

Impact of Presenteeism Among Employees on Job Related Factors in Chemical Industries, in Cuddalore District, TamilNadu

Dr. M.S.Gayathri¹, Dr. K. Prakash², Ms. R.Nithiya³

¹Assistant Professor, Department of Management Studies, A.V.C. College of Engineering, Mannampandal, Mayiladuthurai.

²Post Doctoral Fellow (RUSA 2.0), Department of Business Administration, Annamalai University, Chidambaram.

³Research Scholar, Department of Business Administration, Annamalai University

Abstract

The research on presenteeism is predicated on the premise that most employees need and desire to continue working if they can, and that they do not take their jobs lightly. Presenteeism refers to the lost productivity that occurs when employees are not fully functioning in the workplace because of an illness, injury, or other condition. Even though the employee may be physically at work, they may not be able to fully perform their duties and are more likely to make mistakes on the job.. Presenteeism may also be more damaging for employees' health, morale and productivity. The promotion of a healthy workplace should therefore drive down both absenteeism and presenteeism, rather than one at the cost of the other The study aims to explore the factors contributing to presenteeism, its impact on employee productivity and well-being, and potential interventions to address the issue. . The researcher conducted a study on presenteeism and its associated characteristics among a subset of employees from certain chemical firms located in Cuddalore. The study's qualitative design included 120 individuals. The spss software was used to examine the transcribed data. The results of this study provide important insights into the notions and factors that lead to presenteeism, as well as important recommendations for the larger population of chemical industry workers who want to raise the standard of care.

Keywords: Presenteeism, Employees, Chemical Industries, Work Performance, Absenteeism.

Introduction

Presenteeism is when workers show up for work when they are sick or tired, which reduces their productivity and quality of work. Absenteeism at work leads to poorer performance, lower production, and an increased risk of health issues. In groups that are under a lot of stress, like the nursing profession, it is particularly high. To assess the impact of presenteeism, one tool that can be utilized is the Stanford Presenteeism Scale.

Presenteeism and absenteeism

Presenteeism and absenteeism at work are two different things. Absenteeism is the term used to describe an abrupt absence caused by illness or other factors. The act of someone reporting to work when ill is kno-

wn as presenteeism. As a result, their productivity declines.

Despite its seeming paradox, presenteeism is not always a bad quality. Presenteeism can happen for a number of reasons. The first piece of good news is that many of the medical conditions that cause presenteeism are minor. After all, if the worker had a significant medical reason, they would stay at home. One form of presenteeism that we have all experienced is sleep deprivation. The headache and general lack of sleep from a late-night drinking session with an old acquaintance that only left us with a few hours of sleep will have a detrimental effect on our productivity. Presenteeism has more serious causes on other occasions. These include conditions including diabetes, depression, joint pain or rheumatoid arthritis, seasonal allergies, asthma, and neck or back pain.

The Stanford Presenteeism Scale

This leads us to the next topic: how can presenteeism's impacts be measured? To answer this question, a review of academic literature is required. The most popular instrument for assessing presenteeism is the Stanford Presenteeism Scale. The Stanford Presenteeism Scale (SPS-6) measures the degree to which a worker's health impairs their capacity to concentrate and complete tasks. It is predicated on the idea that the individual has a medical condition. The influence of presenteeism on performance for various job categories within the company may be computed using the scale. The most successful and economical interventions will be those that focus on the populations that presenteeism most adversely affects.

Research Problem

Even while presenteeism in the workplace is a relatively new concept, it is an alarmingly common occurrence for people to show up for work but not give their all. One instrument for evaluating presenteeism's consequences is the Stanford Presenteeism Scale. The following three-step intervention can be used as a guide, notwithstanding the paucity of research on workplace practices that reduce presenteeism at the moment: Identifying its frequency, estimating productivity losses, and creating reasonably priced solutions for each situation that leads to presenteeism.

Theoretical Background and Hypotheses Development

Oral et al., (2024) examined in this study in relation to factory workers' presenteeism and absenteeism.

This cross-sectional study was carried out in southern Turkey among employees of a heavy industry plant. Face-to-face interviews with 152 plant workers were conducted using a survey with 57 questions. The behavior of the participants throughout the previous month was assessed in terms of presenteeism and absenteeism. Twenty employees engaged in presenteeism, working when they shouldn't have been at work, while twenty employees missed work altogether in the past month, omitting holidays and sick days. Workers who were unhappy in their work and experienced an acute sickness had a high absence rate. Poor economic situations, family health issues, prior unemployment, working overtime, job unhappiness, strained relationships with coworkers and trouble finding a replacement, acute sickness, sleep issues, and exhaustion are some of the causes that have been linked to presenteeism. In order to boost employee commitment and productivity, it could be helpful to determine the causes of current behaviors and absenteeism, support effective interpersonal communication skills by looking at the workplace culture, and manage workload based on a thorough evaluation of employees' health.

Lakisa et al., (2022) examined the relationships between disputes at work and self-reported sick presenteeism, which is the practice of reporting for work when ill. Because respondents were chosen at

random from a variety of industries and areas, the sample is representative of Latvia's working population. Data was gathered at the residences of the respondents using the computer-assisted personal interviewing technique. Binomial logistic regression was used to investigate the relationships between workplace disputes and presenteeism. The results were presented as odds ratios (ORs) with 95% confidence intervals that were adjusted for survey year, gender, age, and education. 11% of respondents on average said they had missed work due to illness in the previous year. All forms of workplace disputes considerably increased the probability of presenteeism, but disagreements with supervisors increased the most. When employees reported confrontations with customers (OR = 1.85) or with other employees (OR = 2.19) the likelihood of presenteeism doubled. Disputes at work that happened frequently (seven times for disputes between managers and workers, and four times for conflicts with customers) and with other employees were associated with considerably greater likelihood of sick leave presenteeism. If respondents reported more than two different kinds of conflicts at work, the incidence of presenteeism increased by more than three times. According to the study's findings, there is a considerable rise in the frequency of sick leave absenteeism when there is a disagreement in the workplace of any kind, particularly when the confrontations are frequent or involve several employees. The study's findings support the necessity of instituting focused and successful workplace dispute resolution strategies at the corporate level in order to reduce absenteeism due to illness.

Bae and Young (2021) sought to determine the variables influencing employees' present-day and absence at work and to offer rudimentary data to support enhancing their well-being and output. Analysis was done using data from the Fourth Korea Working Conditions Survey. For exploratory investigation, a stepwise regression model was created to determine the relevant components. Presenteeism was shown to be the most significant predictor, followed by absenteeism and subjective risk perception about health and work-related issues. The greatest predictor of presenteeism was fatigue, which was followed by a high body temperature at work, lower back discomfort, and other medical disorders, in that order. By concentrating on issues like the working environment and health condition that impact presenteeism and absenteeism, workers' quality of life and productivity might be enhanced. According to the current investigation, employees' risk of absenteeism due to illness is significantly increased when they experience many sorts of disputes at work at the same time. This may be explained by the fact that increased emotional stress levels, an unfavorable psychosocial environment, and a lack of support are caused by more conflicts. A friendly workplace is one where employees feel comfortable asking for help on personal difficulties, communicating openly with bosses or other staff members, and relying on one another for support when things go wrong. These factors together reduce the probability of presenteeism. There are negative repercussions associated with the presence of conflicts, particularly those that are multifaceted or occur frequently. Similar to how conflicts with coworkers or supervisors can affect an employee's concentration, the presence of one type of conflict at work can lead to other conflicts. Additionally, if employees use up their cognitive and emotional reserves trying to avoid potential risks, they may provide poor customer service and escalate conflict with customers.

Objectives

- To know the personal profile of employees in Selected Chemical industries, Cuddalore.
- To explore the factors influencing the Presenteeism and Work performance.
- To check the association between the profile of the employees and their health habits

Hypotheses

Ho 1: There is no association between smoking habits and their frequency of illness.

Ho2: There is no association between drinking habits and their frequency of illness.

Methods

The association between self-reported absenteeism from sickness and workplace conflicts was evaluated using a cross-sectional study design. Work conditions and risks data from four pooled countrywide periodic workforce surveys were merged for this study using the Stanford Presenteeism Scale. The study was a follow-up analysis of data gathered for a different reason and not previously analyzed; these national surveys aimed to evaluate the factors related to workplace safety and health. By employing this technique, we were also able to increase statistical significance for less frequently occurring variables. Participants were found through the use of purposeful sampling. To be eligible for inclusion, a person had to have a higher secondary degree, work at least 20% of a full-time equivalent job, and have been employed in the chemical sector for at least a year at their current job (formally referred to as the period necessary for integration). In light of organizational constraints and clinical realities, we believed it was imperative to impose the inclusion criterion that participants must have at least a year of experience in their current role. This would give them more time to adapt and express their views on the workload, company culture, and procedures.

Analysis and Results

Reliability Statistics

This table shows the reliability analysis using Cronbach’s Alpha of the data for analysis.

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.596	14

Source:

The reliability value of Problem Towards Tax System is 0.596, which is above the recommended value of 0.50 (Nunnally(1978); Hair et al. (2006)).

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation	Skewness		Kurtosis	
						Statistic	Std. Error	Statistic	Std. Error
Age	120	1	3	3.98	.710	.024	.221	-.990	.438
Gender	120	1	2	3.43	.498	.272	.221	-1.959	.438
Education	120	1	4	3.49	1.012	-.026	.221	-1.081	.438
Experience	120	1	4	3.48	.943	-.110	.221	-.891	.438
smoking habits	120	1	2	3.54	.500	-.119	.221	-1.005	.438
Drinking habits	120	1	2	3.56	.499	-.138	.221	-1.977	.438

fever or any physical problems	120	1	2	3.46	.500	.169	.221	-1.005	.438
--------------------------------	-----	---	---	------	------	------	------	--------	------

From the above table, it is found that all the items relate to the respondents in effectiveness of the use of internet resources having the mean value between 3 to 4. The highest Std. Deviation valued as Education (1.012). The skewness and kurtosis value of all the items are prevailing between -1 and +1.

Item Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
I found it much more difficult to handle the pressures of my job because of my health issue.	3.70	.656	.777
In spite of my health issue, I managed to complete challenging assignments at work.	3.64	.646	.899
My health issue prevented me from enjoying my work.	3.89	.658	.884
Because of my health issue, I felt helpless to complete several work tasks.	3.82	.648	.895
Despite my health issue, I was able to concentrate on reaching my goals at work.	3.87	.685	.795
In spite of my health issue, I had enough energy to finish all of my tasks.	3.98	.739	.900
My boss values me	3.67	.873	.943
I really care about the company	4.03	.709	.844
I have a future here	3.95	.672	.949
My coworkers are great	3.83	.737	.936
My opinion counts	3.83	.863	.831
Any superior pressure I do not degrade my work pattern	3.79	1.068	.898
I care for things that are important to me, not what is important to others.	3.93	1.083	.831
I understand the expectation from me.	3.55	1.144	.893

From the above table, we can understand that, all the mean values are above 3 according to the guideline, and all the standard deviation values are above 7.

KMO and Bartlett's Test

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.852
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	612.717
	df	91
	Sig.	.000

Based on the above Table, it is evident that the KMO and Bartlett test of Sphericity check the sample adequacy is valid as KMO value is 0.852 which is above 0.50 it quantifies the inter-correlation between the variables.

Total Variance Explained

Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings			Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	3.808	27.198	27.198	3.808	27.198	27.198	3.733	26.665	26.665
2	2.154	15.385	42.584	2.154	15.385	42.584	1.921	13.719	40.385
3	1.824	13.031	55.615	1.824	13.031	55.615	1.874	13.385	53.769
4	1.324	9.459	65.073	1.324	9.459	65.073	1.583	11.304	75.073
5	.918	6.556	71.630						
6	.773	5.520	77.150						
7	.677	4.832	81.982						
8	.569	4.064	86.046						
9	.518	3.700	89.746						
10	.396	2.828	92.575						
11	.328	2.342	94.916						
12	.298	2.128	97.045						
13	.240	1.711	98.756						
14	.174	1.244	100.000						

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

From the Table, it is evident that, the 3 constructs, comprising of 14 items that are extracted cumulatively explains 75.073 percent of the total variance.

Rotated Component Matrix^a

	Component		
	1	2	3
My coworkers are great	.911		
My boss values me	.872		
My opinion counts	.837		
I really care about the company	.837		
I have a future here	.830		
Any superior pressure I do not degrade my work pattern		.866	
I care for things that are important to me, not what is important to others.		.779	
I understand the expectation from me.		.716	
I found it much more difficult to handle the pressures of my job because of my health issue.			.796
In spite of my health issue, I managed to complete challenging assignments at work.			.773
My health issue prevented me from enjoying my work.			.745

In spite of my health issue, I had enough energy to finish all of my tasks.			.753
Because of my health issue, I felt helpless to complete several work tasks.			.709
Despite my health issue, I was able to concentrate on reaching my goals at work.			.646

Factor 1:

Every item that loaded greatest than the permissible threshold of 0.05, or 0.70, as well as those with low factor loading, were removed from the analysis. Consequently, every one of these items constitutes a distinct construct named as **work place performance**

Factor 2:

Every item that loaded greatest than the permissible threshold of 0.05, or 0.70, as well as those with low factor loading, were removed from the analysis. Consequently, every one of these items constitutes a distinct construct named as **work place issues**.

Factor 3:

Every item that loaded greatest than the permissible threshold of 0.05, or 0.70, as well as those with low factor loading, were removed from the analysis. Consequently, every one of these items constitutes a distinct construct named as **health issues**

Chi-Square Tests between fever or any physical problems and smoking habits

Ha 1: There is an association between fever or any physical problems and smoking habits
 Ho 1: There is no association between fever or any physical problems and smoking habits

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	3.668 ^a	1	.055		
Continuity Correction ^b	2.997	1	.083		
Likelihood Ratio	3.694	1	.055		
Fisher's Exact Test				.067	.041
Linear-by-Linear Association	3.637	1	.057		
N of Valid Cases	120				

From the chi square table, it is proved that **there is an association between fever or any physical problems and smoking habits** with the Pearson chi square value of 0.041. So, the null hypothesis is rejected

Chi-Square Tests between fever or any physical problems and Drinking habits

Ha 1: There is an association between fever or any physical problems and Drinking habits
 Ho 1: There is no association between fever or any physical problems and Drinking habits

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.397 ^a	1	.529		
Continuity Correction ^b	.199	1	.656		
Likelihood Ratio	.397	1	.529		
Fisher's Exact Test				.582	.328
Linear-by-Linear Association	.394	1	.530		
N of Valid Cases	120				

From the chi square table, it is proved that **there is no association between fever or any physical problems and Drinking habits** with the Pearson chi square value of 0.328. So, the null hypothesis is accepted

Crosstab

Count

		Drinking habits		Total
		yes	no	
fever or any physical problems	yes	27	38	65
	no	26	29	55
Total		53	67	120

This is the table indicated that the detailed cross tabulation between preference for document format for downloading and department of the respondents. The total of 120 respondents are divided according with their fever or any physical problems and Drinking habits interfere with your life.

Conclusions

The results of the study confirmed that employees frequently show up for work feeling stressed, ill, and overworked. The employees were not only showing in sick, but they were also behaving much worse. Because they were contagious, they purposefully infected other healthy employees. Workers also reported a variety of health problems that led to a greater loss of productivity for the organization. Several of the hypothesized underlying causes of the employees' poor performance, such as self-employment, retaliation, approaching deadlines, and a distaste of taking sick days, were also confirmed by the study.

References

1. Bae, Young-Hyeon. (2021). Exploratory Analysis of Related Factors with Absenteeism and Presenteeism on Workers: Using the Fourth Korea Working Condition Survey. International journal of environmental research and public health. 18. 10.3390/ijerph182111214.
2. Chang YT, Su CT, Chen RY et al (2015): Association between organization culture, health status, and presenteeism. J Occup Environ Med 57(7): 765–771 Yang T, Ma M, Zhu M et al (2018): Challenge or hindrance: Does job stress affect presenteeism among Chinese healthcare workers?. J Occup Health 60(2): 163–171
3. Kim J, Kim YK, Leem SH & Won JU (2019): Association between job-related stress and experience of presenteeism among Korean workers stratified on the presence of depression. Ann Occup Environ Med 31: e26
4. Lakisa, Svetlana & Matisāne, Linda & Gobina, Inese & Orru, Hans & Vanadzins, Ivars. (2022).

- Sickness Presenteeism among Employees Having Workplace Conflicts, Results from Pooled Analyses in Latvia. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*. 19. 10525. 10.3390/ijerph191710525. Loeppeke R, Taitel M, Haufle V, Parry T, Kessler RC & Jinnett K (2009): Health and productivity as a business strategy: a multiemployer study. *J Occup Environ Med* 51(4): 411–428
5. Miraglia M & Johns G (2016): Going to work ill: a meta-analysis of the correlates of presenteeism and a dual-path model. *J Occup Health Psychol* 21(3): 261–283
 6. Oral, Belgin & Solak, Yavuzalp & Durmuş, Hasan. (2024). Evaluation of absenteeism and presenteeism status of factory employees. *Work*. 1-9. 10.3233/WOR-230642.
 7. Van Scheppingen AR, de Vroome EM, ten Have KC, Bos EH, Zwetsloot GI & van Mechelen W (2013): The associations between organizational social capital, perceived health, and employees' performance in two Dutch companies. *J Occup Environ Med* 55(4): 371–377

1. Introduction

Research on presenteeism focuses on chronic or episodic problems such as depression, back pain, gastrointestinal disorders, seasonal allergies, asthma, migraines, and other headaches. Most of a company's direct health-related expenses are incurred by progressive diseases like cancer or heart disease, which often strike people later in life and require expensive treatments. These diseases also account for the majority of claims paid for medical care and drugs if the company is self-insured. However, even though they have significantly lower direct costs, diseases that individuals bring to work still contribute to larger loss productivity because they are so widespread, often go untreated, and typically occur during the busiest working seasons. Historically, the majority of employers were ignorant of these indirect expenses.

1.1 Consequences of Presenteeism

Employers lose money when employees are absent. Even if an employee is making a contribution by coming to work when they are unwell, wounded, or worried, presenteeism can have negative effects on the company in a number of ways. The most evident is the difference in productivity between an employee who is having a hard time getting through the day and an employee who is in good health and spirits. Furthermore, an employee who is under stress and struggle is more likely to make mistakes that might end up costing the organization more than if they were just absent.

It's also possible that a worker is making their illness or condition worse by trying to work through it instead of taking a break or taking care of it in another way. This increases the amount of time that the productivity loss will matter. Finally, if an individual arrives at work while physically ill, there's a chance that the sickness may spread to other employees, increasing both presenteeism and attendance.

1.2 Reasons for Presenteeism

Even while presenteeism might be hard to quantify, employee surveys have revealed why it's so prevalent in the workplace.² The culture of the workplace is important because many workers are afraid of losing their jobs or losing out on chances to grow in their careers if they take time off when they should be working. In addition to having their commitment called into question,