



**MOUNTAIN TOP UNIVERSITY**

**JOURNAL OF**

**HUMANITIES,  
MANAGEMENT AND  
SOCIAL SCIENCES**

Volume 3 Number 1

December 2023

ISSN: 2659 1677

**JHUMASS**



**MOUNTAIN TOP UNIVERSITY**

**JOURNAL OF HUMANITIES,  
MANAGEMENT AND  
SOCIAL SCIENCES  
(MTU-JHUMASS)**

Volume 3 Number 1

December 2023

**MOUNTAIN TOP UNIVERSITY  
JOURNAL OF HUMANITIES,  
MANAGEMENT AND SOCIAL SCIENCES  
(MTU-JHUMASS)  
Volume 3 Number 1**

© December, 2023

Published by College of Humanities,  
Management and Social Sciences,  
Mountain Top University,  
MFM Prayer City,  
Lagos-Ibadan Expressway,  
Ogun State, Nigeria

Book Design by  
Kehinde H. Shobukonla  
Department of Fine and Applied Arts,  
Mountain Top University

ISSN: 2659-1677

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, serialised, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form without the prior permission of the publisher.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Financing Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) through Laffer Curve: Evidence from SDGs 2030 Threshold Analysis in Nigeria. <i>Oluwatosin O. Oluyomi, Stephen O. Obasa, Ohusegun R. Daisi.</i>	11
2. Presenteeism and Employees' Performance: Empirical Evidence from Lagos State Ministry of Health, Nigeria. <i>Ugochukwu D. Abasilim, Ohuwatumininu O. Adebajo.</i>	44
3. A Conversational Analysis of Students' Interactions in a Nigerian University. <i>Anana Mariam.</i>	71
4. Socio-economic Implications of Christmas Festival in Lagos State, Nigeria. <i>Grace Olayinka Gbenle.</i>	99
5. Corporate Governance Quality and Earnings Management in Troubled Non-Listed Companies in Nigeria. <i>Taleatu, T. Akinwumi.</i>	139
6. Appropriating Talent and Skills in the Music Artistry of the Yorùbá People, South West, Nigeria. <i>Bayo O' Yemi.</i>	162
7. A Historical and Musicological Study of Oge Amaenu Ensemble of Ugwulangwu Traditional Society in Igbo Culture. <i>Victor C. Chukwu.</i>	176
8. Key Audit Matters and Quality of Audit Report in Lagos State Nigeria. <i>Joshua A., Adesina K. &amp; Tomomewo A.</i>	194
9. English Language, SDGs and Development: the Nigerian Experience. <i>Jibowo A.V., Omotoso S.</i>	216
10. Enhancing Public Service Delivery through Total Quality Management: Reflection on Japan and Nigeria. <i>Stephen O. Obasa, Ajibola Patience.</i>	237



*Chapter*

**2**

**Presenteeism and Employees'  
Performance: Empirical  
Evidence from Lagos State  
Ministry of Health, Nigeria**

**Ugochukwu D. Abasilim**

Postdoctoral Research Fellow

Political and Governance Policy Department

Nigerian Institute of Social and Economic Research,  
Ibadan, Oyo State, Nigeria

&

Department of Political Science and International Relations  
Covenant University,

Ota, Ogun State, Nigeria

[ugochukwu.abasilim@covenantuniversity.edu.ng](mailto:ugochukwu.abasilim@covenantuniversity.edu.ng)

**Oluwatumininu O. Adebajo**

Department of Political Science and International Relations  
Covenant University,

Ota, Ogun State, Nigeria

[oluwatumininu.adebajo@stu.cu.edu.ng](mailto:oluwatumininu.adebajo@stu.cu.edu.ng)

## Abstract

*To achieve organisational goals and objectives, presenteeism and employee performance are among the most crucial human resource phenomena to consider. However, since sickness presenteeism is the most common type of presenteeism and receives less attention than voluntary and involuntary presenteeism, there is a knowledge gap regarding the specific kind of presenteeism with the most significant influence. To this end, this study focused on how presenteeism influences employees' performance at the Lagos State Ministry of Health in Nigeria. Data from 362 employees at the Lagos State Ministry of Health in Nigeria was gathered using a cross-sectional survey research design. A structured Standard Presenteeism Scale (SPS), and an Individual Work Performance Questionnaire (IW PQ) were the instruments used for data collection. The Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) 25.0 version was used to analyse the data using regression analysis. According to the results, voluntary presenteeism has an insignificant negative influence on employees' performance ( $\beta = -0.027$ ,  $S.E = 0.087$ ,  $t\text{-calc.} = -0.419$ ,  $p\text{-value} = 0.676$ ,  $p > 0.05$ ). In comparison, involuntary presenteeism significantly negatively influences employees' performance ( $\beta = -0.148$ ,  $S.E = 0.090$ ,  $t\text{-calc.} = -2.331$ ,  $p\text{-value} = 0.020$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ). The results show that between the two presenteeism variables, involuntary presenteeism has a more negative influence on employee performance than voluntary presenteeism. These findings imply that presenteeism, regardless of the form, negatively influences employees' performance. Also, the organisation must avoid the conditions that encourage presenteeism because it serves no useful purpose.*

**Keywords:** Employees' Performance, Nigeria, Personnel Management, Presenteeism, Public Sector

## 1. Introduction

Organizations worldwide, both government and private sectors, comprise of employees who ensure that the goals and objectives of

the organizations are achieved. These goals can only be attained with human resources. This implies that human resources cannot be overlooked irrespective of available factors of production. The importance of having employees present at work is critical because their presence gives room for maximum participation and concentration. This helps to increase their capacity to achieve the tasks given to them (Karanika-Murray & Cooper, 2018). In this regard, organisations try to ensure their employees are present (avoiding absenteeism), not realising that presenteeism is being encouraged. However, the decision to be present at work does not lie in the hands of the employee. The decision of what to do when at work cannot be taken away from an employee. Employees now try their best to make it to work to meet up with these attendance tactics and not necessarily because of the work they want to do.

The concept of presenteeism is gaining popularity because of its immense impact on organisational performance. In the past, the focus has been on absenteeism, but in recent times, presenteeism has become the order of the day as it has taken over absenteeism (Mosteiro-Díaz, Baptista, Baldonado-Mosteiro, Borges, Queirós, Sánchez-Zaballos & Franco-Correia, 2020). This is because in trying to curb absenteeism, presenteeism has become the substitute, which is why the level of presenteeism is on the rise in organisations. Scholars have agreed that presenteeism has become a threat to organisations with its adverse consequences such as employees not meeting up with their tasks and absentmindedness, which leads to a high tendency to make mistakes among others (Ruhle, Breitsohl, Aboagye, Baba, Biron, Correia & Yang, 2020; Shan, Wang, Wang, Guo & Li, 2021). Due to organisational Job demands and the number of tasks to be executed, employees are left with no option but to be at work irrespective of whatever they feel or think. This encourages them to exhibit involuntary presenteeism (Abasilim, Adebajo & Gberevbie, 2022).

On the other hand, some employees do not see the odds as they are personally motivated and self-driven, so they voluntarily engage in presenteeism to get the job done at all costs. However, both



variances of presenteeism have their respective consequences on the individual and the organisations. Studies on presenteeism and employees' performance abound, but existing literature dwelled majorly on sickness presenteeism as it is the most prevalent type of presenteeism (Arjona-Fuentes, Ariza-Montes, Han & Law, 2019; Greden, Garcia-Tosi & Harrington, 2019; Haque, 2021) focusing little on other forms of presenteeism such as the voluntary and involuntary presenteeism (Brouard, 2019) thereby leaving a gap to be filled concerning which particular type of presenteeism influence more on employees' performance. In addition, limited studies (Li, Zhang, Wang & Guo, 2019; Ferreira, da Costa Ferreira, Cooper & Oliveira, 2019; Ruhle et al, 2020) have used government organisations in Nigeria as their study area, and this justified the reason why this study was carried out.

This study will fill the gaps observed, thereby expanding the frontiers of knowledge in this area of research. In line with the preceding, this study focused on how presenteeism (voluntary and involuntary) influences employees' performance at the Lagos State Ministry of Health, Nigeria. The contributions of this study include the following aspects: First, it enriches the research results of the influence of presenteeism on employees' performance in the field of public administration with specific attention to Public Personnel Administration by examining the influence of the sub-variables of presenteeism on employees' performance in the Lagos State Ministry of Health, Nigeria. Also, we proffer some practical suggestions to help solve trending presenteeism and performance issues in the work environment used as the study area.

## **2. Literature Review**

### **2.1 The Concept of Presenteeism**

Scholars have defined presenteeism in various ways, implying differing perspectives on what presenteeism is all about (Mehmet, 2016; Maria, 2018; Kinman & Wray, 2018; Donohoe, 2019). It is frequently used to describe circumstances in which people report to work while ill, jeopardising their health and even operating



below par. According to Mehmet (2016), presenteeism refers to being at work rather than absent. Similarly, Abasilim, Salau & Falola (2015) defined presenteeism as simultaneous presence and absence. According to Lohaus & Habermann (2019), presenteeism is commonly considered the opposite of absenteeism and is described as reporting to work while experiencing a health condition. This means that employees can be present at work but also be absent in the sense that they are not actively engaged in their work, such as when they are working while ill and not at their best (Johns, 2011; Kinman, 2019), or when they are present at their duty station but perform below par (Ospina, Dennett, Jacobs, Waye & Thompson, 2015).

Kinman (2019) bolstered two views on presenteeism. The first is that presenteeism is not always associated with going to work while sick. Instead, it has been used to characterise people who are not sick but come to work and must put in their best effort concerning the organisation's demands. The second point of view is that people stay at work longer than necessary to perform adequately because they want to be on the overtime list. This implies that presenteeism can sometimes be displayed as 'eye service' to give the impression that they are performing when, in fact, they are not. According to Maria (2018), presenteeism is an intentional act because individuals who exhibit it are fully aware of their decision not to be absent but rather choose to show up at work, which may not be evident to people outside the organisation. Kinman & Wray (2018) agreed, stating that presenteeism is an invisible behaviour by employees. Those on the web do not make it obvious; one can only tell if told or performance is measured.

Yildis, Yildis, Zehir, Altindag, Mologlu & Kitapci (2017) revealed in their study that presenteeism had previously been defined in ways that are fixated on productivity loss. This means that presenteeism is highly related to productivity loss. According to Karanika-Murray & Cooper (2018), presenteeism can increase productivity. They consider presenteeism a good thing because it is preferable to being absent. They believe that a person who is

present at his or her place of duty regardless is preferable to a person who is absent at his or her place of duty. Presenteeism manifests in two dimensions, first, as a behavioural approach resulting from job uncertainty caused by the economy's reformation process. This viewpoint regards presenteeism as a behaviour compelled by the current state of the economy, which is unfavourable. Those who have been employed do not want to return to the labour market, resulting in presenteeism. The second technique is the productivity-focused strategy, which determines how various illnesses or medical conditions affect employee output at different work locations (Pohling, Buruck, Jungbauer & Leiter, 2015).

Given the decrease in productivity caused by presenteeism, effectively dealing with it could result in long-term economic benefits for organisations because it harms organisations in terms of productivity loss. Presenteeism must be addressed in the workplace (Yildis, Yildis, Zehir, Altindag, Mologlu & Kitapci, 2017). To put it in another way, if employees continue with presenteeism due to physical or emotional indisposition or uneasiness and refuse to take advantage of recovery opportunities, they may suffer additional pain due to the mounting weariness. Yi & Kim (2020) discovered that presenteeism is negatively related to one's overall health. Attending work while ill may increase workload because efficiency is reduced, increasing the risk of burnout and decreasing satisfaction (Nwosu, Ossai, Onwuasoigwe, Ezeigweneme & Okpamen, 2021). This concept is consistent with the theory of resource conservation, which states that increased job demands cause a loss because they deplete and consume people's resources (Jeong, Kim, Oh, Yoon & Park, 2020). When such failures occur, people devote their resources to adapt successfully. As a result, it was discovered that working while sick is exhausting and that sickness presenteeism prevents the replacement of resources used to overcome the sickness. As a result, the apparent act of diligence that is sickness presenteeism becomes a turnoff and affects their job satisfaction, if not overall

well-being. According to Li et al (2019), employees who had experienced presenteeism frequently described their jobs as stressful and unsatisfying—attending to job expectations while sick degrades an individual's performance due to physical and psychological factors.

## **2.2 Employee Performance**

Several scholars have presented their perspectives on what employee performance means to them. This definition has several dimensions. Employee performance is defined as the monetary or non-monetary product of the employee that is associated with improving the organisation's performance and success (Anitha, 2014). She viewed employee performance in terms of the organisation. In other words, if an employee performs and the performance has no monetary value for the organisation, the employee has not performed. Employee performance refers to how employees complete their tasks and carry out their essential duties (Donohoe, 2019). It refers to the effectiveness and efficiency of their output quality (Pawirosumarto, Katijan & Muchtar, 2016). This is still consistent with Anitha's definition of employee performance. The employee in front of the performance subjects it to organisational goals and objectives. Performance is also part of what is used to assess how valuable and committed an employee is to the organisation.

Employee performance in some manufacturing companies is measured by the quality and quantity of products produced per hour or per day. Individual performance has an impact on the team, which in turn has an impact on organisational performance. When employee performance is poor, it is difficult for the organisation to satisfy their customers, and they begin to see adverse effects on their profits, company reputation, and sales (Inuwa, 2016). Performance refers to a person's overall outcome during specific duty periods, as measured against work standards or criteria. He went on to say that one's abilities, skills, and personal characteristics, as well as job satisfaction and remuneration, all



impact performance. In other words, employee performance is determined by one's ability, desire, and work environment. Employee performance is determined by a variety of personal characteristics that each individual possesses (Pawirosumarto, Katijan & Muchtar 2016). Firms seek top achievers with high qualifications in today's competitive and globalised world. Employee performance is a sensitive issue that has long been a concern in organisational management.

As a result, the goal of every business organisation is to develop effective strategies to encourage people to improve job performance while increasing the organisation's competitiveness (Maetas, Mullen & Rennane, 2021). Employee performance is critical to an organisation's growth and profitability. When employees perform well, they help the organisation achieve its objectives, goals, and profits. Employees are regarded as the most crucial factor of production in an organisation, as they expedite day-to-day activities and operations (Karanika-Murray & Biron, 2020). Similarly, Oluyemi, Adejoke & Deborah (2019) proposed that an organisation's efficiency and effectiveness are measured by the efficacy and efficiency of its personnel, demonstrating the link between employees' effectiveness and efficiency and the organisation's effectiveness and efficiency. This means that if the employees' effectiveness and efficiency are low, so is the organisation. Employers must be able to understand their employees' job satisfaction as it relates to how they will attend to their schedules and daily responsibilities, which significantly impacts employee productivity and performance.

### **2.3 Presenteeism and Employees' Performance: Evidence from Previous Empirical Studies**

Studies on how presenteeism relates to employee performance have attracted far-reaching research interests from various countries. Some research findings had similar and divergent results depending on the work context. Presenteeism, an invisible behaviour, becomes visible through the performance of the



employee exhibiting the behaviour. When people are sick, studies reveal they are much less productive (Barnes, 2016; Gail, 2018; Lohaus & Habermann, 2019; Abasilim, Adebajo & Gberevbie, 2022). They can also endanger others by spreading infection or making blunders that aggravate their health, resulting in a prolonged absence (Cooper & Lu, 2016).

As Karanika-Murray & Cooper (2018) conceived, presenteeism posited that association does not indicate causality. The relationship between productivity loss, and poor health does not necessarily mean that productivity loss will always be the outcome of ill health. An employee might be poor in health and still perform better than a lazy healthy employee. In this scenario, the employee chooses to be at work voluntarily. Voluntary presenteeism can sometimes be beneficial; it is not a type that leads to poor performance. Such definitional ambiguities are troublesome when it comes to quantifying productivity loss because it is tough to determine when work is not getting done in most circumstances, and there are a variety of reasons for lost output that are not related to health; this opens the door to other forms of presenteeism that leads to productivity loss asides sickness.

Li, Zhang, Wang & Guo (2019), amongst other scholars, argued that presenteeism is a significant issue regarding employee productivity. Though it may appear to be a dedication to work (a voluntary act), employees who come to work while ill will be unable to concentrate and carry out their tasks to their best potential. Furthermore, overworked employees, stressed and burnt out, are unlikely to feel encouraged and interested in work. Regardless of their presence in the workplace, they may need to improve their daily responsibilities. As a result, the quality and volume of their work will suffer. Loss of morale can spread to other employees, potentially creating a hostile working environment. Overworked and stressed employees are more likely to make mistakes, which is bad for the company and affects employee motivation and performance (Lohaus & Habermann, 2019). From the preceding, both voluntary and involuntary presenteeism have

adverse effects. However, one might be slightly better than the other, but it does not change the fact that it affects overall productivity.

For Tang, Han, Yang, Zhao & Zhang (2019) argued that a present employee, whether performing or underperforming, is better than an absent one and that some productivity is preferable to no productivity. This is not true, as an absent employee can be replaced by a better one. However, a disappointing employee is like a silent killer, often leading to customer dissatisfaction, which will take a while to correct. Based on this, Oluyemi, Adejoke & Deborah (2019) concluded that someone in the circumstances like this, not feeling sick but feeling obliged to do something else or be somewhere else, will not perform to the level at which they are expected to perform.

In other words, presentees' performance levels fluctuate depending on various individual and circumstantial factors, like the degree of their healthiness or the reasons for their absence or presenteeism (Li, Zhang, Wang & Guo, 2019). However, this affects their ability to be of great performance. Therefore, there is a reason why the correlation between presenteeism (voluntary or involuntary) and employee performance should be of interest. Employees might involve in voluntary presenteeism. Nevertheless, this does not mean they do not suffer the consequences; they might appear productive compared to those exhibiting involuntary presenteeism. However, the pile-up of these consequences might aggravate into something worse. In a similar study, Lohaus & Habermann (2019) concurred that employees working longer hours than required could suffer from burnout, leading to a drop-in performance. Stress and overwork can lead to more mistakes, which is not only bad for businesses but also impacts employee motivation and engagement.

Tang, Han, Yang, Zhao & Zhang (2019) in their study argued that the satisfaction of employees with their job is one major factor why employees would want to exhibit presenteeism voluntarily; once their job satisfaction is affected, they will start engaging in

involuntary presenteeism and most often than not involuntary presenteeism leads to employees scouting for another job which will eventually lead to a high turnover. Their survey discovered that mindfulness and self-efficacy are variable factors affecting an employee's performance during an episode of presenteeism. They also added that health workers in China have incredibly high job stress and inequitable work conditions, which eventually affects their overall performance.

According to Bergstrom, Gustafsson, Aboagye, Marklund, Aronsson, Bjorklund & Leineweber (2020), presenteeism is more widespread among employees who handle people than it is among employees who handle things or symbols, language, code, and signs. Their research indicated that the major cause for presenteeism amongst people dealing with personnel was a desire not to bother their coworkers, demonstrating not just solidarity with coworkers but also the fact that work in this industry is frequently team-oriented. This reason is organisational instigated and leads to involuntary presenteeism. According to their findings, the prevalence of having practised presenteeism four times or more was highest among employees handling people. Employees managing things and symbols gave the most prevalent cause for presenteeism as nobody else could handle my duties, which could imply a high level of specialisation involved in the job and specific work responsibilities and commitments. It was revealed that many employees were involved in involuntary presenteeism, and the organisation can solve the problem by employing more specialised employees in the respective departments.

In another study, Yoshimoto, Oka, Fuji, Nagata & Matsudaira (2020) discovered that the impact of health issues on presenteeism is critical in assisting management in improving job performance. They exposed that sore neck or stiff shoulders, poor sleep, back discomfort, eye difficulties, and depression were the top five health concerns linked to the economic implications of presenteeism. This then becomes a problem because most of these illnesses are inevitable and familiar; they also lead to disengagement from



work, absent-mindedness and loss of interest. They also revealed that mental illnesses like depression, anxiety, headaches, and poor sleep are substantial causes of poor job performance, which may be due to the high occurrence<sup>3</sup> of these symptoms among employees.

However, Ishibashi & Shimura (2020) looked at presenteeism relating to performance from the type of health condition; according to them, some health conditions might not require the employee to be out of work since it can be easily managed and may not drastically affect the employees' performance. At the same time, some, on the other hand, will drastically affect the employees' performance. Also, they revealed that certain age brackets are prone to presenteeism and affect employee performance. To them, employees between the age of 25 to 44 years (middle-aged workers) exhibited presenteeism more. Employees within this category are still at a young age and can still afford many risks. Their study made it clear that not all causes of presenteeism can stop employees from working or lead to poor employee performance; this is partly dependent on the employees themselves.

Chun & Song (2020) found that presenteeism has a significant relationship with job-related stress and resultant turnover intention among occupational therapists in Korea. Presenteeism was substantially linked to workplace stress (involuntary presenteeism), which predicted the likelihood of turnover. They perceived presenteeism as the link between occupational stress and the desire to leave. Being hit with the stress from organisational demands causes much pressure on employees; instead of quitting and becoming jobless once again, they rather stick to presenteeism voluntarily. Furthermore, the sense of organisational support by occupational therapists worked as an essential medium through which presenteeism arbitrated the connection between turnover intention and occupational stress. As a result, they concluded that there is a need to make the most of employee performance by providing managers with insight into



ways of reducing presenteeism with work-related stress and turnover intention among employees in Korea.

In their study in South Korea, Yi & Kim (2020) they opined that presenteeism affects individuals and society negatively. The research observed the causes of presenteeism in South Korean employees, particularly concerning their job performance. They discovered that those with increased presenteeism had the following qualities: shift workers; negative social behaviour and discrimination; high demand for quality work, poor job autonomy, high emotional demands, and high job stress were found to have increased presenteeism. Workers exposed to bad social behaviour had a greater rate of presenteeism in South Korea, with low job independence being the most critical forecaster of presenteeism. The study concluded that giving employees extensive independence in job-related activities might reduce presenteeism and improve performance.

A study by Maestas, Mullen & Rennane (2021) discovered that presenteeism or nonappearance at work indicates that an employee plans to leave the labour field and could be helped by early intervention. They argued that the earlier management begins to identify symptoms of presenteeism or absenteeism, the better for the organisation so the effects do not begin to compound, thereby causing a drastic effect on performance. They analysed the association between nonappearances, presenteeism, and job performance. They discovered that nonappearances and low productivity levels when working ill are very high, and absenteeism and presenteeism are positively correlated. They posited that most reasons for being absent could give room for presenteeism, and this is because of the risk attached to absenteeism. They postulated that those employees with very high absenteeism and presenteeism have an 80% probability of exiting the labour force after three years. The study suggested that workers with high rates of absenteeism could be a starting point for admonishing and preventing presenteeism because presenteeism is usually the second choice for absenteeism.

Haque (2021) went further to conduct a study on the effect presenteeism has on Bangladeshi workers, which looked at the relationship between presenteeism, job fulfilment, and turnover intentions of an employee, as well as the arbitrational role of job satisfaction in the association of presenteeism and employee performance. They stated that when presenteeism negatively impacts employee performance over time, it causes the employee to consider quitting the company, which they called Employee Turnover Intention. Presenteeism and employee performance have been linked in studies. Remarkably, the impact of presenteeism on job performance was found to be reconciled by job satisfaction. They argued that if people are happy with their jobs, the inner motivation to attend work even while sick will be there (voluntary presenteeism). The study also suggested presenteeism being so unfavourable to job satisfaction and employee performance amongst employees in Bangladeshi. Nevertheless, if employees' job satisfaction is appreciated and improved, presenteeism rates can be reduced. Illustrating the impact of presenteeism and its negative consequences on employee motivation.

In another study Abasilim, Adebajo & Gberevbie (2022) found that several factors, including workplace norms, perceptions, pressures, operational requirements, competitive job markets, and increased job demands, account for presenteeism at work. They also found that various factors, including operational demands, competitive job markets, and increased job demands, cause presenteeism. However, the tasks that must be completed must be compatible with the staff's available resources. They held that a balance between job demands and resources was necessary before presenteeism could be addressed. Organisations must also allow for more flexibility in the workplace; thus, managers must provide workers with alternative options besides always being present to accomplish organisational goals.

However, studies on presenteeism have two limitations. The first is the need for more consensus on defining and measuring presenteeism. Most European scholars focus on "ill" and "work"

when discussing the definition of presenteeism, and the majority of them prefer to measure its occurrence (Aronsson Gustafsson & Mellner, 2011). In contrast, American scholars tend to define presenteeism according to the productivity loss that is caused by employees' "ill and still work" and have highlighted the calculation of economic cost (Turpin et al., 2004).

### **3. Methodology**

The study was conducted in the Lagos State Ministry of Health in Ikeja Local Government of Lagos State, Nigeria. The study population comprised all the seven hundred and seventy-one (771) staff in the Lagos State Ministry of Health. The sample size for this study was ascertained using Gill, Johnson & Clark's (2010) sample size determination table, which shows that a population of 771 at 99% confidence level and 5% margin error will yield a minimum sample size of 362 respondents. The simple random sampling technique was used to determine the employees that participated in the study. Data were collected via a well-structured questionnaire administered to the Lagos State Ministry of Health staff to elicit responses from them as it pertains to the subject matter of the study. The Stanford Presenteeism Scale (SPS) developed by Koopman, Pelletier, Murray, Sharda, Berger, Turpin & Bendel (2002) and the Individual Work Performance Questionnaire (IWPQ) by Koopman, Bernards, Hildebrandt, Buuren, Beek & Vet, (2013) were adopted for this study.

The structured questionnaire was partitioned into segments. The first segment asked about the respondent's socio-demographics (gender, age, marital status, highest educational level, employment status and length of service). The second segment contained statements enquiring on the extent to which the staff in the Lagos State Ministry of Health agrees or disagrees with the influence of voluntary and involuntary presenteeism on employee's performance. The questionnaire adopted the Likert scaling model with the exemption of the undecided rating character in the standard scaling method (this is because undecided



has no point attached to it and has no significant impact on the data collected). It was modified to a four-choice variable, that is, Strongly Agree (SA) = 4, Agree (A) = 3, Disagree (D) = 2, and Strongly Disagree (SD) = 1. Three hundred and sixty-two (362) copies of the questionnaire were systematically administered, of which two hundred and seventy-six (276) copies of the useable questionnaire were retrieved.

The total copies of the retrieved useable questionnaire show that the response rate was 76.2%. According to Yousef (2022), a response rate of 50% or more is considered excellent; this justifies that the response rate of 76.2% was deemed suitable for this study. The data collected were analysed using regression analysis using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) 25.0 version.

## 4. Results and Analyses

### 4.1 Test of Hypotheses One

Ho: Presenteeism (voluntary and involuntary) has no influence on employees' performance in Lagos State Ministry of Health.

**Table 1: Parameter Estimates of the Regression Result for the Influence of Presenteeism (voluntary and involuntary) on Employees' Performance in Lagos State Ministry of Health**

Model	Unstandardised Coefficients		Standardised Coefficients		T	Sig.	Collinearity Statistics	
	B	Std. Error	Beta				Tolerance	VIF
(Constant)	11.473	1.257			9.129	0.000		
Voluntary presenteeism	-0.037	0.087	-0.027	-0.419	0.676	0.883	1.132	
Involuntary presenteeism	-0.209	0.090	-0.148	-2.331	0.020	0.883	1.132	

\*Significant at 5% ( $p < 0.05$ ),  $t$ -critical 1.97

The result in Table 1 presents parameter estimates of the regression result for the influence of presenteeism (voluntary and involuntary) on employee performance. The unstandardised regression coefficients of -0.037 and -0.209 were obtained for voluntary and involuntary presenteeism, respectively, meaning



that voluntary and involuntary presenteeism negatively influence employees' performance in the Lagos State Ministry of Health. The standardised regression coefficient of -0.027 and -0.148 was obtained for voluntary and involuntary presenteeism, which indicates that if other variables were held constant, for every 1 unit increase in voluntary presenteeism, employees' performance would decrease by 0.027 and for every 1 unit increase in involuntary presenteeism, employee performance will decrease by 0.148.

The result also reveals that voluntary presenteeism has an insignificant negative influence on employee's performance ( $\beta = -0.027$ , S.E = 0.087, t-calc. = -0.419, p-value = 0.676,  $p > 0.05$ ). In contrast, involuntary presenteeism significantly negatively influences employee performance ( $\beta = -0.148$ , S.E = 0.090, t-calc. = -2.331, p-value = 0.020,  $p < 0.05$ ). The result also indicates that among the two presenteeism variables, involuntary presenteeism has a more negative influence on employees' performance than voluntary presenteeism in the Lagos State Ministry of Health. The F-calculated (3.553) is greater than the F-critical (3.03) at the 0.05 level of significance. The null hypothesis is rejected; hence, presenteeism (voluntary and involuntary) influences employees' performance in the Lagos State Ministry of Health.

#### **4.2 Discussion of Findings**

The study's objective was to investigate how presenteeism (voluntary and involuntary) influences employees' performance in the Lagos State Ministry of Health. The hypothesis tested if presenteeism influences employees' performance in the Lagos State Ministry of Health. The result reveals a coefficient of determination of 0.034, which implies 2.5 % of the influence on employee performance variation was accounted for by presenteeism (voluntary and involuntary). The null hypothesis was rejected because presenteeism (voluntary and involuntary) influences employees' performance in the Lagos State Ministry of Health.

Health. The consequences of the influence of presenteeism on employees' performance in Lagos State Ministry of Health was manifested in the employees' accumulated fatigue, which can lead to poor health, exhaustion or future health implications. This aligns with previous findings (Lohaus & Habermann, 2019; Yoshimoto, Okra, Fuji, Nagata & Matsudaira, 2020; Yi & Kim, 2020) as they also revealed similar consequences of presenteeism. In addition to these findings, most employees claimed that the workload and job demands were too great for them to handle. Such a person must deliver, which poses a challenge and causes fatigue, annoyance, and exhaustion. Employees in the organisation also reported other effects of presenteeism, such as loss of motivation, absentmindedness, and a high tendency to make mistakes at work. However, as presented in previous studies, the study disagrees with scouting for a better job as a major consequence (Arronson, Gustaffson & Mellner, 2011; Chun & Song, 2020). In the Lagos State Ministry of Health, as rigorous as their workload is, most of them opined that they are satisfied with their job; this is partially due to the high unemployment rate in the country and looking for another job was out of the options of relatable consequences.

## 5. Conclusion

This study is a vital piece of empirical evidence to the sparse literature on presenteeism and employees' performance in Nigeria. Voluntary and involuntary presenteeism influences employees' performance; involuntary presenteeism is more prevalent than voluntary presenteeism in the Lagos State Ministry of Health. Voluntary presenteeism positively influences employees' performance more than involuntary presenteeism. Though both types of presenteeism have diverse consequences on employees' performance. The results of this study suggest that presenteeism can significantly influence employees' performance at the Lagos State Ministry of Health and that management should be aware of employee behaviours that might either advance or obstruct organisational objectives. The dataset was only obtained from one

public entity (Lagos State Ministry of Health) in a specific geographic area of Nigeria. Hence this study has certain limitations. The findings, however, provide a critical glimpse of the relationship between presenteeism and employee performance in the public sector. The study was cross-sectional, which may not have been sufficient to prove a causal relationship as opposed to a longitudinal study design. Using a longitudinal study, researchers can make specific statistical inferences about the causal relationships between the variables. Using the information from this study as a foundation, the following suggestions are made:

- Employees should desist from voluntary presenteeism and avoid being present at work at all means, working overtime, and indulging in eye service as it negatively influences their performance in the long run.
- To reduce involuntary presenteeism, the government can reduce job demands by employing more staff so there can be enough hands to handle the workload in the ministry. It can also aid the delegation of duties for the speedy actualisation of set goals and objectives. This will be very important in the medical department to help bridge the doctor-to-patient ratio. Government should work on making the working environment adequate with enough resources, necessary tools and equipment to carry out their job demands so employees can work in a conducive environment without being stressed.
- Government should note that other factors enhance employee's performance, such as employee motivation and satisfaction. To this end, the government should improve the welfare system by making it more captivating and compelling.
- The study was restricted to the Lagos State Ministry of Health; therefore, further investigation should be attempted on the influence of presenteeism on employees' performance in other Ministries, Departments or Agencies of government.

### **Acknowledgement**

This is an improved version of the conference paper titled 'How Presenteeism influences Employees' Performance in Nigeria'



presented at the 4th International Conference on Public Administration and Sustainable Development in the New Normal in collaboration with the Chartered Institute of Local Government and Public Administration organised by the Faculty of Management Sciences, Department of Public Administration, Lagos State University, Ojo, Lagos State, Nigeria, 23 – 24 November 2022.

### Conflict of interests

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest.

### References

- Abasilim, U. D., Adebajo, O. O., & Gberevbie, D. E. (2022). Causes and remedial measures of presenteeism in the post Covid-19 era workplace: Insight from job demands-resources theory. *Masyarakat, Kebudayaan dan Politik*, 35(2), 242-251.  
<https://doi.org/10.20473/mkp.V35I22022.242-251>
- Abasilim, U., Salau, O., & Falola, H. (2015). Toward an understanding of presenteeism and its effects in the workplace. *LASU Journal of Public Administration and Management*, 1(1), 75-82.  
<http://eprints.covenantuniversity.edu.ng/7380/#.ZE6MH9rMK5c>
- Anitha, J. (2014). Determinants of employee engagement and their impact on employee performance. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, 63(3), 308-323.  
<https://www.emerald.com/insight/content/doi/10.1108/IJPPM-01-2013-0008/full/html>
- Arjona-Fuentes, J., Ariza-Montes, A., Han, H., & Law, R. (2019). Silent threat of presenteeism in the hospitality industry: Examining individual, organisational and physical/mental health factors. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 82, 191-198.

[https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0278431919300799?casa\\_token=yOMcPZU6A7AAAAAA:UdG7k10V92B\\_h5G0u6dhO2QqwzFIGG26APQ9dWFv143uaH1LROHbEpz0QtV21nVM1uLiUyA2no0](https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0278431919300799?casa_token=yOMcPZU6A7AAAAAA:UdG7k10V92B_h5G0u6dhO2QqwzFIGG26APQ9dWFv143uaH1LROHbEpz0QtV21nVM1uLiUyA2no0)

Aronsson, G., Gustafsson, K., & Mellner, C. (2011). Sickness presence, sickness absence, and self-reported health and symptoms. *International Journal of Workplace Health Management*, 4(3), 228-243.

<https://www.emerald.com/insight/content/doi/10.1108/17538351111172590/full/html>

Barnes, S. (2016). Presenteeism - how it can be managed and used to benefit the unwell who want to work and the employer organisation. *Strategic Human Resources Review*, 15(2), 95-97

<https://www.emerald.com/insight/content/doi/10.1108/SHR-01-2016-0002/full/html>

Bergstrom, G., Bodin, L., Hagberg, J., Lindh, T., Arronson, G., & Josephson, M. (2009). Does sickness presenteeism have an impact on future general health? *International Archives of Occupational and Environmental Health*, 82(10), 1179-1190. <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s00420-009-0433-6>

Bergstrom, G., Gustafsson, K., Aboagye, E., Marklund, S., Aronsson, G., Bjorklund, C., & Leineweber, C. (2020). A resourceful work environment moderates the relationship between presenteeism and health. A study using repeated measures in the Swedish working population. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 17(13), 4711-4725. <https://www.mdpi.com/1660-4601/17/13/4711>

Brouard, C. (2019). Presenteeism in the workplace: 10 ways to tackle it. <https://www.myhrtoolkit.com/blog/presenteeism-in-the-workplace>.

Chun, B., & Song, C. (2020). A moderated mediation analysis of occupational stress, presenteeism, and turnover intention among occupational therapists in Korea. *Journal of*

*Occupational Health*, 62(1), 121-153.

[https://www.jstage.jst.go.jp/article/joh/62/1/62\\_e12153/article/-char/ja/](https://www.jstage.jst.go.jp/article/joh/62/1/62_e12153/article/-char/ja/)

Cooper, C., & Lu, L. (2016). Presenteeism as a global phenomenon. *Cross Cultural and Strategic Management*, 23(2), 216-231.

<https://www.emerald.com/insight/content/doi/10.1108/CSM-09-2015-0106/full/html>

Donohoe, A. (2019, June 07). *Employee Performance Definition*. Retrieved December 2nd, 2021, from Bizfluent: <https://bizfluent.com/facts-7218608-employee-performance-definition.html>

Ferreira, A. I., da Costa Ferreira, P., Cooper, C. L., & Oliveira, D. (2019). How daily negative affect and emotional exhaustion correlates with work engagement and presenteeism-constrained productivity. *International Journal of Stress Management*, 26(3), 261-272.

<https://psycnet.apa.org/record/2018-45588-001>

Kinman, G. (2019). Sick absence at work: prevalence, costs and management. *British Medical Bulletin*, 30-48. <https://uobrep.openrepository.com/handle/10547/623041>

Gill, J., Johnson, P. & Clark, M. (2010). *Research Methods for Managers*. United Kingdom: SAGE Publications.

<https://hal.science/hal-02557333/document>

Greden, J. F., Garcia-Tosi, R., & Harrington, A. W. (2019). Healthy minds at work: Challenges and strategies for businesses. *Mental health in the workplace: Strategies and tools to optimize outcomes*, 45(6)1-16.

[https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-3-030-04266-0\\_1](https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-3-030-04266-0_1)

Haque, A. (2021). The effect of presenteeism among Bangladeshi employees. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*. 2(3), 57-65.

<https://www.emerald.com/insight/content/doi/10.1108/IJPPM-06-2020-0305/full/html>



- Inuwa, M. (2016). Job satisfaction and employee performance: an empirical approach. *The Millennium University Journal*, 1(1), 1-14.  
[https://www.researchgate.net/publication/321966659\\_Job\\_Satisfaction\\_and\\_Employee\\_Performance\\_An\\_Empirical\\_Approach](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/321966659_Job_Satisfaction_and_Employee_Performance_An_Empirical_Approach)
- Ishibashi, Y., & Shimura, A. (2020). Association between work productivity and sleep health: a cross-sectional study in Japan. *Sleep Health*, 6(3), 270-276.  
[https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S2352721820300826?casa\\_token=ICsHuDMY18YAAAAA:gbAaKPXvpFuiD8mTAFhleDju71H7UgMKdUTOosgztRqmqjz1l2R77xm8tC2sPPdq63zzGnineG0](https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S2352721820300826?casa_token=ICsHuDMY18YAAAAA:gbAaKPXvpFuiD8mTAFhleDju71H7UgMKdUTOosgztRqmqjz1l2R77xm8tC2sPPdq63zzGnineG0)
- Jeong, W., Kim, Y., Oh, S., Yoon, J., & Park, E. (2020). Association between presenteeism/absenteeism and well-being among Korean workers. *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, 62(8), 574-580.  
[https://journals.lww.com/joem/Abstract/2020/08000/Association\\_Between\\_Presenteeism\\_Absenteeism\\_and.4.aspx](https://journals.lww.com/joem/Abstract/2020/08000/Association_Between_Presenteeism_Absenteeism_and.4.aspx)
- Johns, G. (2011). Attendance dynamics at work: the antecedents of presenteeism, absenteeism and productivity loss. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 16(4), 483-498.  
<https://psycnet.apa.org/record/2011-19070-001>
- Karanika-Murray, M., & Cooper, C. (2018). Presenteeism: An introduction to a prevailing global phenomenon. Cambridge University Press 9-34.  
<https://www.cambridge.org/core/books/presenteeism-at-work/presenteeism-an-introduction-to-a-prevailing-globalphenomenon/3EDBBADA204B214A1AA069454809D5FA>
- Karanika-Murray, M., & Biron, C. (2020). The health-performance framework of presenteeism: Towards understanding an adaptive behaviour. *Human Relations*, 73(2), 242-261.  
<https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/00187267>

19827081

- Karanika-Murray, M., & Cooper, C. L. (2018). Presenteeism: An introduction to a prevailing global phenomenon. Retrieved from 8260\_Karanika-Murray.pdf(ntu.ac.uk)
- Kinman, G., & Wray, S. (2018). Presenteeism in academic employees: occupational and individual factors. *International Journal of Occupational Medicine*, 68(1), 46-50. <https://academic.oup.com/occmed/article/68/1/46/4812481>
- Koopmans, L., Bernaards, C., Hildebrandt, V., Van Buuren, S., Van der Beek, A. J., & De Vet, H. C. (2013). Development of an individual work performance questionnaire. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, 62(1), 6-28. [https://www.emerald.com/insight/content/doi/10.1108/17410401311285273/full/html?utm\\_campaign=Emerald\\_Strategy\\_PPV\\_November22\\_RoN](https://www.emerald.com/insight/content/doi/10.1108/17410401311285273/full/html?utm_campaign=Emerald_Strategy_PPV_November22_RoN)
- Koopman, C., Pelletier, K. R., Murray, J. F., Sharda, C. E., Berger, M. L., Turpin, R. S., ... & Bendel, T. (2002). Stanford presenteeism scale: health status and employee productivity. *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, 44(1), 14-20. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/44995848>
- Li, Y., Zhang, J., Wang, S., & Guo, S. (2019). The effect of presenteeism on productivity loss in nurses: the mediation of health and the moderation of general self-efficacy. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 10, 1745-1760. <https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.01745/full>
- Lohaus, D., & Habermann, W. (2019). Presenteeism: A review and research directions. *Human Resource Management Review*, 29(1), 43-58. [https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S105348221830127X?casa\\_token=Zg8M6IZvAOsAAAAA:heGRN92XfsVH0iuslOkayf6FoR\\_Abf7TaiW8xWmRUHBknanEg7wpWLfbwFguV6DTnIjLvvxH](https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S105348221830127X?casa_token=Zg8M6IZvAOsAAAAA:heGRN92XfsVH0iuslOkayf6FoR_Abf7TaiW8xWmRUHBknanEg7wpWLfbwFguV6DTnIjLvvxH)
- Maestas, N., Mullen, K., & Rennane, S. (2021). Absenteeism and

- presenteeism among American workers. *Journal of Disability Policy Studies*, 32(1), 13-23.  
<https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/1044207320933211?journalCode=dpsa>
- Maria, K. (2018). Presenteeism: An introduction to a prevailing global phenomenon. *International Journal of Psychology*, 12(6), 30-42.  
[http://irep.ntu.ac.uk/id/eprint/33625/1/8260\\_Karanika-Murray.pdf](http://irep.ntu.ac.uk/id/eprint/33625/1/8260_Karanika-Murray.pdf)
- Mehmet, C. (2016). An exploratory study of presenteeism in the Turkish context. *Emerging Markets Journal*, 6(1), 25-38.  
<http://emaj.pitt.edu/ojs/index.php/emaj/article/view/93>
- Mosteiro-Díaz, M., Baldonado-Mosteiro, M., Borges, E., Baptista, P., Queirós, C., Sánchez-Zaballos, M., & Franco-Correia, S. (2020). Presenteeism in nurses: comparative study of Spanish, Portuguese and Brazilian nurses. *International Nursing Review*, 67(4), 466-475.  
<https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/inr.12615>
- Nwosu, A., Ossai, E., Onwuasoigwe, O., Ezeigweneme, M., & Okpamen, J. (2021). Burnout and presenteeism among healthcare workers in Nigeria: Implications for patient care, occupational health and workforce productivity. *Journal of Public Health Research*, 10(1), 141-157.  
<https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.4081/jphr.2021.1900>
- Oluyemi, J., Adejoke, J., & Deborah, A. (2019). Presenteeism in Work Places and its Implications on Employees' health: Experiences of Bankers in the Nigerian Banking Sector. *Journal of Language, Technology and Entrepreneurship in Africa*, 10(1), 82-93.  
<https://www.ajol.info/index.php/jolte/article/view/186508>
- Ospina, M. B., Dennett, L., Wayne, A., Jacobs, P., & Thompson, A. H. (2015). A systematic review of measurement properties of instruments assessing presenteeism. *The American Journal of Managed Care*, 21(2), 171-185.
- Pawirosumarto, S., Katijan, P., & Muchtar, M. (2016). Factors



affecting employee performance of PT. Kiyokuni Indonesia. *International Journal of Law and Management*, 59(4), 602-614.

<https://www.emerald.com/insight/content/doi/10.1108/IJLMA-03-2016-0031/full/html>

Pohling, R., Buruck, G., Jungbauer, K.-L., & Leiter, M. P. (2015). Work-related factors of presenteeism: The mediating role of mental and physical health. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 21, 220–234.

<https://psycnet.apa.org/record/2015-39997-001>

Ruhle, S., Breitsohl, H., Aboagye, E., Baba, V., Biron, C., Correia Leal, C., & Yang, T. (2020). "To work, or not to work, that is the question"—Recent trends and avenues for research on presenteeism. *European Journal of Work and Organisational Psychology*, 29(3), 344-363.

<https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/1359432X.2019.1704734>

Shan, G., Wang, S., Wang, W., Guo, S., & Li, Y. (2021). Presenteeism in nurses: prevalence, consequences, and causes from the perspectives of nurses and chief nurses. *Frontiers in Psychiatry*, 11, 584040.

<https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fpsy.2020.584040/full>

Tang, N., Han, L., Yang, P., Zhao, Y., & Zhang, H. (2019). Are mindfulness and self-efficacy related to presenteeism among primary medical staff: A cross-sectional study. *International Journal of Nursing Sciences*, 6(2), 182-186.

<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2352013217302375>

Turpin, R. S., Ozminkowski, R. J., Sharda, C. E., Collins, J. J., Berger, M. L., Billotti, G. M., ... & Nicholson, S. (2004). Reliability and validity of the Stanford Presenteeism Scale. *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, 1123-1133. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/44997373>

Yi, J., & Kim, H. (2020). Factors related to presenteeism among

- South Korean workers exposed to workplace psychological adverse social behavior. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 17(10), 3472.  
<https://www.mdpi.com/1660-4601/17/10/3472>
- Yildis, H., Yildis, B., Zehir, C., Altindag, E., Mologlu, V., & Kitapci, H. (2017). *Social Behaviour and Personality*, 45(3), 399-412.  
<https://www.ingentaconnect.com/content/sbp/sbp/2017/0000045/00000003/art00005>
- Yoshimoto, T., Oka, H., Fujii, T., Nagata, T., & Matsudaira, K. (2020). The economic burden of lost productivity due to presenteeism caused by health conditions among workers in Japan. *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, 62(10), 883-898.  
<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7537733/>