Title: Exploring U.S. food system worker's intentions to work while ill during the early COVID-19 pandemic: a national survey analysis

Authors:

Caitlin A. Ceryes[1,2], Jackie Agnew[2], Andrea L. Wirtz[3], Daniel J. Barnett[2], Roni A. Neff[1,2]

1. Johns Hopkins Center for a Livable Future, 111 Market St., Ste. 840, Baltimore, Maryland 21202, USA
2. Department of Environmental Health & Engineering, Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health, 615 N. Wolfe Street, Baltimore, MD 21205, USA
3. Department of Epidemiology, Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health, 615 N. Wolfe Street, Baltimore, MD 21205, USA

Funding: This research was funded by a Directed Research Grant from the Johns Hopkins Center for a Livable Future. Additional funding was provided by the Johns Hopkins Education and Research Center Pilot Project Research Program and the Wini Hayes Student Research Fund. CAC was supported by a Johns Hopkins Center for a Livable Future-Lerner Fellowship and a National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health training grant (T42 OH0008428). The funders had no role in study design; data collection, analysis, or interpretation; or decision to publish.

The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

Keywords: Safety climate; disaster preparedness; presenteeism; food system; worker; food insecurity; COVID-19

ABSTRACT

Background: As "stay at home" orders were in effect, many US food workers attended in-person work during early phases of the COVID-19 pandemic, charged with maintaining normal operation of the national food supply chain. Despite establishment of a novel national paid sick leave policy, anecdotal evidence suggests that many U.S. food system workers encountered barriers to staying home when ill.

Methods: Using quantitative and free-text analyses from a national, cross-sectional, online survey deployed from July to October 2020 among 2,535 respondents, we explored workplace and non-workplace factors associated with U.S. food system workers' intentions to attend work while ill (i.e. presenteeism intentions) during the first four to six months of the COVID-19 pandemic.

Results: Overall, 8.8% of workers surveyed reported intentions to attend work while ill. Both quantitative data and free-text responses suggest that aspects of workplace culture influenced workers' decisions to attend work while ill. Workers reporting a high workplace safety climate score had half the odds of reporting presenteeism intentions (adjusted odds ratio [aOR] 0.52, 95% confidence interval (CI) 0.37, 0.75) relative to those reporting low scores. Workers described cultural barriers, including retaliation and penalties, that reduced paid sick leave access. Workers reporting low (aOR 2.06, 95% CI 1.35, 3.13) or very low (aOR 2.31, 95% CI 1.50, 3.13) levels of household food security had more than twice the odds of reporting presenteeism intentions.

Conclusions: This study offers insights into opportunities for reducing presenteeism related to illness among food workers both during the COVID-19 pandemic and in other infectious disease scenarios. Addressing vulnerabilities like food insecurity and empowering food system workers to make health-protective decisions is important both for optimal worker health outcomes and maintaining a functioning food system.

INTRODUCTION

Soon after the March 11th, 2020 World Health Organization COVID-19 pandemic declaration (World Health Organization, 2020), United States (U.S.) food system workers, i.e. those responsible for producing, processing, distributing, selling, and serving food, were deemed "essential" by the U.S. government (U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2021). As "stay at home orders" were in effect, many US food workers attended in-person work during early phases of the COVID-19 pandemic, charged with maintaining normal operation of the national food supply chain. Essential food workers experienced high COVID-19 exposure and illness risks (Ceryes et al., 2021), largely due to inability to socially distance while working (Chang et al., 2020; Faghri et al., 2021; Taylor et al., 2020). Presenteeism, a phenomenon wherein employees attend work despite symptomatic illness (Johns, 2010), became recognized as an important risk factor for workplace and community COVID-19 spread (Kinman & Grant, 2020; Milligan et al., 2021), especially in workplaces with limited social distancing. Anecdotal evidence suggests that many food system workers encountered barriers to staying home if ill (Hammonds et al., 2020). Understanding factors associated with food workers' intent to work while ill (here termed "COVID-19 presenteeism intentions") is important for preventing future workplace spread of COVID-19 and other infectious illnesses. Here we explore workplace and non-workplace factors associated with food system worker COVID-19 presenteeism intentions during the early COVID-19 pandemic.

U.S. Food System Workforce*:* The U.S. food system is an interconnected network which relies on approximately 21.5 million workers who produce, process, distribute, sell, and serve food in mostly "non-relocatable" jobs (Baker, 2020; Food Chain Workers Alliance, 2016). Table 1 provides an overview of food sector and subsector characteristics. When considered together, these workers form one of the nation's largest employment segments (Food Chain Workers Alliance, 2016). Despite engaging in diverse work tasks across sectors and jobs, many individuals engaged in food work share various demographic and occupational similarities and are all needed to maintain a functioning food supply chain. For these

reasons, studying these workers as a group rather than in occupational silos may provide insights relevant to this large worker cohort, the individual sectors that comprise it, and the functionality and resilience of the food system itself.

Even before the COVID-19 pandemic, many food system workers experienced challenges atypical of other "essential" sectors. Many of these challenges are associated with negative outcomes (Fan & Qian, 2017; Neff, 2015; Williams et al., 2019), including presenteeism (Webster et al., 2019). The many food system workers who come from marginalized and foreign-born communities (Fan & Qian, 2017; Stephenson, 2020) face high rates of systemic and individual discrimination (Menasche Horowitz et al., 2019) including in the workplace (Siqueira et al., 2014). Power imbalances between workers and employers can potentiate exploitation and encourage tolerance of unsafe or unhealthy conditions (Arcury et al., 2013; Grzywacz et al., 2007; Lorr, 2020). Food system jobs are often characterized by: full-time wages at or below the poverty line (U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2020b, 2020a, Appendix 1); low unionization rates resulting in job insecurity and at-will employment (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2020); tipped work (Food Chain Workers Alliance, 2016) or piece work (Goldman & Martin, 2021); and a lack of benefits such as sick pay and health insurance (Osterman & Shulman, 2011). These jobs exhibit high injury and illness rates relative to national averages (Guillory et al., 2018; Newman et al., 2015), despite suspected widespread reporting suppression (Azaroff et al., 2002; Leigh et al., 2014) and systematic surveillance exemptions (U.S. Occupational Safety and Health Administration, 2007). Many food jobs exist in the "gig economy," meaning they are difficult to enumerate, exempted from Fair Labor Standards Act provisions (Tran & Sokas, 2017), and commonly excluded from national occupational health and safety surveillance efforts (Gunter, 2016). Appendix 1 provides an overview of food system sectors included in this study.

Presenteeism: Early presenteeism research examined economic and productivity losses resulting from employees attending work while sick or injured (Hemp, 2004). More recently, presenteeism has been

investigated as a public health issue, with implications for food safety (Clayton et al., 2015) and worker and community health (Johns, 2010; Widera et al., 2010). Pre-pandemic studies examining illness presenteeism precursors have found that organizational factors (e.g. work policies or cultures), job characteristics (e.g. shift design, job demands), and personal characteristics (e.g. financial stability concerns, personal sense of duty, and perceived co-worker expectations, Webster et al., 2019) can potentiate presenteeism.

A limited literature focuses on presenteeism antecedents among food system workers. Studies among restaurant/service workers have found associations between presenteeism and high work demands, poor employer-employee communication, poor staffing, and inadequate workplace policies (e.g., lacking paid sick leave or requiring doctors' notes for absences) (Clayton et al., 2015; Norton et al., 2015; Sumner et al., 2011). Among farmworkers, illness and injury presenteeism is associated with reporting poor workplace safety climate (Arcury et al., 2012). Studies of processing workers have found associations between job insecurity, job dissatisfaction, and hazardous working conditions and working through occupational musculoskeletal disorders (i.e. injury presenteeism) (Lipscomb et al., 2007).

Though most COVID-19 presenteeism research (and much illness presenteeism research, generally, see, e.g. Webster et al., 2019) has focused on healthcare workers, three studies have explored COVID-19 presenteeism behaviors among other essential and non-essential workers. Two small panel survey studies suggested that COVID-19 presenteeism behaviors are associated with demographic factors including household income, food security, and age (Tilchin et al., 2021), as well as job characteristics including poor access to health benefits (Tilchin et al., 2021) and workplace climate (Probst et al., 2021). To date, only one study has explored presenteeism among a national cohort of restaurant workers, finding that expanding paid sick leave at a large, fast-casual restaurant chain, reduced presenteeism rates when compared to similar restaurant chains (Schneider et al., 2021). To our

knowledge, no study has examined presenteeism intentions in a large, nationwide, food system worker sample.

COVID-19 Presenteeism-related Policies: At the time of this survey, COVID-19 case rates and deaths were rising (U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2020a). The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention had issued guidance for sick workers to stay home or isolate (U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2020b), but concerns remained that exacerbated income pressures and other factors could incentivize COVID-19 presenteeism (Sinclair et al., 2020; Stephenson, 2020). In April 2020, the federal government implemented the first ever national sick leave policy (U.S. Department of Labor, 2020) and augmented unemployment insurance (Congressional Research Service, 2020). The Families First Coronavirus Response Act (FFCRA) provided access to paid sick leave for many food chain workers who did not previously have this benefit, including part-time workers (Schneider & Harknett, 2020; U.S. Department of Labor, 2020). However, firms with fewer than 50 or more than 500 employees were excluded from this policy, and voluntary implementation remained inconsistent among some exempted food service firms (Schneider et al., 2021). Additionally, a presidential executive order prevented meat and poultry processing plant closures (Office of the President of the United States, 2020), and many processing workers were either encouraged or required to work with COVID-19 symptoms (Schlitz, 2020; Taylor et al., 2020).

Despite the importance of maintaining national food security, greater occupational vulnerability relative to other worker cohorts, and concerns about presenteeism potentiating COVID-19 spread. Our study examined both workplace and non-workplace factors associated with COVID-19 presenteeism intentions in this critical cohort. Our intent was to identify opportunities for supporting this population to remain home when ill, in order to deter their work attendance when at risk of infecting others.

We used a quantitative approach informed by free-text data to explore these associations. We anticipated the following: (1) workers who report access to workplace resources, including a positive safety climate and access to paid sick leave, would be less likely to report presenteeism intentions; (2) workers experiencing high levels of work demands and economic precarity (indicated by reporting recent food insecurity) would be more likely to report COVID-19 presenteeism intentions than others.

METHODS:

Data analyzed here were drawn from the Johns Hopkins COVID-19 Food Worker Survey, developed during the early COVID-19 pandemic and deployed from July 31, 2020 to October 02, 2020. This cross-sectional, national, online survey of 3,399 workers captured food system worker perspectives and COVID-19 working conditions. Recruitment and survey design methods have been reported in-depth elsewhere (Ceryes et al., 2021).

Instrument: In brief, the instrument, created with input from workers, worker representatives and experts in survey design, disaster preparedness, and occupational health, contained 114 items. We used validated scales where possible and included novel items to capture COVID-19-related perspectives about working conditions. For example, greater levels of work demands (e.g. time pressure or many overlapping tasks) and positive safety climate were denoted by high scores on previously validated scales (Burr et al., 2019). Presenteeism intention was assessed by an item that inquired whether workers would attend work while ill during COVID-19.

Inclusion criteria included working in any of six targeted food system sectors (production; processing; distribution; retail; service; assistance), reading and speaking English or Spanish, living in the U.S., being 18 years old or older, and having attended a food system job in-person since March 11th, 2020=. Those who reported previously contracting COVID-19, and those not receiving a paycheck at the time were excluded from quantitative analyses. Sample size calculations determined(?) that a sample of

at least 1,000 would provide enough power to detect group differences using a 3% margin of error and 95% confidence for our outcome of interest. The median time to complete this survey was 19.5 minutes.

Measures*:* Demographic variables included age, gender identity, race, ethnicity, highest educational attainment, household income, and geographic location. All questions included "don't know" or "not applicable" options and participants could skip any item. The survey was terminated if demographic responses did not satisfy inclusion criteria. Appendix 2 provides a description of survey items and coding.

Presenteeism Intentions: We derived our main outcome from the level of agreement with the statement: "If I was sick with COVID-19, but I was still able to work, I would go to work." The five-point Likert scale was later dichotomized to workers who strongly agreed or agreed with the statement versus all others.

Occupational Measures: Workers indicated their food system sector and subsector from an edited Food Chain Workers Alliance list (FCWA; this is a coalition of worker-based organizations) (Food Chain Workers Alliance, 2016). Workers employed in more than one sector were asked to indicate the job in which they worked the most hours. Occupational characteristics included food industry sector, job tenure, full/part-time status, organization size, customer contact, work transportation, whether workers were told they were "required" to work by their employers, and union membership.

We assessed quantitative work demands and workplace social support using medium- length scales from the Copenhagen Psychosocial Questionnaire III (COPSOQ III, Burr et al., 2019). We assessed organizational safety climate using a 6-item short scale (Hahn & Murphy, 2008), where high scores indicated that workers perceived their organization had a high commitment to safety. We dichotomized scores at the median for multivariable analyses. Respondents specified workplace benefits provided by

their employers since the pandemic declaration from a select-all-that-apply list. These were aggregated to frequencies and analyzed separately.

Non-occupational measures: We measured food security since March 11, 2020, using the six-item short form of the USDA Household Food Security Survey Module (Economic Research Service, 2012). Cronbach's alpha estimates were greater than 0.7 for all scales except quantitative work demands, which was 0.67 (Robert A Peterson, 1994).

We also measured attitudes regarding reopening the economy based on agreement with the statement, "It is worth the health risk to reopen the economy as soon as possible." The 6-point Likert scale was collapsed to three points: agreement; neither agreement nor disagreement; and disagreement.

Treatment of Missing Data*:* We examined frequency of missing data for all items and tabulated these by demographic characteristics. Of 3,831 who initiated the survey, 25.4% of respondents did not answer the question corresponding to presenteeism intentions thus, their data were excluded from analyses. This produced an analytic sample of 2,535 participants. Participants missing outcome data were more likely to identify as Hispanic/Latinx and/or work at organizations with fewer than 10 employees. Missing the outcome was not associated with age, race, gender, U.S. census region, having worked in the past month, or customer interaction.

To increase sample size and therefore our ability to detect true differences, we modified requirements for scoring independent variable scales, thus retaining a greater number of participants for analyses. For the USDA Food Security Module, the composite variable for food insecurity included data from all participants with > 2 items (out of six) completed, and for Organizational Safety Climate the composite variable included data from participants with > 5 (out of six) items. These cutoffs were selected because they generated minimum exposure categories with existing data. While these efforts

enhanced participant inclusion so that, for each variable no more than 10% were missing data, associations remained between missing USDA Food Security Module scores and identifying as non-white, female or "other" gender, and Hispanic/Latinx. We discuss the implications of these missing data patterns in our limitations section.

Theoretical Approach: The Job Demands-Resources (JD-R, Bakker & Demerouti, 2007) and Total Worker Health (TWH) models (Sorensen et al. 2021) guided our approach. The JD-R model suggests that job resources, including worker protections and sources of support, counterbalance the negative health impacts of workplace demands (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007). We therefore hypothesized that supports such as organizational safety climate (defined as employees' shared perceptions of their organization's prioritization of worker safety (Hahn & Murphy, 2008; Zohar, 1980)) and access to paid sick leave would reduce the likelihood of reporting presenteeism intentions. The Total Worker Health approach (Schill & Chosewood, 2013), considers external (non-workplace) factors impacting worker well-being. Our conceptual model (presented in Ceryes et al., 2021) includes workplace and non-workplace factors associated with food worker outcomes, including presenteeism, during the COVID-19 pandemic.

Statistical analyses: We used STATA 14 I/C software (College Station, Texas USA) to generate descriptive statistics and used Chi Squared or Rank Sum tests (significance value $p < 0.05$) to examine differences between participants reporting presenteeism intentions versus not. We assessed collinearity using Spearman's rank and Pearson's correlation coefficients. We then assessed correlations between variables of interest and the outcome using bivariate logistic regression.

We estimated adjusted associations between presenteeism intentions and workplace characteristics using logistic regression. Multivariable model covariate selection was informed by a priori conceptual associations (race, ethnicity) and bivariable association ($P < 0.05$) between the outcome and independent variables (age, gender, food system sector, organization size, hourly status). We also

included food security status and perspectives on reopening the economy based on free-text data (explained below) analysis and bivariable associations ($P < 0.05$) with the outcome. The final model estimated associations between presenteeism intentions, workplace, and non-workplace characteristics while controlling for age, race, ethnicity, gender, food system sector, organization size, and hourly status. We used Akaike's Information Criteria (AIC) values to assess model fit and assessed multicollinearity using variance inflation factors, which averaged 1.43 across models and were all less than 4.

Sensitivity analyses were conducted by stratifying on degree of customer interaction and whether workers were told they were "required" to work and controlled for clustering at the state level. Estimates did not meaningfully differ from our primary results (Appendix 3).

Free-text Analyses: Many survey participants provided detailed free-text responses to the open-ended question: *"Do you have any other comments about the level of risk from COVID-19, or decisions about whether to go to work?"* These comments often included discussion of factors influencing presenteeism intentions. We analyzed these responses simultaneously with quantitative data. This approach is recommended when free-text responses elaborate on quantitative findings (O'Cathain & Thomas, 2004) and has been used previously in survey-based presenteeism studies (Chambers et al., 2017). Specifically, comments informed covariate selection by narrowing non-workplace variables considered for analyses. For example, responses mentioned food security status and perspectives on opening the economy; therefore, those respective variables were retained. We also used comments to choose between highly correlated variables (e.g., food security status was selected over annual household income), and when interpreting and discussing quantitative results.

For analysis, the lead investigator (CAC) conducted two close reviews of free-text data and took notes before coding responses and organizing them into themes (Charmaz, 2006). Non-substantive

comments were excluded (e.g. "N/A" or "No"). Atlas.ti (Version 8.0, Berlin, Germany) and Microsoft Excel (Washington, USA) were used to sort, organize, and manage free-text data. Those offering comments were compared to those who did not and to the full sample to identify potential biases. Post coding, we analyzed presenteeism-related text responses as a whole and by sector, by subgroups of those reporting presenteeism versus not, and by benefits and working conditions reported. Qualitative memos were used to track CAC's reactions to comments (Saldaña, 2015).

The Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health Institutional Review Board considered this study exempt (category 2) from oversight (IRB No. 12549).

RESULTS

Quantitative Results: Table 1 presents demographics of the analytic sample. Respondents were primarily female (64.8%), not Hispanic/Latinx (90.0%), white (86.0%), non-union (79.6%), working full-time (64.7%) and of average age 45.9 years (SD 11.2). Most worked in restaurant/service (43.4%) and retail (34.9%), with the fewest in distribution (2.4%). Almost all (95.9%) had worked in the past month before taking the survey. Nearly a third (32.7%) had been told they were "required" to work by their employers at some point between pandemic onset and the survey in August-September, 2020. Almost half of respondents (41.1%) reported low or very low food security. Demographic characteristics from the analytic sample resembled those of the overall study population.

Presenteeism: Of 2,535 respondents, 8.8% agreed that they would attend work if sick with COVID-19. The production sector had the highest proportion of workers reporting presenteeism intentions (24.2%), followed by processing workers (10.6%), restaurant and service workers (8.3%), and retail workers (7.5%). Food assistance workers were least likely to report presenteeism intentions (3.7%, $x2=45.31$, $p<0.001$). Appendix 4 shows comparisons between groups reporting presenteeism intentions versus not by variables of interest.

Benefits: Of 2,527 who responded, 27.7% reported paid sick leave access, 30.1% reported that their employer had made it easier to access sick leave since March 11th, 2020, and 14.0% received free COVID-19 testing from their employers at some point since the pandemic declaration.

Multivariable Model: Table 2 presents bivariate (Model 1) and multivariable logistic regression (Models 2 and 3) results examining associations between variables of interest (organizational safety climate score; work demands score; access to paid leave; food security score; perspectives about reopening the economy) and presenteeism intentions, adjusted for age, gender, ethnicity, race, full/part-time status, food system sector and organization size. Appendix 5 presents results for all models.

After adjustment, workplace factors were associated with reporting intent to work while ill during the COVID-19 pandemic. Respondents who reported positive organizational safety climates had almost half the odds of reporting presenteeism intentions (adjusted odds ratio [aOR] 0.52, 95% CI 0.37, 0.75) as those reporting negative organizational safety climate. Workers with high levels of work demands had almost 50% higher odds of reporting presenteeism intentions (aOR 1.49, 95% 1.03, 2.16). Having access to paid sick leave (aOR 1.00, 95% CI 0.67, 1.50) was not associated presenteeism intentions. Food production workers had higher odds of reporting presenteeism intentions relative to retail workers, after adjustment (aOR 3.96; 95% CI 1.98, 7.92).

In terms of non-workplace factors, both food security status and perspectives on reopening the economy were highly associated with presenteeism intentions. Respondents experiencing low or very low food security had over twice the odds of reporting presenteeism intentions (aORs 2.06, 95% CI 1.35, 3.13 and 2.31, 95% CI 1.50, 3.13, respectively) relative to those reporting marginal/high food security. Workers who agreed that it was "worth the health risk" to reopen the economy had much higher odds of reporting presenteeism intentions (aOR 1.44; 95% CI 0.95, 2.16 and 2.43, 95% CI 1.58, 3.73, respectively) than those who disagreed with this statement.

Free Text Results: Free-text data revealed the complex landscape impacting food workers' attendance decisions during the early pandemic. Of the full sample, 13.5% answered the question, *"Do you have any other comments about the level of risk from COVID-19, or decisions about whether to go to work?"* with 460 comments across six sectors. Responses ranged from 1 to 233 words, with 23-word median length. Median word count was lowest in food production (13 words) and highest in retail (24 words). Workers who commented were less likely to work in food production, have annual household incomes below $15,000 or above $100,000, and were more likely to work for tips and report very low food security status (Appendix 6.)

Workplace factors:

Policies: Many comments mentioned employers' policies' in reference to presenteeism and workplace COVID-19 spread. While a few workers described adequate pay for time off if symptomatic or COVID-19- positive, many described insufficient policies and benefits, including lacking paid sick leave, as barriers to remaining home when ill. As a retail worker explained, *"Obviously no one wants to go to work sick, but it is necessary since the pay is so low and I don't get sick pay."* Respondents also described barriers to quarantine and testing. For example, a retail worker described financial disincentives to disclosing exposure, *"If I was to be exposed to someone with Covid I would not tell my [employers] about it because they will not pay me to be off work. I cannot afford to be off work."* Barriers to testing included unpaid post-testing quarantine periods, *"… it is a 2 week or more wait for results. If you are tested you may not return to work until you get results. How many people with mild symptoms are going to be out of work for 2 weeks or more voluntarily?"* (restaurant worker), and high test costs, *"The test cost as much as half of my weekly wage"* (retail worker). Other workers explained that companies disincentivize staying home through policies that only pay partial sick leave salaries, or require employees to find coverage for their shifts, use personal vacation time, obtain doctors' notes, or incur penalties leading to termination. For example, a processing worker described a penalty-driven

attendance system: *"If you were sick or had any of the symptoms of COVID-19, if you didn't go to work they would "point" [penalize] you for that so if you have enough points you will eventually 'point out' [lose your job]."*

Culture: Even if employers officially had policies supporting those who stayed home, employees described barriers to accessing them that communicated an expectation to work when symptomatic. As an example, workers frequently cited concerns about employer retaliation for using sick leave. This retaliation was often implicit, for example, *"Calling in sick is frowned upon. People who call in sick frequently get less hours [meaning less pay] and the worse [less desirable] hours" (retail worker). A restaurant worker described anxiety about job security, "Even if you don't get fired for calling out … they'll find something else to fire you for… "*

Respondents also described instances in which policies meant to discourage working with COVID-19 symptoms were not clear, or not taken seriously, including symptomatic co-workers continuing to work after symptom-checks, and managers ignoring COVID-19 symptoms rather than sending staff home. One retail worker's superior explicitly discouraged testing, *"Boss told us not to get tested so we wouldn't have to miss work."*

Non-workplace factors:
Economic precarity: Aside from workplace conditions contributing to presenteeism, workers cited economic instability, stemming from insufficient wages, as a driver for presenteeism. Many comments mentioned working to make ends meet, working paycheck to paycheck, and working to buy food for their families. A processing worker explained, *"There is NO decision!... We have bills and children to feed…I cannot stay home!" A retail worker shared her frustration that she had already used most of her sick leave, meaning she had limited options, "what the **** am I gonna do, not feed my kids?... (pardon my profanity, it's necessary for emphasis, I can't really convey how strongly I feel about this.)"*

Distrust of public health messaging: Some respondents reporting presenteeism intentions did not see COVID-19 as a credible health threat, often describing it as exaggerated. As one processing worker reporting presenteeism intentions described, *"I think it's blown out of proportion and has very skewed and inaccurate testing. I don't think I'm anymore at risk than the seasonal flu."*

DISCUSSION

Our findings highlight workplace and non-workplace conditions associated with food system workers' intentions to work while ill and provide insights into the drivers behind this decision. While our results are specific to the COVID-19 pandemic context, they are relevant for planning for future infectious disease outbreaks and even for more quotidian contagious conditions.

Given rapid changes in infection rates, resources available to workers to protect themselves, and scientific knowledge about COVID-19 throughout 2020 and 2021, it is important to view these results in their temporal context. This study was conducted during the first four to six months of the pandemic, when vaccines were not available, after federal paid sick leave policies had taken effect, and before eviction moratoriums and unemployment insurance enhancements expired (Sherfinski, 2021). Because of rapid increases in U.S. case rates and news coverage emphasizing disease severity during these months (Mach et al., 2021), respondents could have perceived COVID-19 as more severe than other illnesses, and therefore planned to remain home. As the pandemic continued and many states prioritized "reopening," both essential and non-essential workers were encouraged to return to work, and supporting policies were relaxed or rescinded. Therefore, if repeated later in the pandemic, a similar study might show an even higher prevalence of presenteeism intentions among food system workers.

Workplace Factors associated with Presenteeism Intentions

Organizational Safety Climate: Free-text and quantitative results suggest workplace culture played an important role in determining workers' COVID-19 presenteeism intentions. Though we did not measure COVID-19-related workplace culture (as in, e.g. Probst et al., 2021), we measured organizational safety climate as a facet of workplace culture. Workers with high organizational safety climate scores were less likely to report COVID-19 presenteeism intentions. This finding aligns with other pre- and mid-pandemic studies suggesting that organizational safety climate influences workers' presenteeism decisions (Bronkhorst & Vermeeren, 2016; Liu et al., 2020; Probst et al., 2021). Additionally, these results build on previously established associations between organizational safety climate and food workers' COVID-19 safety perceptions (Ceryes et al., 2021).

Free-text comments provided examples of how perceived workplace culture influenced workers' presenteeism intentions. These examples often related to organizational safety climate constructs and could help explain its strong association with COVID-19 presenteeism intentions. For example, comments describing managers ignoring COVID-19 safety policies could indicate a lack of employee empowerment to participate fully in safety activities and policy enforcement. Organizational safety climate is often studied regarding its effects on injury prevention, but these findings suggest that this construct represents a relevant and consequential measure of workplace culture and can influence workers' self-protective behaviors.

Sick Leave: We found no association between paid sick leave and presenteeism intentions after adjusting for covariates, which is not consistent with our hypothesis. Workers' comments describing cultural and organizational barriers to using sick leave provide one interpretation of this finding. Descriptions of retaliation and penalties barring workers from accessing sick leave indicate that, while employers may "officially" establish sick leave policies, in some cases employees are not empowered to use them. Such barriers have been documented among restaurant workers (Schneider & Harknett,

2020), and we have expanded these findings to include other food system worker sectors. Our results also diverge from Schneider and colleagues' (2021), whose findings indicated that increasing paid sick leave reduced pandemic presenteeism among restaurant workers at the Olive Garden fast-casual restaurant chain. This difference could again relate to empowerment to use paid sick leave benefits. Olive Garden's paid sick leave expansion occurred following "significant public pressure" to make this change (Schneider et al., 2021). These employees might have felt more able to access their newfound benefits than did workers whose employers were not experiencing public scrutiny.

Work Requirements: Notably, nearly one-third (32.7%) of respondents reported being told they were "required" to work during COVID-19. This circumstance would not typically be considered presenteeism, as workers are deprived of choice. Sensitivity analysis estimates stratified by the requirement to work did not meaningfully differ from our primary results. Requirements to work have been anecdotally linked to strikes and other demonstrations during the COVID-19 pandemic (Eidelson, 2021). Research should assess the physical and mental health impacts of food system workers being "required" to work during the COVID-19 pandemic.

Sector differences: After controlling for worker demographics and job characteristics, production workers were more likely to report presenteeism intentions when compared to retail workers. There are several reasons why food production workers may be especially likely to report presenteeism intentions, including the perception of reduced risk associated with their ability to distance in open-air working environments that do not require customer interaction. Agricultural workers who hold H-2A visas might also feel obliged to attend work while ill, as their ability to stay in the country is predicated on their ability to work (Lauzardo et al., 2021). However, there is widespread recognition that agricultural workers experienced substantial COVID-19 morbidity and mortality relative to other worker groups (Chen et al., 2021). We did not identify other sector-specific differences and did not note

differential comment content by sector in free-text analyses, though production workers were less likely to provide comments than other sectors.

External factors associated with presenteeism intentions

Food Security: Over 40% of respondents reported experiencing low or very low food security, despite working at in-person food jobs during the COVID-19 pandemic. After controlling for all covariates, these workers were more than twice as likely to report presenteeism intentions than those with marginal or high food security. This finding, combined with many free-text comments that mentioned the need to work to buy food, suggests food insecurity was a major driver of presenteeism intentions in this population. Our findings align with Tilchin and colleagues' (2021) findings that perceived food insecurity was associated with a three-fold increase in intention to work sick among U.S. employees. The paradox of food workers experiencing food insecurity while feeding the nation has been previously acknowledged in literature on farmworkers (Minkoff-Zern, 2014), and we re-emphasize its inherent inequity here. We also note that these findings could help explain broader disparities in COVID-19 morbidity and mortality (Tai et al., 2021) during the early waves of the pandemic.

Risk Perceptions: Finally, the workers who felt it is "worth the health risk" to reopen the economy were twice as likely to report presenteeism intentions. Qualitative comments suggest some individuals lacked trust in public health messaging about the severity of COVID-19, and/or felt the benefits of working, which included financial stability, outweighed COVID-19 exposure risks. This finding is unsurprising, given politicization of COVID-19 and inconsistent public health messaging around prevention measures and effectiveness.

Future research directions and recommendations:

Organizational safety climate represents a modifiable workplace characteristic, with connections to overall health and safety improvements (Nahrgang et al., 2011). We suggest that regulatory policies that

target safety climate constructs, such as improved workplace safety communication, employee safety policy involvement, and policy enforcement without retaliation could not only improve worker health, but also reduce presenteeism. Such actions might mitigate economic losses related to presenteeism, which are estimated to be substantial (Hemp, 2004). We also advocate for heightened external accountability, including proactive worksite inspections and statutory worker protections, especially for "essential" workplaces.

More research is needed to chart COVID-19 presenteeism trends among food workers over time, and to assess whether presenteeism intentions align with actual behaviors. Longitudinal studies are needed to further examine the connection between workplace culture and food worker presenteeism, and whether shifts in workplace safety culture could potentially decrease workplace spread of infectious illnesses. Research is also needed to explore ways to empower employees to use policies, like paid sick leave and symptom checks, especially in the context of prolonged emergencies or pandemics. Third, this study suggests that worker food insecurity represents a major driver of COVID-19 presenteeism intentions. We therefore endorse the development of policies that improve overall financial stability among working people to prevent presenteeism and its accompanying disease transmission. Other policies to reduce presenteeism include raising food workers' compensation to a living wage, limiting "just in time" shifts and standardizing work schedules so that workers can plan for childcare and other needs, and providing reliable, full-time, work with benefits (Scheiber, 2021).

The COVID-19 pandemic incentivized food system workers to organize and resign in masses in response to longstanding conditions and remuneration inconsistent with their "essential" work (Durbin & Schulte, 2021; Greenhouse, 2021). As evidence mounts that COVID-19 disproportionately impacted food workers and their communities more than previously suspected (e.g. Douglass, 2021), policies that address such workplace power imbalances and that emphasize worker health should be disaster preparedness priorities.

LIMITATIONS:

As with other Internet-based surveys, our sample overrepresented white, female, and high-income individuals (Ali et al., 2020; Lehdonvirta et al., 2020) (despite considerable measures to improve sample diversity); and attrition resulted in missing data. Our treatment of missing data strengthen this study by identifying limitations in generalizability. Because respondents identifying as Hispanic/Latinx are more likely to lack outcome data and our sample sizes of non-white workers are small, our analyses may underestimate or fail to detect effects felt by African American and Hispanic/Latinx or other Black/Indigenous/People of Color (BIPOC) individuals. These groups are of high interest because we expect they were more likely to feel negative impacts related to COVID-19 (Waltenburg et al., 2021). Future studies must focus on the inclusion of these groups. While our efforts to recover scale data allowed us to include more respondents, it is likely we are underestimating levels of presenteeism intentions, work demands, and food insecurity while overrepresenting organizational safety climate due to these missing data patterns.

We used validated scales and measures; however, these scales measure perceptions (e.g. concern about food insecurity, not actual food insecurity) which could have been influenced by the widespread anxiety felt by many Americans during the early pandemic. Still, our findings fill an important research gap by documenting conditions facing food system workers during early COVID-19.

Our analysis of free-text data enriched our interpretation of quantitative associations, allowing us to detect nuances regarding use of benefits (versus availability) and workplace culture in the context of COVID-19. Comments also indicate workers' perceptions of causal relationships between our variables of interest and outcomes, which is helpful given the inability to determine causality using a cross-sectional study design. It would have been useful to garner a greater number of responses to the free-text question. In fact, we recognize that other forms of qualitative data, like in-depth interviews, might

better serve the purposes of a study such as ours should time and access allow (LaDonna et al., 2018). However, given the depth of information we were able to capture, we feel our data were extremely useful for interpreting our quantitative results.

CONCLUSIONS:

The COVID-19 pandemic has highlighted our reliance on food system workers to maintain national food security. Despite their heightened risks of morbidity and mortality, many food system workers indicated their intent to attend work while ill during the early COVID-19 pandemic. Often, they felt that they had no choice. This research provides insights into needed support that could reduce presenteeism among food workers both during this pandemic and in other disaster and infectious illness scenarios. Addressing barriers to staying home when ill, like employer retaliation, and vulnerabilities like food insecurity could empower and enable food system workers to make decisions that protect themselves and their workplaces. Reducing presenteeism is important for creating optimal worker health outcomes, public health outcomes, and maintaining a functioning food system that can feed the population.

Table 1. Demographic and occupational characteristics for a national U.S. food system worker cohort during early COVID-19.

		n (%)	
Age in years			(n=2,535)
	18-24	81 (3.2)	
	25-44	1,054 (41.6)	
	45-65	1,334 (52.6)	
	>65	66 (2.6)	
Gender			(n=2,535)
	Female	1,641 (64.8)	
	Male	846 (33.4)	
	Other	48 (1.9)	
Race			(n=2,527)
	White	2,196 (86.0)	
	African American	112 (4.4)	
	Other / Mixed race	242 (9.6)	
Ethnicity			(n=2,440)
	Not Hispanic/Latinx	2,196 (90.0)	
	Hispanic/Latinx	244 (10.0)	
Sector			(n=2,535)
	Production	115 (4.5)	
	Processing	227 (9.0)	
	Distribution	60 (2.4)	
	Retail	884 (34.9)	
	Restaurant/Service	1,097 (43.3)	
	Assistance	152 (6.0)	
Household Income			(n=2,330)
	< $25,000	642 (27.6)	
	$25,000 – 34,999	427 (18.3)	
	$35,000 – 49,999	427 (18.3)	
	$50,000 – 99,000	696 (30.0)	
	> $100,000	138 (5.9)	
Food Security Status since pandemic declaration			(n=2,374)
	High or marginal	1,399 (58.9)	
	Low	505 (21.3)	
	Very low	470 (19.8)	
Education			(n = 2,353)
	Up to/some high school	124 (5.3)	
	High school diploma/GED	789 (33.5)	
	Some college/ Associate degree	1,104 (46.9)	
	Bachelor's/ advanced degree	336 (14.3)	

U.S. Census Region		(n= 2,375)
Northeast	427 (18.0)	
Midwest	654 (27.5)	
South	857 (36.1)	
West	437 (18.4)	
Union Status		(n = 2,471)
Non-Union Member	1,965 (79.5)	
Union Member	506 (20.5)	
Employer Size		(n= 2,454)
1 – 10	316 (12.9)	
11 -- 49	813 (33.1)	
50 – 499	1,120 (45.6)	
> 500	205 (8.4)	
Hourly status		(n= 2,332)
Full Time	1,510 (64.8)	
Part Time	651 (27.9)	
Other	171 (7.3)	
Worked in the last month		(n=2,535)
Yes	2,430 (95.9)	
No	105 (4.1)	
Customer Contact		(n=2,523)
Yes	1,918 (76.0)	
No	605 (24.0)	
Safety Climate Score		(n=2,375)
High	1,069 (55.0)	
Low	1,069 (45.0)	
Work Demands		(n=2,466)
High	1,360 (55.2)	
Low	1,106 (44.9)	
"Required" to work		(n=2,420)
Required to work during COVID-19	792 (32.7)	
Asked to work but not required	623 (25.7)	
Both required and asked at different times	324 (13.4)	
Neither required nor asked	681 (28.1)	

Table 2. Workplace and non-workplace factors associated with reporting presenteeism intentions in a national food chain worker sample during early COVID-19.

	Model 1[+] **Odds Ratio** **95% CI** **P value** **n**	**Model 2[++]** **Odds Ratio** **95% CI** **P value** **n**	**Model 3[+++]** **Odds Ratio** **95% CI** **P value** **n=1793**
Organizational Safety Climate Score			
Low	Ref	Ref	Ref
High	0.61 0.46, 0.81 0.001 N=2375	0.59 0.44, 0.79 <0.001 N=2287	0.52 0.37, 0.75 <0.001
Quantitative Work Demands			
Low	Ref	Ref	Ref
High	1.91 1.42, 2.57 <0.001 N=2466	1.95 1.44, 2.65 <0.001 N=2370	1.49 1.03, 2.16 0.03
Access to paid leave			
No	Ref	Ref	Ref
Yes	0.83 0.60, 1.14 0.25 N=2,527	0.83 0.60, 1.14 0.25 N=2249	1.00 0.67, 1.50 0.99
Food Chain Sector			
Retail	Ref	Ref	Ref
Production	3.99 2.43, 6.54 <0.001	3.59 2.04, 6.34 <0.001	3.96 1.98, 7.92 <0.001
Processing	1.47 0.90, 2.40 0.13	1.49 0.90, 2.46 0.12	1.29 0.67, 2.51 0.45
Distribution	1.91 0.87, 4.18 0.11	1.81 0.81, 4.05 0.15	2.14 0.88, 5.16 0.09
Restaurant/Service	1.12 0.81, 1.56 0.50	1.07 0.76, 1.51 0.70	1.18 0.72, 1.93 0.51
Food Assistance	0.42 0.17, 1.06 0.07 N=2535	0.48 0.19, 1.23 0.13 N=2436	0.50 0.14, 1.74 0.28
USDA Food Security Category			
High	Ref	Ref	Ref

Low	2.33 1.65, 3.29 <0.001	2.31 1.61, 3.31 <0.001	2.06 1.35, 3.13 0.001
Very low	2.26 1.59, 3.22 <0.001 N=2374	2.25 1.55, 3.24 <0.001 N=2282	2.31 1.50, 3.13 <0.001
"It is worth the health risk to reopen the economy as soon as possible"			
Strongly/disagree	Ref	Ref	Ref
Neutral	1.29 0.89, 1.87 0.176	1.28 0.87, 1.86 0.21	1.44 0.95, 2.16 0.08
Strongly/Agree	2.27 1.56, 3.30 <0.001 N=2114	2.23 1.51, 3.28 <0.001 N=2030	2.43 1.58, 3.73 <0.001

[+] Model 1: Unadjusted
[++] Model 2: Controlled for age, gender, race, ethnicity.
[+++] Model 3: Controlled for age, gender, race, ethnicity, organization size, hourly status. N=1793
Ref = Reference

References

Ali, S. H., Foreman, J., Capasso, A., Jones, A. M., Tozan, Y., & Diclemente, R. J. (2020). Social media as a recruitment platform for a nationwide online survey of COVID-19 knowledge, beliefs, and practices in the United States: methodology and feasibility analysis. BMC Medical Research Methodology, 20(116). https://doi.org/10.1186/s12874-020-01011-0

Arcury, T. A., Grzywacz, J. G., Sidebottom, J., & Wiggins, M. F. (2013). Overview of immigrant worker occupational health and safety for the agriculture, forestry, and fishing (AgFF) sector in the southeastern United States. American Journal of Industrial Medicine, 56(8), 911–924.

Arcury, T. A., O'Hara, H., Grzywacz, J. G., Isom, S., Chen, H., & Quandt, S. A. (2012). Work Safety Climate, Musculoskeletal Discomfort, Working While Injured, and Depression Among Migrant Farmworkers in North Carolina. American Journal of Public Health, 102(Suppl 2), S272. https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2011.300597

Azaroff, L. S., Levenstein, C., & Wegman, D. H. (2002). Occupational injury and illness surveillance: conceptual filters explain underreporting. American Journal of Public Health, 92(9), 1421–1429.

Baker, M. G. (2020). Nonrelocatable Occupations at Increased Risk During Pandemics: United States, 2018. Public Health, 110, 1126–1132. https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2020.305738

Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2007). The Job Demands-Resources model: state of the art. Journal of Managerial Psychology, 22(3), 309–328. https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940710733115

Bronkhorst, B., & Vermeeren, B. (2016). Safety climate, worker health and organizational health performance: Testing a physical, psychosocial and combined pathway. International Journal of Workplace Health Management, 9(3), 270–289. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJWHM-12-2015-0081

Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2020). Union Members Summary. Economic News Release. https://www.bls.gov/news.release/union2.nr0.htm

Burr, H., Berthelsen, H., Moncada, S., Nübling, M., Dupret, E., Demiral, Y., Oudyk, J., Kristensen, T. S., Llorens, C., Navarro, A., Lincke, H. J., Bocéréan, C., Sahan, C., Smith, P., & Pohrt, A. (2019). The Third Version of the Copenhagen Psychosocial Questionnaire. Safety and Health at Work, 10(4), 482–503. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.shaw.2019.10.002

Ceryes, C., Robinson, J., Biehl, E., Wirtz, A. L., Barnett, D. J., & Neff, R. (2021). Frequency of Workplace Controls and Associations With Safety Perceptions Among a National Sample of US Food Retail Workers During the COVID-19 Pandemic. Journal of Occupational & Environmental Medicine, 63(7), 557–564. https://doi.org/10.1097/JOM.0000000000002218

Chambers, C., Frampton, C., & Barclay, M. (2017). Presenteeism in the New Zealand senior medical workforce-a mixed-methods analysis. NZMJ, 130, 1449. www.nzma.org.nz/journal

Chang, S., Pierson, E., Koh, P. W., Gerardin, J., Redbird, B., Grusky, D., & Leskovec, J. (2020). Mobility network models of COVID-19 explain inequities and inform reopening. Nature. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-020-2923-3

Charmaz, K. (2006). Constructing Grounded Theory: A Practical Guide through Qualitative Analysis. Sage Publications Ltd. https://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=2ThdBAAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PP1&dq=charmaz+2006&ots=fZnRaMpGDV&sig=wdugVgOYgRtfLJuPhWN3fdlJquc#v=onepage&q=charmaz 2006&f=false

Chen, Y.-H., Glymour, M., Riley, A., Balmes, J., Duchowny, K., Harrison, R., Matthay, E., & Bibbins-Domingo, K. (2021). Excess mortality associated with the COVID-19 pandemic among Californians 18–65 years of age, by occupational sector and occupation: March through November 2020. PLOS ONE, 16(6), e0252454. https://doi.org/10.1371/JOURNAL.PONE.0252454

Clayton, M. L., Smith, K. C., Neff, R. A., Pollack, K. M., Ensminger, M., Clegg Smith, K., Neff, R. A., Pollack, K. M., & Ensminger, M. (2015). Listening to food workers: Factors that impact proper health and hygiene practice in food service. International Journal of Occupational and Environmental Health, 21(4), 314–327. https://doi.org/10.1179/2049396715y.0000000011

Congressional Research Service. (2020, April 9). Unemployment Insurance Provisions in the CARES Act. https://crsreports.congress.gov

Douglass, L. (2021, October 28). Coronavirus infections at U.S. meat plants far higher than previous estimates -House subcommittee | Reuters. Reuters. https://www.reuters.com/world/us/coronavirus-infections-us-meat-plants-far-higher-than-previous-estimates-house-2021-10-27/

Durbin, D.-A., & Schulte, G. (2021, October 6). Fed up by pandemic, Kellogg workers join a wave of strikes in food industry - Los Angeles Times. https://www.latimes.com/business/story/2021-10-06/kellogg-us-food-workers-launch-rare-strikes

Eidelson, J. (2021, October 25). 'Suicide Shifts,' 7-Day Weeks Fuel Rare Flare-Up in U.S. Strikes. Bloomberg News. https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2021-10-25/-suicide-shifts-7-day-weeks-fuel-rare-flare-up-in-u-s-strikes

Faghri, P. D., Dobson, M., Landsbergis, P., & Schnall, P. L. (2021). COVID-19 Pandemic: What Has Work Got to Do With It? Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine, 63(4), e245–e249. https://doi.org/10.1097/JOM.0000000000002154

Fan, W., & Qian, Y. (2017). Native-immigrant occupational segregation and worker health in the United States, 2004e2014. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2017.04.029

Food Chain Workers Alliance. (2016). No Piece of the Pie. www.foodchainworkers.org

Goldman, S., & Martin, R. (2021). Essential and in Crisis: A review of the public health threats facing farmworkers in the US. https://clf.jhsph.edu/sites/default/files/2021-05/essential-and-in-_crisis-a-review-of-the-public-health-threats-facing-farmworkers-in-the-us.pdf

Greenhouse, S. (2021, October 23). 'Striketober' is showing workers' rising power – but will it lead to lasting change? . https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2021/oct/23/striketober-unions-strikes-workers-lasting-change

Grzywacz, J. G., Arcury, T. A., Ma, A. M., Carrillo Bs, L., Coates, M. L., Ma, B., & Quandt, S. A. (2007). The Organization of Work: Implications for Injury and Illness among Immigrant Latino Poultry-processing

Workers. Archives of Environmental & Occupational Health, 62(1), 19–26. https://doi.org/10.3200/AEOH.62.1.19-26

Guillory, J., Wiant, K. F., Farrelly, M., Fiacco, L., Alam, I., Hoffman, L., Crankshaw, E., Delahanty, J., & Alexander, T. N. (2018). Recruiting hard-to-reach populations for survey research: Using Facebook and Instagram advertisements and in-person intercept in LGBT bars and nightclubs to recruit LGBT young adults. Journal of Medical Internet Research, 20(6). https://doi.org/10.2196/jmir.9461

Gunter, M. M. (2016). An update on SOII undercount research activities. Monthly Labor Review, 2016(9). https://doi.org/10.21916/MLR.2016.41

Hahn, S. E., & Murphy, L. R. (2008). A short scale for measuring safety climate. Safety Science, 46(7), 1047–1066. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssci.2007.06.002

Hammonds, C., Kerrissey, J., & Tomaskovic-Devey, D. (2020). Stressed, Unsafe, and Insecure: Essential Workers Need A New, New Deal.

Hemp, P. (2004). Presenteeism: At Work-But Out of It. Harvard Business Review. https://www.npg-rsp.ch/fileadmin/npg-rsp/Themen/Fachthemen/Hemp_2004_Presenteeism.pdf

Johns, G. (2010). Presenteeism in the workplace: A review and research agenda. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 31(4), 519–542. https://doi.org/10.1002/JOB.630

Kinman, G., & Grant, C. (2020). Presenteeism during the COVID-19 pandemic: risks and solutions. Occupational Medicine. https://doi.org/10.1093/OCCMED/KQAA193

LaDonna, K. A., Taylor, T., & Lingard, L. (2018). Why open-ended survey questions are unlikely to support rigorous qualitative insights. Academic Medicine, 93(3), 347–349. https://doi.org/10.1097/ACM.0000000000002088

Lauzardo, M., Kovacevich, N., Dennis, A., Myers, P., Flocks, J., Morris, J. G., & Jr. (2021). An Outbreak of COVID-19 Among H-2A Temporary Agricultural Workers. American Journal of Public Health, 111(4), 571. https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2020.306082

Lehdonvirta, V., Oksanen, A., Räsänen, P., & Blank, G. (2020). Social Media, Web, and Panel Surveys: Using Non-Probability Samples in Social and Policy Research. Policy & Internet, poi3.238. https://doi.org/10.1002/poi3.238

Leigh, J. P., Du, J., & McCurdy, S. A. (2014). An estimate of the US government's undercount of nonfatal occupational injuries and illnesses in agriculture. Annals of Epidemiology, 24(4), 254–259.

Lipscomb, H. J., Mcdonald, M. A., Dement, J. M., Schoenfisch, A. L., & Epling, C. A. (2007). Are We Failing Vulnerable Workers? The Case of Black Women in Poultry Processing in Rural North Carolina. NEW SOLUTIONS, 17(1). https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.2190/D410-2KM2-51R2-08HM?casa_token=T4x0bseHsUYAAAAA%3A8M-tMAcW7Sz6pXoJiMVAns05u8lXA8MFKP_LMvBmmbZaYhPQbW0czH6880fRnzOZ7pq2PzwqIUfj_Q

Liu, B., Lu, Q., Zhao, Y., & Zhan, J. (2020). Can the Psychosocial Safety Climate Reduce Ill-Health Presenteeism? Evidence from Chinese Healthcare Staff under a Dual Information Processing Path Lens.

International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 17(8). https://doi.org/10.3390/IJERPH17082969

Lorr, B. (2020). The Secret Life of Groceries: The Dark Miracle of the American Supermarket eBook: Lorr, Benjamin: Kindle Store. Penguin Random House. https://www.amazon.com/Secret-Life-Groceries-American-Supermarket-ebook/dp/B083RZFYZC

Menasche Horowitz, J., Brown, A., & Cox, K. (2019). The role of race and ethnicity in Americans' lives. Pew Research Center. https://www.pewresearch.org/social-trends/2019/04/09/the-role-of-race-and-ethnicity-in-americans-personal-lives/

Milligan, W. R., Fuller, Z. L., Agarwal, I., Eisen, M. B., Przeworski, M., & Sella, G. (2021). Impact of essential workers in the context of social distancing for epidemic control. PLOS ONE, 16(8), e0255680. https://doi.org/10.1371/JOURNAL.PONE.0255680

Minkoff-Zern, L.-A. (2014). Hunger amidst plenty: farmworker food insecurity and coping strategies in California. International Journal of Justice and Sustainability, 19(2), 204–219. https://doi.org/10.1080/13549839.2012.729568

Nahrgang, J. D., Morgeson, F. P., & Hofmann, D. A. (2011). Safety at Work: A Meta-Analytic Investigation of the Link Between Job Demands, Job Resources, Burnout, Engagement, and Safety Outcomes. Journal of Applied Psychology, 96(1), 71–94. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0021484

Neff, R. (2015). Introduction to the US Food System: Public Health, Environment, and Equity. In R. Neff (Ed.), Introduction to the US Food System: Public Health, Environment, and Equity (1st ed.). John Wiley & Sons, Incorporated. https://www.ebooks.com/en-us/book/1813350/introduction-to-the-us-food-system/roni-neff/

Newman, K. L., Leon, J. S., & Newman, L. S. (2015). Estimating Occupational Illness, Injury, and Mortality in Food Production in the United States: A Farm-to-Table Analysis. Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine / American College of Occupational and Environmental Medicine, 57(7), 718–725. https://doi.org/10.1097/JOM.0000000000000476 [doi]

Norton, D. M., Brown, { L G, Frick, R., Carpenter, } L R, Green, A. L., Tobin-D'angelo, || M, Reimann, D. W., Blade, H., Nicholas, D. C., Egan, J. S., & Everstine, A. K. (2015). Managerial Practices regarding Workers Working while Ill 3. Journal of Food Protection, 78(1), 187–195. https://doi.org/10.4315/0362-028X.JFP-14-134

O'Cathain, A., & Thomas, K. J. (2004). "Any other comments?" Open questions on questionnaires – a bane or a bonus to research? BMC Medical Research Methodology 2004 4:1, 4(1), 1–7. https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2288-4-25

Office of the President of the United States. (2020, April 28). Executive Order on Delegating Authority Under the DPA with Respect to Food Supply Chain Resources During the National Emergency Caused by the Outbreak of COVID-19. https://web.archive.org/web/20200429142220/https://www.whitehouse.gov/presidential-actions/executive-order-delegating-authority-dpa-respect-food-supply-chain-resources-national-emergency-caused-outbreak-covid-19/

Osterman, P., & Shulman, B. (2011). Good jobs America: making work better for everyone.

Probst, T. M., Lee, H. J., Bazzoli, A., Jenkins, M. R., & Bettac, E. L. (2021). Work and Non-Work Sickness Presenteeism: The Role of Workplace COVID-19 Climate. Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine, 63(8), 713. https://doi.org/10.1097/JOM.0000000000002240

Robert A Peterson. (1994). A Meta-Analysis of Cronbach's Coefficient Alpha. Journal of Consumer Research, 21. https://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/2489828.pdf?casa_token=0YCpPTZE0J4AAAAA:buq57Wr4lp_HpJ83i_zbG2N4ytAEDDoLcbqQ7Wo797Odl2IEmIqceqbw53q1BWplupUQFp11Ddum5j68MHBNP_RJWNvUKh1DJBWg_nGCDKErmREbjp8

Saldaña, J. (2015). The coding manual for qualitative researchers (2nd ed.). Sage Publications Ltd. https://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=ZhxiCgAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PP1&dq=the+coding+manual+for+qualitative+researchers+saldana&ots=yIW96FSYaY&sig=9wnG7K71fy7hEIKRJAUvx81szhk

Scheiber, N. (2021). Despite Labor Shortages, Workers See Few Gains in Economic Security. The New York Times. https://www.nytimes.com/2022/02/01/business/economy/part-time-work.html?campaign_id=9&emc=edit_nn_20220202&instance_id=51915&nl=the-morning&regi_id=61261114&segment_id=81386&te=1&user_id=a76ef1c85306c3416fff874e59fab3ce

Schill, A. L., & Chosewood, L. C. (2013). The NIOSH Total Worker HealthTM program: an overview. Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine, 55. https://doi.org/10.1097/JOM.0000000000000037

Schlitz, H. (2020). Meatpacking workers say attendance policy forces them to work with potential Covid-19 symptoms - Investigate MidwestInvestigate Midwest. Midwest Center for Crisis Reporting. https://investigatemidwest.org/2020/10/20/meatpacking-workers-say-attendance-policy-forces-them-to-work-with-potential-covid-19-symptoms/

Schneider, D., & Harknett, K. (2020). Essential and Vulnerable: Service-sector workers and paid sick leave. The Shift Project.

Schneider, D., Harknett, K., & Vivas-Portillo, E. (2021). Olive Garden's Expansion Of Paid Sick Leave During COVID-19 Reduced The Share Of Employees Working While Sick. Health Affairs, 40(8), 1328–1336. https://doi.org/10.1377/hlthaff.2020.02320

Sinclair, R. R., Allen, T., Barber, L., Bergman, M., Britt, T., Butler, A., Ford, M., Hammer, L., Kath, L., Probst, T., & Yuan, Z. (2020). Occupational Health Science in the Time of COVID-19: Now more than Ever. Occupational Health Science, 4(1–2), 1–22. https://doi.org/10.1007/s41542-020-00064-3

Siqueira, C. E., Gaydos, M., Monforton, C., Slatin, C., Borkowski, L., Dooley, P., Liebman, A., Rosenberg, E., Shor, G., & Keifer, M. (2014). Effects of social, economic, and labor policies on occupational health disparities. American Journal of Industrial Medicine, 57(5), 557–572. https://doi.org/10.1002/ajim.22186

Stephenson, J. (2020). COVID-19 Outbreaks Among Food Production Workers May Intensify Pandemic's Disproportionate Effects on People of Color. JAMA Health Forum, 1(6), e200783–e200783. https://doi.org/10.1001/JAMAHEALTHFORUM.2020.0783

Sumner, S., Green Brown, L., Frick, R., Stone, C., Carpenter, L. R., Bushnell, L., Nicholas, D., Mack, J., Blade, H., & Tobin-D'angelo, M. (2011). Factors Associated with Food Workers Working while Experiencing Vomiting or Diarrhea. Journal of Food Protection, 74(2), 215–220. https://doi.org/10.4315/0362-028X.JFP-10-108

Tai, D. B. G., Shah, A., Doubeni, C. A., Sia, I. G., & Wieland, M. L. (2021). The Disproportionate Impact of COVID-19 on Racial and Ethnic Minorities in the United States. Clinical Infectious Diseases, 72(4), 703–706. https://doi.org/10.1093/CID/CIAA815

Taylor, C. A., Boulos, C., & Almond, D. (2020). Livestock plants and COVID-19 transmission. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 117(50), 31706–31715. https://doi.org/10.1073/PNAS.2010115117

Tilchin, C., Dayton, L., & Latkin, C. A. (2021). Socioeconomic factors associated with an intention to work while sick from COVID-19. Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine, 63(5), 343–368. https://doi.org/10.1097/JOM.0000000000002147

Tran, M., & Sokas, R. K. (2017). The Gig Economy and Contingent Work: An Occupational Health Assessment. In Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine (Vol. 59, Issue 4, pp. e63–e66). Lippincott Williams and Wilkins. https://doi.org/10.1097/JOM.0000000000000977

U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2020a). Agricultural Workers: Occupational Outlook Handbook. https://www.bls.gov/ooh/farming-fishing-and-forestry/agricultural-workers.htm

U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2020b). Food and Beverage Serving and Related Workers: Occupational Outlook Handbook. https://www.bls.gov/ooh/food-preparation-and-serving/food-and-beverage-serving-and-related-workers.htm

U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2021). Essential work: Employment and outlook in occupations that protect and provide. https://www.bls.gov/careeroutlook/2020/article/essential-work.htm

U.S. Centers for Disease Control. (2020a). COVID View Summary ending on July 25, 2020. https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/covid-data/covidview/past-reports/07312020.html

U.S. Centers for Disease Control. (2020b, June 30). COVID-19 Guidance: Businesses and Employers . https://web.archive.org/web/20210630153208/https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/community/guidance-business-response.html

U.S. Department of Labor. (2020). Families First Coronavirus Response Act: Employee Paid Leave Rights. https://www.dol.gov/agencies/whd/pandemic/ffcra-employee-paid-leave

U.S. Occupational Safety and Health Administration. (2007). Small farming operations and exemption from OSHA enforcement activity under CPL 02-00-051. | Occupational Safety and Health Administration. https://www.osha.gov/laws-regs/standardinterpretations/2007-07-16

Waltenburg, M. A., Rose, C. E., Victoroff, T., Butterfield, M., Dillaha, J. A., Heinzerling, A., Chuey, M., Fierro, M., Jervis, R. H., Fedak, K. M., Leapley, A., Gabel, J. A., Feldpausch, A., Dunne, E. M., Austin, C., Pedati, C. S., Ahmed, F. S., Tubach, S., Rhea, C., … Honein, M. A. (2021). Coronavirus Disease among Workers in Food Processing, Food Manufacturing, and Agriculture Workplaces. Emerging Infectious Diseases, 27(1), 243. https://doi.org/10.3201/EID2701.203821

Webster, R. K., Liu, R., Karimullina, K., Hall, I., Amlôt, R., & Rubin, G. J. (2019). A systematic review of infectious illness Presenteeism: prevalence, reasons and risk factors. BMC Public Health, 19(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/S12889-019-7138-X

Widera, E., Chang, A., & Chen, H. L. (2010). Presenteeism: A public health hazard. Journal of General Internal Medicine, 25(11), 1244–1247. https://doi.org/10.1007/S11606-010-1422-X/FIGURES/1

Williams, D. R., Mph, J. A. L., Davis Mph, B. A., & Vu, C. (2019). Understanding how discrimination can affect health. Health Services Research, 54, 1374–1388. https://doi.org/10.1111/1475-6773.13222

World Health Organization. (2020, March 11). WHO Director-General's opening remarks at the media briefing on COVID-19 - 11 March 2020. https://www.who.int/director-general/speeches/detail/who-director-general-s-opening-remarks-at-the-media-briefing-on-covid-19---11-march-2020

Zohar, D. (1980). Safety climate in industrial organizations: Theoretical and applied implications. Journal of Applied Psychology, 65(1), 96–102. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.65.1.96