/j.1754-7121.2010.00148.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1754-7121.2010.00148.x)
- Jensen, S., & Mcintosh, J. (2007). Absenteeism in the workplace: results from Danish sample survey data. *Empirical Economics*, 32(1), 125–139. DOI: [10.1007/s00181-006-0075-4](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00181-006-0075-4)
- Johns, G. (1997). Contemporary research on absence from work: Correlates, causes and consequences. *International Review of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 12, 115–173.
- Johns, G. (2003). How methodological diversity has improved our understanding of absenteeism from work. *Human Resource Management Review*, 13(2), 157–184. DOI: [10.1016/S1053-4822\(03\)00011-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1053-4822(03)00011-1)
- Littauer, F., & Littauer, M. (1999). *Osebnostna sestavljanja: sestavljanje slike osebnosti ljudi na delovnem mestu*. Ljubljana: Lisac & Lisac.
- Løkke Nielsen, A.-K. (2008). Determinants of absenteeism in public organizations: a unit-level analysis of work absence in a large Danish municipality. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 19(7), 1330–1348. DOI: [10.1080/09585190802110158](https://doi.org/10.1080/09585190802110158)
- Løkke, A.-K., Eskildsen, J. K., & Jensen, T. W. (2007). Absenteeism in the Nordic countries. *Employee Relations*, 29(1), 16–29. DOI: [10.1108/01425450710714450](https://doi.org/10.1108/01425450710714450)
- Maddi, S. R. (1976). *Personality Theories*. Homewood, Dorsey.

- Matthews, G., Deary, I. J., & Whiteman, M. C. (2009). *Personality Traits* (3rd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. DOI: [10.1017/CBO9780511812743](https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511812743)
- Musek, J. (1993). *Znanstvena podoba osebnosti*. Ljubljana: Educy d.o.o.
- NIJZ – Nacionalni inštitut za javno zdravje. (2015). Kazalniki bolniškega staleža. Retrieved on 13 March 2015, from https://podatki.nijz.si/pxweb/sl/NIJZ%20podatkovni%20portal/NIJZ%20podatkovni%20portal_3%20Zdravstveno%20stanje%20prebivalstva_3f%20Bolni%C5%A1ki%20stale%C5%BE/BS_TB01_00_13.px/?rxid=25368e45-72e1-4ceb-b918-7afec3277ffd
- Ones, D. S., Viswesvaran, C., & Schmidt, F. L. (2003). Personality and absenteeism – A meta-analysis of integrity tests. *European Journal of Personality*, 17(S1), 19–39. DOI: [10.1002/per.487](https://doi.org/10.1002/per.487)
- Rantanen, I., & Tuominen, R. (2011). Relative magnitude of presenteeism and absenteeism and work-related factors affecting them among health care professionals. *International Archives of Occupational and Environmental Health*, 84(2), 225–230. DOI: [10.1007/s00420-010-0604-5](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00420-010-0604-5)
- Rhodes, S. R., & Steers, R. M. (1990). *Managing Employee Absenteeism*. Wesley Publishing Company.
- Ruch, W. (1992). Pavlov's types of nervous system, Eysenck's typology and the Hippocrates-Galen temperaments: An empirical examination of the asserted correspondence of three temperament typologies. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 13(12), 1259–1271. DOI: [10.1016/0191-8869\(92\)90168-O](https://doi.org/10.1016/0191-8869(92)90168-O)
- Tičar, B., & Rakar, I. (2011). *Pravo javnega sektorja*. Maribor: Inštitut za lokalno samoupravo in javna naročila.
- Toth, M. (1999). Kako se Evropa spopada z zdravstvenim absentizmom. *Evrobilten*, 6, 20–21. Available at <http://www.arhiv.evropa.ukom.gov.si/fileadmin/dokumenti/dokumenti/publikacije/evrobilten/evrobilten-06.pdf>
- Vučkovič, R. (2010). Obvladovanje zdravstvenega absentizma – izziv za družbo. V *Zdravstveni absentizem v Sloveniji: zbornik primerov iz prakse 14 slovenskih podjetij* (str. 10–21).