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Abstract

A growing interest in presenteeism, attending work despite being ill, has led to an increase in research on the construct across various disciplines. The objective of this research was to provide a cohesive definition from prior literature, measure presenteeism in a novel manner, and identify potential casual explanations to expand the presenteeism literature within Industrial-Organizational Psychology. In this study, presenteeism was operationalized as, “attending work and putting forth effort at work while ill,” and was measured using behavioral intentions (the intent to presentee). Potential motivation for presenteeism behavior was modeled using social exchange theory, organizational support theory (perceived organizational support), and expectancy theory (expectancy, instrumentality, and valance). It was hypothesized that individuals would intend to presentee if they perceived the behavior as a method to reciprocate their perceived organizational support and/or if they viewed presenteeing as instrumental to achieving a valued reward. The conceptual models were tested using structural equation modeling (confirmatory factory analysis) and path analysis in AMOS 23. Using a sample of 163 individuals from Mechanical Amazon Turk (MTURK), the results of the study provided evidence that the social exchange and the expectancy theoretical models can explain individuals’ intention to presentee. Hypotheses based on the norm of reciprocity were not supported. Some of the hypotheses based in expectancy theory were supported.
Explaining Presenteeism through Social Exchange and Expectancy Theories

Introduction

Decades of research have demonstrated that absenteeism, failing to attend work, relates to reduced levels of performance and organizational productivity (Blank & Diderichsen, 1995; North, Syme, Feeney, Head, Shipley, & Marmont, 1993). However, recent research has focused on a different attendance related behavior, presenteeism. Presenteeism has been broadly defined as “sickness presenteeism”, “impaired presenteeism, and “working through illness.” Although it has had a variety of definitions, generally, presenteeism occurs when an ill individual opts to go to work when he/she has the option to stay at home (Aronsson & Gustafsson, 2005).

Contemporary presenteeism research has focused on three main areas of inquiry. First, what are the antecedents of presenteeism? Second, how does acute or chronic physical illness affect decisions to attend work? Third, what are the organizational and individual outcomes of presenteeism? Generally, scholars in the UK and Europe have been focused on the frequency of presenteeism as it relates to job insecurity and occupational health while those in the US have been concerned with productivity losses from employees ignoring health concerns (Bergström, Hagberg, Busch, Jensen, & Björklund, 2014; Galon, Briones-Vozmediano, Agudelo-Suárez, Felt, Benavides, & Ronda; Johns, 2011; Krane, Larsen, Nielsen, Stapelfeldt, Johnsen, & Risør; Kristensen, 1991). Despite the growing relevance of presenteeism, its literature is .01% the size of that on absenteeism (Hansen & Anderson, 2008).

Presenteeism has been identified as a major occupational health issue with organizational and individual consequences. At the organizational level, research has shown that large scale presenteeism may lead to deficits in overall productivity and product quality and these deficits may be greater than the costs from employees’ absenteeism behavior (Collins, Baase, Sharda,
Ozminkowski, Nicholson, Billotti, & Berger 2005; Leineweber, Westerlund, Hagberg, Svedberg, & Alexanderson, 2012). At the individual level, presenteeism creates work and home health concerns as it has been linked with higher levels of occupational accidents, burnout, and inadequate recovery from stress and illness (Ferriera & Martinez, 2012; Irvine, 2011; McKevitt, Morgan, Dundas, & Holland, 1997). Furthermore, presenteeism may be uniquely dangerous in that individuals voluntarily forgo recovery to deal with job demands, which leads to an experience of continuous strain and exacerbated illness (Hansen & Anderson, 2008). With a plethora of potential negative outcomes, it is important to determine the mechanisms behind presenteeism, especially because research shows that 70% of workers tend to engage in presenteeism behaviors regardless of the outcomes (Hansen & Anderson, 2008).

The current literature has determined many antecedents of presenteeism. For instance, different and high levels of job demands (i.e. low autonomy and high amounts of work) and strain lead to higher levels of presenteeism (Demerouti, 2009). Miraglia and Johns’ (2016) dual path model suggested that individuals presentee in response to greater work demands as they perceive presenteeism as a mechanism to meet said work demands (i.e. not getting behind in work) or as an intrinsic challenge. In determining alternative antecedents, research has also shown that financial rewards can act as motivation for those in positions of financial (stress) and/or job insecurity (Pederson & Skagen, 2014). For instance, temporary employees tend to presentee as they depend on the income and they cannot afford to lose pay. However, contrasting research has shown that full-time employees tend to presentee to a higher degree than temporary employees, which suggests that a “financial insecurity” hypothesis may not explain all presenteeism behavior (Aronsson & Gustafsson, 2005; Böckerman & Laukkanen, 2010; Heponiemi, Kouvonen, Sinervo, & Elovainio, 2010).
Another line of research has linked reciprocity behaviors, such as commitment and obligation, to higher levels of presenteeism (Lu, Lin, & Cooper, 2013). In his review of presenteeism, Johns (2011) highlighted different categories of antecedents such as work context, job demands, job security, job rewards, absence policy, health (severity of objective health concerns), and person-centered variables (work attitudes, justice, stress, health locus of control, and perceived absence legitimacy) (Lack, 2011; Virtanen, Kivimäki, Eloainio, Vahtera, & Ferrie 2003). Also, as presenteeism is a sickness-related behavior, researchers have determined that different types of sickness, i.e. neck and back pain, are more predictive of presenteeism (Aronsson, Gustafsson, & Dallner, 2000). Finally, negative psychological states such as burnout and high stress have been linked to higher levels of presenteeism (Jourdain & Chênevert, 2015).

While studies have determined numerous antecedents, they have been somewhat isolated in explaining how the different antecedents relate to each other or cause presenteeism behaviors. Therefore, there may be multiple theoretical explanations for presenteeism. The purpose of this study is twofold. First, it is to highlight some of the major issues in presenteeism research including some definitional, construct, and measurement issues in the contemporary literature. Second, it is to test motivational theories (expectancy theory and social-reciprocity theory) that may be used to identify predictors of presenteeism.

**Background and Rationale for the Study**

One of the first issues with the presenteeism literature is a lack of a concrete definition and/or operationalization. In Europe, presenteeism has been studied in fields of epidemiology and occupational health with the primary concerns being relating physical illness with work behaviors, future illness, and work quality (Böckerman & Laukkanen, 2010). In the United States, it has been studied in the economic and management literatures and has been defined as,
“An individual showing up to work yet having productivity fall” (Hansen & Anderson, 2008; Hirsch, Lechmann, Schnabel, & Lechmann, 2015; Huver, Richard, Vaneecloo, Delclite, & Bierla, 2012). Furthermore, Johns (2011) lists eight different definitions, but most recently defined presenteeism as, ‘showing up to work when ill, irrespective of productivity loss.’ Therefore, John’s (2009) definition, based on a review of the literature, seems to highlight a motivational component rather than a productivity outcome.

Defining and/or operationalizing presenteeism differently results in multiple issues. First, theoretically each study using a disparate operationalization is potentially ‘researching’ a niche aspect of presenteeism. More specifically, different research operationalizes and measures different “presenteeisms” and links them to antecedents uniquely. For example, Schreuder, Roelen, van der Klink, and Groothoff (2013) measured presenteeism as zero absence behavior (zero recorded absences from work on an annual basis) and others have measured it by “leavism” (utilization of annual leave entitlements or flexi hours instead of sick leave) or by productivity decreases (Gerich, 2015; Matsushita, Adachi, & Arakida 2011).

Unfortunately, these methods may be inadequate to study presenteeism accurately. For instance, research has determined that absenteeism positively correlates with presenteeism and therefore, presenteeism should not be measured using zero absenteeism measures (Böckerman & Laukkanen, 2010; Gosselin Lemyre, & Corneil, 2013; Hansson & Harms-Ringdahl, 2006). The authors also found that many measures for “health-related” difficulties with workplace tasks or work limitations are being incorrectly used to quantify presenteeism. For instance, scales that are typically used to assess individuals’ difficulty with a task might be used to assess objective presenteeism behavior. Therefore, the authors suggest that this use is improper as the scale would suffer from criterion deficiency and lack of construct validity. Furthermore, some measurement
scales do not contain any reference to illness and only measure productivity, which can be correlated with a variety of antecedents.

To date only three presenteeism measurement instruments (SPS-6: Stanford Presenteeism Scale, Health and Work Questionnaire: HWQ, and the Endicott Work Productivity Scale: EWPS) had been assessed for construct validity (Endicott, 1997; Gerich, 2015; Koopman, Pelletier, Murray, Sharda, Berger, & Turpin 2002; Ospina, Dennett, Waye, Jacobs, & Thompson, 2015; Shikiar, Halpern, Rentz, & Khan, 2004). Furthermore, the SPS-6 focuses may be criterion deficient in it focuses on how depression, anxiety, and stress affects goal setting, work satisfaction, and stress tolerance, and task performance. The latter two scales may also be criterion deficient in that they focus highly on the outcome of work productivity. Therefore, even the validated measures may contribute to presenteeism’s operationalization and measurement issues and present further difficulties in determining causation in the presenteeism literature. Again, this results in different theoretical relationships between varied antecedents and outcomes.

A second issue with the presenteeism literature is that some of the current methods for measuring the construct include potential criterion contamination. What constitutes illness? Physical symptoms? Pain? Stress? Mental illness? Emotional health? Objective outcomes, such as sick days taken, productivity decreases, or days absent potentially conflate sickness criteria and outcomes with presenteeism behavior. In other words, can an objective measure (“days present”) partial out the relative and temporal influence of different “illness” symptoms? For instance, the relative effects of acute versus chronic illness or the type of illness (i.e. the common cold versus a broken arm) may differently affect the collected presenteeism data depending on the measure used. Therefore, including illness in the outcome measure may cause conflation,
which is supported by Dellve, Hadzibajramovic, and Ahlborg (2011), who indicated that even using one year of work attendance proved to be imprecise as it does not discriminate when one is ill or well.

A secondary issue is that measurements including presenteeism’s illness definition also are conflated by the perception of that illness. Sickness perception is highly subjective and some individuals will consider the same illness (i.e. the common cold) to be more/less severe. Therefore, it is also difficult to use objective measures as individuals’ perceptions of illness may affect the accuracy of the data. Finally, most presenteeism scales also ask individuals to cognitively recall how sick they were and/or what type of illness they had over an elapsed time-period. Not only is there an issue of severity perception, but also of the ability of individuals to accurately recall the days that they attended work when sick. As different fields emphasize different definitions of poor health and presenteeism, there is an inherent difficulty in accurately measuring the construct. For the purposes of the present study, I used behavioral intentions rather than objective or self-reported sick behavior. Issues in collecting data with illness measures were subverted using intention measures. As the influence of physical and/or mental illness is difficult to partial out of presenteeism, dependent on the measure, I instead attempted to answer the question, how can individuals’ intention to presentee be explained?

In one study, presenteeism has been studied using behavioral intentions. Schreuder and colleagues (2013) used the Theory of Planned Behavior to demonstrate that self-efficacy, attitudes, and intrinsic motivation were more important than social pressures in predicting zero-absenteeism rates (zero recorded absences from work on an annual basis). Behavioral intentions stem from Ajzen’s (1991; 2006; 2013) Theory of Planned behavior and have been used in various settings to provide a link between decision making intentions and behavior. For instance,
turnover intentions have been shown to predict turnover rates (Shropshire & Kadlec, 2012). This also applies to health behaviors, as researchers have linked smoking intentions to smoking behaviors (Topa & Moriano, 2013; Van Breukelen, van der List, & Steensma, 2004). Therefore, in this study, I attempted to solve operationalization measurement issues by not measuring past objective or self-report presenteeism behaviors that could be conflated with cognitive issues and/or different illnesses. Instead, the purpose of this study was to use and validate intention based items that may reduce operationalization and method issues.

The third primary issue with the presenteeism literature is that there have been few attempts to theoretically and structurally explain presenteeism behavior. Many studies have correlated the various antecedents and outcomes of presenteeism behavior, but the literature lacks potential causal explanations (Dew, Keefe, Small, 2005). Therefore, the third primary purpose of this study was to determine whether some of the antecedents of presenteeism could be explained by established theoretical models. As many of the antecedents have been indicated to be incentive based (i.e. salary) and/or in reaction to the organization behavior (attitudes, policy, over-commitment), in this study presenteeism was explained through two potential theories: expectancy theory and social exchange theory (Cicei, Mohorea, & Teodoru, 2013; Ekeh, 1974; Van Eerde & Thierry, 1996; Vroom, 1964). First, as some of the antecedents are incentive based, individuals may weigh their effort, what their efforts lead to, and the value of outcomes in a decision to presentee. Secondly, as other antecedents seem to be based on reactions to positive experiences from the organization, social exchange theory may explain individuals’ propensity to presentee as a way of reciprocating to the organization.

**Theoretical Approaches/Explanations**

*Social Exchange Theory*
Social exchange theory is a theoretical framework that can explain some of the antecedents of presenteeism. Social exchange theory includes the norm of reciprocity which highlights the mutual exchange of interpersonal and socioemotional resources. The reciprocity norm constitutes an individual’s reciprocal action for being treated in a specific manner, such as a response for being given money, services, information, respect, liking (Bateman & Organ, 1983). Social exchange and reciprocity have been studied in a variety of “helping” contexts, such as public goods experiments in which participants engaged in positive and negative reciprocity reaction to their team members’ behavior and actively rewarded or penalized members who shared or withheld a “public good” (Ozono, Kamijo, & Shimizu, 2016).

Furthermore, social exchange and reciprocity has been widely studied in social and industrial-organizational psychology in the context of employer-employee, leader-member, and supervisor-subordinate relationships (Settoon, Bennett, & Liden, 1996). Research has also shown if an organization provides support (i.e. flexible work schedules) to employees, there are subsequent, positive employee reactions such as greater satisfaction and organizational commitment (Ahmad & Yekta, 2010; Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchinson, & Sowa, 1986; Pradesa, Setiawan, & Rahayu, 2013). Eisenberger defined this support as perceived organizational support (POS), which refers to the degree to which employees believe that their organization values their contributions and well-being and fulfills their socioemotional need.

The perception of being valued, “Encourages the incorporation of organizational membership and role status into employees’ self-identify and increases the likelihood of pro-social acts” (Muhammad, 2014). If an employee perceives he/she is valued by an organization, he/she may feel a greater connection to the organization and reciprocate with actions beneficial to the organization (Liu, 2004). For instance, researchers have demonstrated that higher POS can
lead to higher levels of job attendance and have suggested that attendance behaviors can directly provide public and identifiable means of reciprocating perceived value while at work (Eisenberger, Falsolo, & Davis-LaMastro, 1990). Rhoades and Eisenberger (2002) demonstrated that higher levels of POS led to lower levels of absenteeism, as the two were correlated negatively (-.26). Therefore, if an organization conveys value to their employees, they may reciprocate specifically with attendance behaviors.

Extending the support for the link between employee reciprocation and attendance, research has shown that employees perceptions of whether they are valued by their organization and its members influences their illness attendance behaviors. For instance, Bernstrøm and Kjekshus (2012) found that supervisor support led to lower sickness absenteeism and suggested that employees perceptions of not being valued may increase the rate of sickness absenteeism. Also, Jourdain and Chenevert (2014) examined the moderating influence of POS on the burnout-absenteeism hypothesis. The authors found that when an organization valued “humanity” (respect for workers, latitude for employee errors), individuals were less likely to absentee when sick. While it has been determined that presenteeism is not necessarily the inverse of absenteeism, theoretically POS may still influence the decision process behind the attendance behavior (Gerich, 2015; Sears, Zhang, & Han, 2016). As employees’ perceptions of value directly relate to their decision to abstain from work when sick, it follows that POS may still relate to individuals’ decision to attend work when sick. If any employee feels valued by their organization, he/she may attempt to demonstrate reciprocity (beyond every-day attendance) by pushing himself/herself to attend work when ill (Kurtessis, Eisenberger, Ford, Buffardi, Stewart, & Adis, 2015).
It should be noted that some studies have previously attempted to link support theory and presenteeism. For instance, Chen, Hannon, Laing, Kohn, Clark and others (2015) measured organizational health support with employee productivity and found that the people who did not feel support tended to presentee more often. Also, Yang, Shen, Zhu, Liu, Deng and others (2015), found that presenteeism rates could be reduced by increasing coworker support, but that supervisor support did not have an effect on presenteeism. While both studies were based on organizational support theory and found mixed relationships between support and presenteeism, neither study included Eisenberger’s perceived organizational support measures. In the former, organizational support was operationalized as supporting a healthier lifestyle and the latter only measured supervisor support. Furthermore, in both studies presenteeism was operationalized as decreased productivity, which fails to account for attendance decision-making. Therefore, these approaches to studying presenteeism may not tap into a presenteeism that can be explained by social exchange, POS, and the reciprocity norm.

Hypothesis 1: POS is related to the intent to presentee.

Furthermore, POS and reciprocity norms may influence presenteeism through a secondary mechanism. Perceived organizational support has been linked distally to work outcomes through felt obligation as POS may also elicit employee’s feelings of felt obligation to the organization (Eisenberger, Armeli, Rexwinkel, Lynch, & Rhoades 2001). Perceived organizational support has been linked to higher levels of felt obligation and caring about the organization’s welfare. Also, felt obligation has been demonstrated as a mechanism that explains the links between POS and some positive work outcomes. Research has demonstrated that felt
obligation acts as a mediator for some of the POS-positive outcomes relationships, such as mediating the relationship between POS and affective commitment (Arshadi, 2011; Marique, Stinglhamber, Desmette, Caesens, & De Zane, 2013; Rhoades, Eisenberger, Armeli, 2001). Also, felt obligation has been shown to mediate the relationship between POS and in-role performance and withdrawal behaviors (Eisenberger et al., 2001; Gupta, Agarwal, & Khatri, 2016).

Hypothesis 2: POS is positively related to felt obligation.

This research attempted to replicate the POS-felt obligation-outcome relationship with presenteeism. Therefore, this research attempted to find causal links between POS and the intent to presentee as mediated by felt obligation. Conceptually, presenteeism might be a reactionary behavior in that it can be explained by the social exchange reciprocity norm. Theoretically, as an employee receives more support from his/her organization, he/she gains more perceptions of values and/or resources. Therefore, a supported individual may feel an increasing obligation to an organization. In order to reciprocate to the organization, an employee may push him/herself during illness as he/she feels obligated to reciprocate to the organization. Therefore, presenteeism may be one of the behaviors that an employee performs to meet his/her obligation to the organization (McMillan & Albrecht, 2010).

Furthermore, an employee could believe that a decision to not presentee may lead to negative repercussions for the organization in reduced individual, team, or organizational performance. For instance, an employee might believe his/her absence would reduce the ability of an entire department to complete a project. Therefore, an employee who regularly supports and feels obligated to help the organization may push himself/herself to attend work when sick in
the belief they are preventing harm to the organization. Furthermore, any support given by an organization should increase the level of felt obligation, and therefore increase the level of the reciprocity (presenteeism) behavior.

Hypothesis 3: Felt obligation is related to the intent to presentee.

Hypothesis 4: Felt obligation mediates the relationship between POS and the intent to presentee.

Expectancy Theory

Another possible theoretical explanation for the antecedents of presenteeism is expectancy theory. Expectancy theory is considered a theory of “achievement motivation” that can explain why individuals are motivated to achieve, persist, and perform tasks and/or behaviors. Theorists argue that individual’s choice, persistence, and performance are explained by their individual beliefs about how well they perform, what their performance leads to, and how much they value that outcome (Van Eerde & Thierry, 1996). These components are referred to as expectancy, instrumentality, and valence and together multiplicatively determine motivational force (Wigfield & Eccles, 2000). As known antecedents of presenteeism included incentive and/or extrinsic based rewards (i.e pay, workload, replicability), expectancy theory can explain the decision-making process that links reward-based antecedents to presenteeism (Palo & Pati, 2013). This may also highlight different “reward typologies” that explain why different employees (e.g. part-time, salaried) presentee at differing rates.

Modeling presenteeism behaviors with expectancy theory suggests that individuals see some sort of incentive for going to work when sick. Brown and Sessions (2004), similarly
posited a model with presenteeism behavior outcomes motivated based on potential increases in leisure and gain and posited utility equations based on the idea of potential gains by attending work when ill. Barmby, Sessions, and Treble (1993) supported this notion, in that they found that individuals presentee even if they are given sick pay. Theoretically, this is an interesting point as it suggests that individuals may still be motivated to presentee when given sufficient “support resources”.

Within the expectancy theory components, expectancy refers to the perceived probability that effort will lead to good performance, which may involve other constructs such as self-efficacy, goal difficulty, and perceived control. Expectancy perceptions have also been shown to relate to an individual’s experience, self-confidence, and perceived difficulty of current goals. In contrast, instrumentality is the perceived probability that certain levels of performance will lead to desired outcomes. Therefore, instrumentality suggests a perception that reaching certain levels of performance will result in rewarding outcomes. Finally, valence refers to the extent that an individual values a specific outcome (Wright, 1991; Wigfield & Eccles, 2000).

Expectancy theory has been used to explain why individuals are directed towards specific behaviors when there are various behavioral options. The theory suggests that people will choose the behavior with the highest motivational force (Sloof & Praag, 2008). This has been demonstrated to be related to individuals’ needs, values, goals and preferences (Tien, 2000). Expectancy theory has generally been supported in a variety of empirical studies, and has been used to explain different phenomena such as work attendance and turnover (Bothma & Roodt, 2013; Fudge & Schlacter, 1999; Ramlall, 2004). Furthermore, research has previously used expectancy to explain relationships between potential rewards and individuals’ goals, choice, and completion of work related behaviors (Riedel, Nebeker, & Cooper, 1988).
In this research, I will address how expectancy theory and its components relate to individuals’ motivation to presentee. The expectancy theory components provide one framework in which to evaluate presenteeism decisions. In applying expectancy to presenteeism, the aim of this research is to explain the relationship between rewards-based antecedents and presenteeism through expectancy decision making (Riedel et al., 1988). Research has shown that individuals personal expectancies of their own behavior to leads to correspondence of the behavior (Miller & Grush, 1988). For instance, Johnson (2009) found a significant, positive correlation between police officers’ expectations to make drug arrests and actual drug arrests. Furthermore, research has shown that individuals expectancy to complete a hard goal led to high motivational force to complete the goal and higher performance (Matsui, Okada, & Mizuguchi, 1981). Therefore, in the context of presenteeism, expectancy would explain individuals’ expectations that their effort to presentee would lead to completion of a performance goal. For instance, individuals would expect that attending and putting forth effort at work while ill will lead to continued levels of successful work performance.

Hypothesis 5: Expectancy is related to the intent to presentee.

Instrumentality beliefs may be present when an individual believes that his/her presenteeism behavior may lead to a desired outcome. For instance, an instrumentality belief could constitute an employee’s belief that attending work when ill will lead to a performance bonus, favorable supervisor ratings, or achieving a self-set challenge. Finally, the value that individuals place on incentives also weighs into the motivational force equation. Under
expectancy theory, a person would not have high motivation force to presentee unless he/she valued a potential reward.

Furthermore, extrinsic and intrinsic rewards may provide different motivation for presenteeism behavior. Extrinsic outcomes are defined as rewards that are distributed by external forces (a manager, supervisor, or organization). In contrast, intrinsic rewards refer to those that are internal, personal rewards (i.e personal challenges, self-development) (Ryan & Deci, 2000). In a meta-analysis, Cerasoli, Nicklin, and Ford (2014) demonstrated that intrinsic and extrinsic motivation predict performance (quality and quantity) differently. Also, some research has even suggested that intrinsic outcomes predict motivation greater than extrinsic outcomes (Mitchell & Albright, 1972). Furthermore, after dividing instrumentality and valence into extrinsic and intrinsic components, Chiang and Jang (2008) found that intrinsic instrumentality better predicts general employee work motivation.

Therefore, instrumentality may be divided into extrinsic and intrinsic parts to better understand presenteeism decisions. Extrinsic instrumentality refers to an individuals’ belief that his/her performance of a behavior will lead to an extrinsic reward. For instance, if an individual believed that presenteeing would lead to a pay increase. Intrinsic instrumentality refers to an individuals’ belief that his/her performance will lead to an intrinsic reward. For instance, if an individual believed that presenteeing would lead to challenging oneself. Research supports the notion that intrinsic rewards may better predict presenteeism as intrinsic outcomes are self-administered and have a greater level of certainty leading to a stronger effect on motivational force (Wahba & House, 1974). In other words, in intrinsic motives there is more perceived expectation and instrumentality in that one can more certainly presentee to gain self-esteem, overcome self-set goals, or increase their perceived control as opposed to gaining an immediate
financial reward for their attendance. Overall, intrinsic and extrinsic motivation may predict presenteeism uniquely.

Hypothesis 6: Extrinsic instrumentality is related to the intent to presentee

Hypothesis 7: Intrinsic instrumentality is related to the intent to presentee

If presenteeism is predicted uniquely by extrinsic and intrinsic instrumentality, presenteeism may also be influenced uniquely by intrinsic and extrinsic valence components. Eccles, Adler, Futterman, Goff, and Kaczala (1983) have suggested that individuals perceive tasks as having intrinsic value, rewards that an individual experience from engaging in a task for its own sake, and extrinsic value, external short-term or long-term rewards associated with a task. Research has shown that when an outcome (i.e. reward) of a work task/behavior is attractive (high in valence), individuals are more likely to engage in that task/behavior to obtain the outcome (Eccles & Wigfield, 2002). Further, Harder (1991) has demonstrated that high valence outcomes (high salaries) affect behavioral choices, motivation, and performance. Schmidt and Dolis (2009) suggest that valence is important as it may amplify or attenuate the effects of expectancy. Furthermore, Diefendorff & Chandler (2011) have also suggested that valence helps to determine the value of a course of action. Therefore, the value that individuals place on intrinsic or extrinsic rewards may influence whether an individual believes that presenteeing is a valuable course of action to engage in when ill.

Chiang and Jang (2008) have demonstrated construct validity evidence for extrinsic and intrinsic valence components. In a presenteeism context, extrinsic valence refers to the value that an ill individual places on an extrinsic reward. An example of extrinsic valence in this setting is
an ill individual valuing gaining a pay increase. Intrinsic valence refers to the value that an employee places on an intrinsic reward when ill, such as an ill employee valuing the challenge of working when sick. Therefore, an individual may perceive presenteeism as having intrinsic and extrinsic reward-outcomes and may value them differently. Again, the intrinsic components may have a greater influence on presenteeism as intrinsic rewards are self-set and potentially delivered more immediately, therefore increasing their importance to work motivation (Wahba & House, 1974). Finally, in an exploratory nature, expectancy theory and social exchange theory will be tested in a single model to explain the relative importance of incentive or reciprocity-based motives for presenteeism.

Hypothesis 8: Extrinsic valence is related to the intent to presentee

Hypothesis 9: Intrinsic valence is related to the intent to presentee

Methods

Sample and Procedure

As the purposes of the current study did not require experimental conditions and/or a student population, the initial challenge was to recruit working subjects. In recent years, Psychological research has received broader access to nationally representative work samples through online recruitment services. Amazon’s Mechanical Turk (MTurk) presented an alternative method to recruit a large sample of U.S. based individuals that could complete the different measurement scales. Various studies across the Industrial-Organizational literature have successfully used MTurk samples to determine both theoretical and applied findings (Mason & Suri, 2012; Woo, Keith, & Thornton, 2015).
In order to use MTurk for survey research, a researcher (a “Requester”) establishes an account on MTurk.com and links a form of tender to pay participants. In this study, the survey was uploaded on another web platform (Qualtrics), and then this link was published on MTurk. Therefore, MTurk referred the subjects to another website, and this is considered an “embedded.” Informed consent and information about the study were hosted on Qualtrics, and any participant was asked to complete this before beginning the survey. Once the survey link has been attached, a researcher sets different requirements for potential MTurk respondents (Workers). For instance, in this study there was a country requirement (based in U.S.). Additionally, a researcher can add other qualifiers such as the level of worker. A MTurk Master Worker is a designation for those workers who have a high approval rating that signals their successful completion of past MTurk surveys. This sample was comprised of Master Workers and the MTurk filter only permitted master workers to search for this study’s survey. The later stage is the process of compensation. If the participants began the study they were paid $.75. This compensation was determined via the length of the study and how this has been linked to MTurk survey completion.

As noted previously, the study sample comes from Amazon Mechanical Turk and comprised an initial sample of 210 Master Workers from the United States. After cleaning the data for random/non-responding, significant univariate outliers, and multivariate outliers on the main criterion (expectancy and perceived organizational support measures), the sample was reduced to 163 participants. 19 responses were removed for random/non-responding, 11 responses were removed as univariate outliers, and 17 responses were removed as multi-variate outliers. Of these 163 participants, 63.1% (n=101) were male and 36.2% (n=59) were female. Three individuals did not indicate their gender. Age ranged from 19 (n=1) to 69 (n=1) years of
age with the majority of the sample in their mid 20s to mid 30’s (84% of the sample between 24-48. Demographically, the sample included White (n=119), African-American (n=13), Asian (n=13), Hawaiian (n=7), and Hispanic subjects (n=11). There was no significant difference between races in their intent to presentee, $F (4) = 1.39, p=.239$. All results should be carefully considered in regards to the low N for non-White populations. Although when the non-white populations were grouped together, there was still not a significant difference between white and non-white participants and their intent to presentee, $t(154) = -1.28, p=.203$.

Finally, 63% of the sample considered themselves to be salaried employees, and 79% of the sample considered themselves to work between 35-50 hours a week. Therefore, this adequately sampled the “full-time” worker. This was supported by conducting a t-test between part time (34 hours) and salaried (35 hours and above) on the intent to presentee (the main DV). Although three people did not indicate their employment status, there was not a significant difference in the scores for part-time (m=12.58, SD = 4.26) and full-time (M=11.42, SD=4.31), on the intent to presentee, $t (158) = -1.60, p=.110$. Therefore, workers in the sample did not significantly differ based on part or full time designation and all individuals’ data were used in the analysis of the intent to presentee.

**Measures**

The expectancy theory components (expectancy, instrumentality, valence) were measured using the entire Chiang and Jang’s (2008) expectancy measure scale, which were then adapted to measure presenteeism. Using the measures allowed for separation of the instrumentality and valence scales into extrinsic and intrinsic subcomponents. Chiang and Jang’s (2008) scale was adapted from previous research investigating expectancy theory (Gavin, 1970; Ilgen & Nebecker, 1981; Sanchez, Truxillo, & Bauer, 2000; Matsui & Ohtuska, 1978; Reinhart &
Wahba, 1975). All expectancy theory components were measured on a 7-point scale ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree and all the items are located in Appendix A.

**Expectancy.** Expectancy was measured using four items that focused on individuals’ performance expectations during hypothetical instances of illness. The original items (e.g. if I work very hard, my job performance will significantly improve) were adapted to fit presenteeism. For example, the item was modified to “If I work when I’m sick, my job performance will remain consistent/my productivity will improve significantly.” In adapting the items, I attempted to retain the ethos of the original expectancy items in that the participant would expect their effort to lead to a certain level of performance outcome. The coefficient alpha for the scale was .83.

**Extrinsic instrumentality.** Extrinsic instrumentality was measured using five items that tapped into the belief that if one meets one’s performance expectations, he/she will receive an extrinsic reward (i.e. pay, bonuses, promotion). Each item had the same stem, “Performing well in my job when I’m sick will definitely result in me…” The extrinsic instrumentality items ended with 1) getting good pay, 2) monetary bonuses, 3) pay increases, 4) having more opportunities for promotion, 5) being noticed for the work that I do. Extrinsic instrumentality had a scale reliability of α = .937.

**Intrinsic instrumentality.** Intrinsic instrumentality was measured using four items that tapped into the belief that if one met his/her performance expectations, he/she would receive an intrinsic reward (i.e. taking on more challenging work, having feelings of accomplishment, feeling good about oneself). The intrinsic items began with the stem, “Performing well in my job when I’m sick will definitely result in me…” The items ended with 1) having more responsibility and control over my job, 2) getting more challenging work tasks, 3) having
feelings of accomplishment, and 4) having feelings of personal growth and development. Intrinsic instrumentality had a scale reliability of $\alpha = .902$.

**Extrinsic valence.** Extrinsic valence was measured using *five items* that tapped into the value that an individual places an extrinsic reward. Extrinsic valence items used the stem, “On a scale of 1-7, I value…” The extrinsic items ended with, 1) Good pay/salary/wage, 2) more monetary bonuses, 3) more pay increases, 4) opportunities for advancement/promotion, 5) being noticed for the work that I do. The scale reliability for extrinsic valence was $\alpha = .873$.

**Intrinsic valence.** Intrinsic valence was measured using *four items* that tapped into the value that individual places an intrinsic reward. Intrinsic valence items used the stem, “On a scale of 1-7, I value…” The extrinsic items ended with, 1) More responsibility/control over job, 2) more challenging work tasks, 3) feelings of accomplishment, and 4) feelings of personal growth and development. Intrinsic valence had a scale reliability of $\alpha = .840$.

**Perceived Organizational Support (POS).** I used Eisenberger and colleagues’ (1986) short form POS scale. POS was measured using eight items on a 5-point scale, ranging from *strongly disagree* to *strongly agree*. POS refers to whether an employee feels that he/she is valued by their organization. One example of an item is, “The organization really cares about my well-being.” The reliability of the POS scale for this sample was $\alpha = .906$

**Felt obligation.** Felt obligation refers to, “An employee’s perceptions of their emotional attachment to or identification with their organization” (McMillan & Albrecht, 2005). I used the felt obligation scale from Eisenberger and colleagues’ (2001) study but adapted some of the items for the present research. Felt obligation was measured using five items. Two items from the original scale: *I would take time from my personal schedule to help the ___ if it needed my help* and *I owe it to the organization to do what I can to ensure that the organization's customers*
are well-served and satisfied were removed for the purposes of this study. Both items did not fit the context of studying presenteeism decisions. For instance, using “personal schedule” does not coincide with presenteeism coinciding with decisions regarding regular work attendance. Also, “serving customers” was deemed too specific to occupation, which might result in occupation influencing the responses patterns. The retained items asked the respondents to agree or disagree with statements like, “I really feel like this organization’s problems are my own.” The felt obligation scale reliability was $\alpha = .704$.

**Intent to presentee.** Finally, three items were used to measure the intent to presentee that addressed an individual’s future intention(s) to attend and/or put forth effort towards work when ill. The item stems were adapted from Chiang and Jang (2008), but the items endings were based in the Theory of Planned behavior (Ajzen, 1991; Francis, Eccles, Johnston, Walker, Grimshaw, & Foy, 2004). The stems began with, “Over the coming year…”. The intent to presentee items were as follows…1) *I expect to attend work when I am sick*, 2) *I want to be highly involved in my job on the days that I am sick*, 3) *I intend to expend full effort towards my work on days that I am sick*. The scale reliability of the intent to presentee scale was $\alpha = .880$.

As many of the scales were adapted, construct validity was investigated using confirmatory factor analyses (CFA). The factor analyses, described in the results, provided the researcher with insight into determining factor structure and what items had the highest factor loadings. Certain items were removed due to poor loadings, also listed in results, and the previously listed scale reliabilities reflect the modified scales’ alphas. All scale reliabilities met the standard for “Good to Excellent” internal consistency except for felt obligation which was “Acceptable.” (George & Mallery, 2003). Finally, the remaining items were formed into scale
means to conduct a path analysis with exogenous (Expectancy, POS) and endogenous (felt obligation and the intent to presentee) variables.

**Results**

**Confirmatory Factor Analyses**

Confirmatory factor analyses (CFA) were conducted in AMOS 23 software to provide construct validity for the adapted expectancy measures. This study included CFA procedures with maximum likelihood estimation using IBM’s AMOS software. I used the CFA to estimate a measurement model, in which each measurement item loaded onto its respective construct. Two CFAs (social exchange and expectancy) were conducted separately for parsimony (Anderson and Gerbing, 1988). The measurement loadings onto their constructs are presented in Appendix A.

A CFA was conducted for the social exchange Theory components of the model (POS, felt obligation, and the intent to presentee). The initial model fit indices were as follows: $\chi^2 = 269.56$, $df = 87$, $\chi^2/df = 3.098$, RMSEA = .105, CFI = .902, NFI = .863, GFI = .819. The large RMSEA and $\chi^2/df$ and lower GFI and NFI suggested that the model was a poor fit for the data. To improve model fit, items were removed due to high standardized residual covariances above .4 (2.58 on an absolute scale) (Li-tze & Bentler, 1999). For POS, the negatively worded items, “The organizational fails to appreciate an extra effort from me”, “The organization would ignore any complaint from me”, “Even if I did the best job possible, the organizational would fail to notice”, and “The organizational shows very little concern for me” had high residual covariances. The model was revised with these items removed. Felt obligation was also in the model and items 3, “I have an obligation to the organization to ensure that I provide high-quality work,” and item 5, “I feel that the only obligation I have to the organization is to fulfil the minimum requirements of my job (reversed coded and below .5 loading),” were dropped.
Therefore, the felt obligation scale included items 1, 2, and 4 and all of the reverse coded items were dropped. The reliabilities of the improved scales were assessed and are presented in Appendix A. The revised model demonstrated good fit, and the fit indices were as follows: $\chi^2 = 46.98$, $\chi^2/df = 1.468$, RMSEA = .05, CFI = .99, NFI = .957, GFI = .96. These indices indicated good improvement and acceptable levels of fit.

The initial model fit indices for expectancy theory CFA were as follows: $\chi^2 = 914.56$ df = 260, $\chi^2/df = 3.518$, RMSEA = .115, CFI = .83, NFI = .782, GFI = .681. The large RMSEA and $\chi^2/df$ and low CFI, GFI, and NFI suggested that the model was a poor fit for the data. To create a better fitting model, items were removed from the expectancy theory scales due to high standardized residual covariances above .4 (2.58 on an absolute scale) to remove discrepancies between the proposed and estimated model (Li-tze & Bentler, 1999). For expectancy, item 1, “If I work when I’m sick, my job performance will remain consistent”, and item 4, “If I put more effort into my job when I’m sick, I will achieve my work goals”, were dropped. For extrinsic instrumentality, item 5 “Being noticed for the work I do”, was dropped. For intrinsic valence, item 3, “Have feelings of accomplishment” and item 4, “Having feelings of personal growth and development” were dropped. For extrinsic valence, items 4, “Opportunities for advancement/promotion” and 5, “being noticed for the work that I do”, were dropped. For intrinsic valence, items 2, “more challenging work tasks”, and 4, “feelings of personal growth and development”, were dropped. As a result, expectancy included two items (2 and 3), extrinsic instrumentality included four items (1, 2, 3, 4), intrinsic instrumentality included two items (1 and 2), extrinsic valence included three items (1, 2, 3), intrinsic valence included two items (1 and 3), and the intent to presentee included three items (1, 2, and 3). The revised model demonstrated good fit, and the fit indices were as follows: $\chi^2 = 172.66$ df = 136, $\chi^2/df = 1.940$, ...
RMSEA = .07, CFI = .96, NFI = .925, GFI = .90. These indices indicated good improvement and acceptable levels of fit.

**Descriptive Analysis**

The mean scores for each measurement item, indicating the magnitude of respondent perception, are presented in Table 1.

Table 1

*Descriptive Statistics of Measurement Items*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurement Item</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Expectancy1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Expectancy2</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Expectancy3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Expectancy4</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Extrinsic Instrumentality1</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>1.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Extrinsic Instrumentality2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Extrinsic Instrumentality3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Extrinsic Instrumentality4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Extrinsic Instrumentality5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Intrinsic Instrumentality1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Intrinsic Instrumentality2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Intrinsic Instrumentality3</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>1.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Intrinsic Instrumentality4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Extrinsic Valence1</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Extrinsic Valence2</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Extrinsic Valence3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Extrinsic Valence4</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Extrinsic Valence5</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Intrinsic Valence1</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Intrinsic Valence2</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Intrinsic Valence3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Intrinsic Valence4</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. POS1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>.899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. POS2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. POS3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. POS4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. POS5</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. POS6</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. POS7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. POS8</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Feltobligation1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 displays the interrelations between the intent to presentee and the other variables on interest in this study. Generally, the participants indicated that they there were relationships between their intent to presentee and expectancy and social exchange Theory as there were significant correlations between expectancy (.453) extrinsic Instrumentality (.429), intrinsic instrumentality (.467) and the intent to presentee. For social exchange, POS and felt obligation correlated .62, which was large for the literature but an expected positive correlation (Eisenberger et al., 2001). Finally, POS and felt obligation correlated -.109 and .164 with the intent to presentee respectively.

Table 2
Cronbach’s alphas, and Correlations of the measures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>α</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Intent to Presentee</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Perceived</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Felt Obligation</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td>.62**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Expectancy</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.45**</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Extrinsic</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.45**</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.43**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumentality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Intrinsic</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.49**</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.48**</td>
<td>.76**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumentality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Extrinsic Valence</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>-.29**</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Intrinsic Valence</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>-.31**</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.57**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *p<.05, **p <.01.
Structural Model (Path Analysis)

Path analysis was conducted using AMOS 23.0 software and evaluated the speculated relationships between expectancy theory, social exchange theory (POS and felt obligation), and the motivation (intent) to presentee. A full multivariate model was necessary to determine the nature of these antecedents when in the same model (Figure 1). Goodness of fit indices indicated the overall fit of the structural model which included expectancy, extrinsic/intrinsic instrumentality, extrinsic/intrinsic valence, perceived organizational support, felt obligation, and the intent to presentee. All of the fit indices demonstrated acceptable levels of model fit. \( \chi^2 = 10.862 \) df = 5, \( \chi^2/df = 2.172 \), RMSEA = .08, CFI = .99, NFI = .98, NNFI = .93, GFI = .98. Values for NFI, NNFI, GFI, and CFI range from 0-1 when comparing the hypothesized model to the independent model, and values greater than .90 indicate acceptable fitting data. RMSEA values less than or equal to .08 indicate adequate fit (Kline, 2004).

Also, in SEM, correlations between variables above .9 may indicate multi-collinearity. In the present study, the highest correlation was between job extrinsic and intrinsic instrumentality (r = .766), indicating that multi-collinearity is most likely not an issue (Lissitz, 2009). The estimated standardized path coefficients were used to examine the hypotheses. The standardized path coefficients and their significances are summarized in Table 3. The pathways in the social exchange perspective indicated replication of the POS literature in which POS positively relates to felt obligation (Arshadi, 2011; Eisenberger et al., 2001). Hypothesis 1, which stated that POS predicted the intent to presentee was supported as the bivariate correlation was nonsignificant, r = -.101, p = .201. Hypothesis 2, which stated that POS positively related to felt obligation, was supported, \( \beta = .674, p < .001 \). Hypothesis 3, which stated that felt obligation positively predicts the intent to presentee, was not supported, \( \beta = .086, p > .05 \).
Figure 1: Bold paths indicate supported hypotheses. Dashed paths indicate unsupported hypotheses.
Therefore, hypothesis 4, which stated felt obligation mediates the relationship between POS and the intent to presentee was not supported, as POS had a significant negative direct effect on the intent to presentee while felt obligation did not in the structural model. Standardized path coefficients, absolute t-values, and significance levels for Figure 1 (N=163)

Table 3

*Standardized path coefficients, absolute t-values, and significance levels for Figure 1 (N=163)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter Estimate</th>
<th>Standardized Path Coefficients</th>
<th>Absolute t-Value</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Hypothesis Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Organization Support → Intent to Presentee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Organizational Support → Felt Obligation</td>
<td>0.674</td>
<td>11.615</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felt Obligation → Intent to Presentee</td>
<td>0.086</td>
<td>0.997</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectancy → Intent to Presentee</td>
<td>0.341</td>
<td>4.305</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrinsic Instrumentality → Intent to Presentee</td>
<td>0.147</td>
<td>1.444</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic Instrumentality → Intent to Presentee</td>
<td>0.257</td>
<td>2.478</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrinsic Valence → Intent to Presentee</td>
<td>-0.052</td>
<td>0.672</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic Valence → Intent to Presentee</td>
<td>0.214</td>
<td>2.588</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:***p<.001, χ² = 10.862 df = 5, χ²/df = 2.172, RMSEA = .08, CFI = .99, NFI = .98, NNFI = .93, GFI = .98. NS = Not supported.*

Based on the results some of the expectancy theory paths/hypotheses were supported.

Hypothesis 5, which stated that expectancy predicts the intent to presentee, was supported β = .341, p<.001. Hypothesis 6, which stated that extrinsic instrumentality would predict the intent to presentee, was not supported, β = .147, p>.05, Hypothesis 7, which stated that intrinsic instrumentality predicts the intent to presentee, was supported, β = .257, p<.05, Hypothesis 8,
which stated that extrinsic valence predicts the intent to presentee, was not supported, $\beta = -0.052$, $p > 0.05$. Hypothesis 9, which stated that intrinsic valence predicts the intent to presentee, was supported $\beta = 0.214$, $p < 0.05$. The results did not differ when the social exchange and expectancy pathways were tested as individual theories in separate path models.

**Discussion**

The purpose of this study was to investigate the relevant contributions of constructs from two psychological theories in explaining presenteeism. Prior presenteeism research has rarely attempted to provide theoretical explanations for the behavior and contains potential operationalization and/or measurement issues (Johns, 2011). This research used expectancy theory and social exchange theory to explain the motivations for presenteeism behavior. Also, to improve upon prior research, I used behavioral intentions and operationalized presenteeism as, “the intent to attend and/or put forth an effort towards work when ill,” in order to circumvent criterion issues when using measures that collect “objective” (i.e. productivity) or self-report measures of prior presenteeism behavior. The findings of this study have implications for determining future presenteeism behavior.

The results of the study supported none of the social exchange and some of the expectancy theory explanations for individuals’ intent to presentee. First, using confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) provided validity evidence for the measures adapted from past expectancy measures (Chiang & Jang, 2008), Ajzen’s behavioral intentions (Ajzen, 1991), and a new intent to presentee measure. Although, using CFA demonstrated that the scales needed to be narrowed as items were dropped from the adapted and established scales for better fitting models, which included eliminating all the reversed coded items. Second, the results of the social exchange Theory explanations for the intent to presentee were mixed. Perceived organizational support
(POS) had a non-significant negative effect on individuals’ intent to presentee. While this was not directly hypothesized, it is interesting in that it suggests that higher levels of POS may lead to lower levels of presenteeism behavior even when research does not use an objective criterion (i.e. productivity). While the finding is non-significant, it is unique as it as it was found using Eisenberger’s POS inventory which has not been previously used to relate POS to presenteeism or the intention to presentee. This result is also further evidence for the negative relationship between POS and presenteeism as seen in the literature (Chen et al., 2015, Yang et al., 2015). This possibly indicates that people do not feel obligated to presentee when their organizational demonstrates they value them.

A recent meta-analysis, further supported the negative relationships between support and presenteeism as the authors demonstrated that collegial and supervisor support led to lower levels of presenteeism. The authors posit that supportive environments coincide with employees having the perception that supervisors or organizations (policies) convey that sickness absence is an acceptable practice, and suggested support has indirect effects on presenteeism rates by buffering work strain and preventing illnesses (Miraglia & Johns, 2016). This could suggest that employees potentially perceive that the organization would rather have them stay home and conveys a lack of pressure to attend work when sick. Therefore, future research on the POS-presenteeism relationship should determine whether the negative relationship is an artifact of perceived leniency in formal or informal sickness absence policies rather than reciprocity norms.

Furthermore, the hypothesized relationships for a felt obligation-intent to presenteeism relationship, and felt obligations’ role in mediating the POS-intent to presenteeism relationship were not supported. While POS and felt obligation did significantly relate, this research was unable to replicate Eisenberger’s model in which felt obligation mediated the relationship
between POS and performance and commitment (Rhoades et al., 2001; Eisenberger et al., 1991). This research suggests that when POS and felt obligation are both present, felt obligation fails to have a direct effect or mediate a POS-intent to presentee relationship. Still, the bivariate correlation between felt obligation and presenteeism was significant, which suggests that felt obligation (i.e. reciprocity norms) may predict the intent to presentee. It is possible that felt obligation taps into intrinsic rewards, but when entered in the same model with intrinsic instrumentality and valence, the latter two are the more dominant predictors. Finally, the result could be a measurement issue as the felt obligation scale marginally achieved acceptable reliability at .70. As the social exchange hypotheses were not supported, this suggests a mixed result with respect to reciprocity norms explaining individuals’ intent to presentee.

With respect to expectancy theory, the results demonstrated that the three major components expectancy (the belief that performing presenteeism when ill will lead to job performance), instrumentality (belief that they will receive a reward for presenteeing), and valence (value on the reward or outcome) significantly related to the intent to presentee. Further, splitting instrumentality and valence into extrinsic (external motivation) and intrinsic (internal motivation) components also proved insightful when predicting the intent to presentee. When instrumentality and valence were divided into intrinsic and extrinsic components, the results depicted an interesting narrative in that only the intrinsic motivation forces (expectancy, intrinsic instrumentality, intrinsic valence), significantly predicted the intent to presentee.

In support of previous research, this suggests that intrinsic motives better predict performance and behavior, as is the case for the intent to presentee (Cerasoli et al., 2014; Chiang & Jang, 2008). This suggests that when individuals consider presenteeing, they may be more strongly motivated by an intrinsic process and rewards. Research suggests that such intrinsic
motives may be stronger motivators as they are more proximal to individuals self-set goals/standards and their perceptions of control, which have also been shown to be important antecedents for presenteeism (Johns, 2009). This logic supports the findings of this study as the items comprising the final intrinsic instrumentality/valence measures focused on an individuals’ self-set challenges and control over work. Finally, when comparing the expectancy and social exchange explanations for the intent to presentee, the intrinsic components had more of an effect than POS. Therefore, this suggests that when individuals consider presenteeing, intrinsic rewards may be a stronger motivational force than individual’s desire to reciprocate their perceived value.

The findings of this study have practical implications. As presenteeism has been shown to be important to individual and organizational well-being, most organizations should likely attempt to reduce the behavior in their organizations (Karimi, Cheng, Bartram, Leggat, & Sarkeshik, 2015). As POS is negatively linked with the intent to presentee, one potential strategy to reduce presenteeism would be for organizations and representatives of the organization to provide a supportive environment with regards to sickness and absence. Support could be presented in flexible working arrangements and/or leniency in sick policy as well as the potential reduction of work demands to reduce work strain (Jourdain & Vézina, 2013; Miraglia & Johns, 2016).

Also, the findings on expectancy theory suggest that an organization may attempt to reduce presenteeism behaviors by targeting intrinsic motivation. Organizations may potentially wish to frame sickness attendance as potentially harmful to ones’ control and individual/group level goals in the workplace. Furthermore, Eisenberger (1990), suggests that POS may have a direct effect on reward-expectancies by signaling trust in reward delivery. Therefore, organizations should be cognizant of how increased levels of POS may potentially lead to
rewards expectations that may motivate individuals to presentee. Thus, this is another area of potential future research to determine whether POS and expectancy components interact during presenteeism decision-making.

**Limitations**

This study was not without its limitations. First, the data was collected in a cross-sectional fashion using self-report data at one time point. The results of this study only provided a snapshot into the explanations for presenteeism decisions, and therefore only demonstrated initial evidence for casual, theoretical explanations. Also, self-report measures were used and such methods have been shown to be prone to some errors in measurement (Paulhus & Vazire, 2007). This data was only captured at one time-point, so the results of this study do not necessarily hold over time and may exclude other contextual variables. For instance, presenteeism decision-making might change with individual maturation (i.e. the development or reduction of illness) or changes in organizational (i.e. policy or support) (Johansson & Lundberg, 2004). Future research should attempt to provide support for theoretical explanations for presenteeism over various time points, and potentially use a combination of methodologies. (i.e. self-report, daily dairy, objective measures).

Second, while Amazon Mechanical Turk (MTurk) data has been shown to be valid for a variety of studies, using MTurk may have inhibited the generalizability of the results (Woo et al., 2015). MTurk samples from a heterogeneous sample and many of the participants work in different industries, hold different occupations, and therefore have different motivations when answering the self-report data. Although occupation data was collected, it was not analyzed or used as a control variable in this initial research. Therefore, it is difficult to say that there are not specific industry or occupational factors that may influence the generalizability of these results.
Theoretically, some industries and jobs may provide different environments that provide different levels of support and/or intrinsic rewards. Therefore, future research should attempt to investigate differences in presenteeism explanations for individuals in different industries or occupations, and other variables that may factor into presenteeism decisions.

Third, this research used a confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) to identify evidence for adapted expectancy theory measures and for a presenteeism intention measure. Although the final model demonstrated good fit in a variety of fit indices, the sample size for the CFA was conducted with a lower sample size than the recommended 200 participants (Wolf, Harrington, Clark, & Miller 2013). As the final sample size was 163, the results of this study should be considered carefully, especially with consideration to the distinction between the intrinsic and extrinsic VIE components. Some of the items that were dropped from the extrinsic, intrinsic instrumentality and valence components mirrored each other in their content.

While statistical procedures indicated a need to drop the items, eliminating the items may have altered the content of the scales, and therefore the construct measured. Therefore, this may serve as evidence that in this sample, the intrinsic, extrinsic VIE constructs may not be as discriminate as proposed and that the sample was not large enough to capture a meaningful discrimination between the dimensions. As a result, this study should be considered an exploratory pilot for the adapted measures. Therefore, future research should attempt to replicate the findings from the CFA and structural equation modeling using similar measures on a different, larger sample to increase the evidence for validity and reliability of the measures.

Other directions for future presenteeism research should make use of Johns (2011) framework and attempt to build theoretical, casual explanations for the antecedents in conceptual model. For instance, attempting to explain the causal relationships between other work attitudes
(i.e. justice) and employee’s motive to presentee. Additionally, future research could consider other contexts to view presenteeism decision making. For instance, in the context of self-care, researchers might examine if presenteeism is part of a decision-making process that inhibits individuals’ choices about their own health and well-being. Finally, it might be useful to extend presenteeism research into work-family life conflict/balance research areas as presenteeism rates may be influenced by positive or negative events at home and/or those individuals residing within an employees’ home. Overall, as the presenteeism literature is small it provides an area where researchers can expand the current literature through novel research.

**Conclusions**

Presenteeism has not been widely studied in the Industrial-Organizational literature and there are many important questions yet to be answered when discussing the causal relationships between identified antecedents and this behavior. In this study, evidence was found for different theoretical explanations for presenteeism. The results demonstrated that perceived organizational support (POS) was unrelated to the intent to presentee, while intrinsic components of expectancy theory positively predict the same behavior. As felt obligation and extrinsic components did not predict the intent to presentee in the model, this research suggests that presenteeism behavior may be strongly intrinsically motivated. Finally, as both POS and intrinsic motives were significant in the same model, this research suggests that presenteeism decisions are dynamic may encompass tenets of different motivational theories.
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## Appendix A: Items and CFA Results

### Confirmatory Factor Analysis 1

1. **Perceived Organizational Support**
   - The organization values my contribution to its well-being. 0.77  0.88
   - The organization fails to appreciate any extra effort from me. R 0.77
   - The organization would ignore any complaint from me. R 0.77
   - The organization really cares about my well-being. 0.82
   - Even if I did the best job possible, the organization would fail to notice. R 0.79
   - The organization cares about my general satisfaction at work. 0.83
   - The organization shows very little concern for me. R 0.83
   - The organization takes pride in my accomplishments at work 0.82

2. **Felt Obligation**
   - I feel a personal obligation to do whatever I can to help the organization achieve its goal. 0.76  0.70
   - I owe it to the organization to give 100% of my energy to the organization's goals while I am at work. 0.84
   - I have an obligation to the organization to ensure that I produce high-quality work. R 0.76
   - I would feel guilty if I did not meet the organization’s performance standards 0.78
   - I feel that the only obligation I have to the organization is to fulfill the minimum requirements of my job. R 0.49

### Confirmatory Factor Analysis 2

3. **Expectancy**
   - If I work when I’m sick, my job performance will remain consistent. R 0.75
   - If I work when I’m sick, I will get a lot more accomplished. 0.72
   - If I put more effort into my job when I’m sick, my productivity will improve significantly. 0.75
   - If I put more effort into my job, when I’m sick, I will achieve my work goals. R 0.78

4. **Extrinsic Instrumentality:** *(Performing well in my job when I'm sick will definitely result in me...)* 0.94
   - Getting good pay/salary/wage. 0.90
   - Getting monetary bonuses. 0.85
   - Getting pay increases. 0.89
   - Having more opportunities for promotion. 0.91
Being noticed for the work that I do. R 0.78

5. **Intrinsic Instrumentality:** *(Performing well in my job when I'm sick will definitely result in me...)* 0.90
   - Having more responsibility and control over my job. 0.80
   - Getting more challenging work tasks. 0.80
   - Having feelings of accomplishment. R 0.87
   - Having feelings of personal growth and development. R 0.87

6. **Extrinsic Valence:** *(On a scale of 1-7 I value...)* 0.87
   - Good pay/salary/wage 0.80
   - More monetary bonuses. 0.77
   - More pay increases. 0.78
   - Opportunities for advancement/promotion. 0.74
   - Being noticed for the work that I do. R 0.71

7. **Intrinsic Valence:** *(On a scale of 1-7 I value...)* 0.84
   - More responsibility/control over job 0.81
   - More challenging work tasks R 0.69
   - Feelings of accomplishment 0.90
   - Feelings of personal growth and development R 0.92

8. **Intent to Presentee:** *(Over the coming year...)* 0.88
   - I expect to attend work when I am sick. 0.81
   - I want to be highly involved in my job on the days that I am sick. 0.79
   - I intend to expend full effort towards my work on days that I am sick. 0.94

*Note:* R denotes items that were removed due to low loadings or high error. Alpha levels are for scales with items removed.