medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.25.22274276; this version posted June 28, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

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

Authors:

Caitlin A. Ceryes[1,2], Jacqueline 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

Corresponding Author:

Dr. Roni Neff,
Johns Hopkins Center for a Livable Future, 111 Market St., Ste. 840,
Baltimore, Maryland 21202, USA

The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

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

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.25.22274276; this version posted June 28, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

ABSTRACT

Background: While "stay at home" orders were in effect during early phases of the COVID-19 pandemic, many U.S. food workers attended in-person work, charged with maintaining operation of the national food supply chain. Anecdotal evidence suggests that many U.S. food system workers encountered barriers to staying home despite symptomatic COVID-19 illness.

Methods: We conducted a national, cross-sectional, online survey between July 31 to October 2, 2020, among 2,535 respondents. We used multivariable regression and free-text analyses to explore 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 symptomatic with COVID-19 disease. Almost half of respondents (41.1%) reported low or very low household food security. Workers reporting a high workplace safety climate score were half as likely to report presenteeism intentions (adjusted odds ratio [aOR] 0.52, 95% confidence interval (CI) 0.37, 0.75) relative to those reporting low scores. 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 twice the odds of reporting presenteeism intentions relative to those reporting high/marginal food security.

Conclusions: Our findings suggest that workplace culture and safety climate could enable employees to feel like they can take leave when sick during a pandemic, which is critical to individual health and prevention of workplace disease transmission. However, the pressure experienced by food workers to work when ill, especially by those experiencing food insecurity, themselves, underscores the need for strategies which address these vulnerabilities and empower food workers to make health-protective decisions.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.25.22274276; this version posted June 28, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

INTRODUCTION

After the March 11th, 2020 World Health Organization COVID-19 pandemic declaration (World Health Organization, 2020), the United States (U.S.) government deemed food system workers, i.e., those responsible for producing, processing, distributing, selling, and serving food, "essential" (1). To maintain operation of the national food supply chain, many U.S. food workers attended work in person while "stay at home orders" were in effect during the early COVID-19 pandemic, Consequently, essential food workers experienced high levels of COVID-19 exposure and illness risks (2), largely due to inability to socially distance while working (3–5). Presenteeism, a phenomenon wherein employees attend work despite symptomatic illness (6), is an important risk factor for workplace and community COVID-19 spread (7,8), especially in workplaces with limited social distancing. Anecdotal evidence suggests that many food system workers encountered barriers to staying home if ill (9). Understanding factors associated with the intent to work while ill (here termed "presenteeism intentions") is important for preventing workplace spread of COVID-19 and other infectious illnesses.

U.S. Food System Workforce*:* In the U.S. food system, approximately 21.5 million workers produce, process, distribute, sell, and serve food in mostly "non-relocatable" jobs (10,11). Appendix 1 provides food sector and subsector characteristics. Despite doing diverse tasks across sectors and jobs, many food workers share demographic and occupational similarities and all are needed to maintain a functioning food supply chain. Studying these workers as a group rather than in occupational silos provides insights relevant to this large cohort, their individual sectors, and food system functionality and resiliency.

Even before the COVID-19 pandemic, many food system workers experienced challenges associated with negative outcomes (12–14), including presenteeism (15). Food system jobs are often characterized by: full-time wages at or below the poverty line (16–18) (Appendix 1); low unionization rates, job insecurity, and at-will employment (19); precarious tipped work (11) or piece work (20); and

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.25.22274276; this version posted June 28, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

lacking sick pay and health insurance (21). These jobs exhibit high injury and illness rates relative to national averages (22,23), despite suspected widespread reporting suppression (24,25) and surveillance exemptions (26). Many food jobs exist in the "gig economy," meaning they are commonly exempted from many labor protections (27) and occupational health surveillance (28).

Presenteeism: Early presenteeism research examined economic and productivity losses resulting from employees working while sick or injured (29). More recently, studies have investigated the implications of presenteeism for food safety (30) and for worker and community health (6,31). Pre-pandemic studies 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) (15) can potentiate presenteeism.

A limited literature explores presenteeism among food system workers, identifying associations between presenteeism and high work demands; poor employer-employee communication; poor staffing; inadequate workplace policies (e.g., lacking paid sick leave or requiring doctors' notes) (30,32,33); poor workplace safety climate (34); and job insecurity, job dissatisfaction, and hazardous working conditions (35). During the COVID-19 pandemic, one study of restaurant workers has found that expanding paid sick leave at a large restaurant chain reduced presenteeism when compared to similar chains (36). Other studies among non-healthcare worker cohorts suggest that COVID-19 presenteeism is associated with household income, food security, and age (37), poor access to health benefits (37) and poor workplace safety climate (38). Despite their importance for maintaining national food security, high occupational vulnerability, and concerns about COVID-19 spread, little is known about how food system workers navigated decisions to attend work if ill.

COVID-19 Presenteeism-Related Policies: At the time of survey, COVID-19 case rates and deaths were rising (39) and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) had issued guidance for sick

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.25.22274276; this version posted June 28, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

workers to stay home or isolate (40). However, concerns remained that exacerbated financial pressures and other factors could incentivize presenteeism (41,42). In April 2020, the federal government implemented the first national sick leave policy (43) and augmented unemployment insurance (44), providing paid sick leave for many food chain workers who previously lacked this benefit, including part-time workers (43,45). However, firms employing fewer than 50 or more than 500 people were excluded from this policy, and voluntary implementation was inconsistent (36). Additionally, many processing workers were encouraged or required to work with COVID-19 symptoms (5,46) following a presidential executive order preventing closures of meat and poultry processing plants (47).

To our knowledge, no study has examined presenteeism intentions in a large, nationwide, food system worker sample. Here we explore workplace and non-workplace factors associated with food system worker COVID-19 presenteeism intentions during the early COVID-19 pandemic to identify opportunities to support food workers to remain home if ill or at risk of infecting others.

METHODS:

We drew data from the Johns Hopkins COVID-19 Food Worker Survey, developed during the early COVID-19 pandemic and deployed from July 31, 2020 to October 2, 2020. This cross-sectional, national, online survey of 3,399 food system workers documented COVID-19 pandemic-related workplace experiences and conditions. Recruitment and survey design have been reported in-depth elsewhere (2).

Study population: The survey included individuals who worked in any of six targeted food system sectors (production; processing; distribution; retail; service; assistance), were literate in English or Spanish, lived in the U.S., were 18 years old or older, and had attended a food system job in-person since March 11th, 2020.

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. We also excluded participants

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.25.22274276; this version posted June 28, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

who had previously contracted COVID-19, and/or did not receive a paycheck, producing 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 than those with outcome data. Missing outcome data was not associated with age, race, gender, U.S. census region, having worked in the past month, or degree of customer interaction. We discuss missing data patterns for independent variables and implications for interpretations in the discussion.

Sample size calculations determined that a sample of at least 1,000 respondents would provide enough power to detect group differences using a 3% margin of error and 95% confidence for the outcome. The median survey completion time was 19.5 minutes.

Instrument: In brief, the 114 item instrument was created with input from workers, worker representatives and experts in survey design, disaster preparedness, and occupational health. We used validated scales where possible and included novel items to capture COVID-19-related perspectives about working conditions. Measures are summarized below.

Measures*:* Demographics 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 beyond demographics. The survey was terminated if demographic responses did not satisfy inclusion criteria. Appendix 2 presents 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 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; a coalition of food worker-based organizations) (11). Workers

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.25.22274276; this version posted June 28, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

employed in more than one sector were asked to indicate the job in which they worked the most hours. Occupational characteristics included 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. Respondents specified all workplace benefits provided by their employers since the pandemic declaration from a select-all-that-apply list (48); these were aggregated as frequencies and analyzed individually.

We assessed quantitative work demands and workplace social support using medium-length scales from the Copenhagen Psychosocial Questionnaire III (COPSOQ III) (49), following published scoring procedures and then dichotomizing scores at the median into “high” and “low” categories. Higher work demands scores indicated more challenging levels of work demands (e.g., time pressure or many overlapping tasks). We assessed organizational safety climate using a 6-item scale (50) where high scores indicated that workers perceived their organization had a high commitment to safety. We created a composite organizational safety climate variable by summing scale responses and dichotomizing at the median, including responses for all participants who had answered 5 or more (of six) items.

Non-Occupational Measures: We measured food security since March 11, 2020, using a United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) Six-item Short Form Household Food Security Survey Module (51). The composite categorical variable included responses of participants with two or more items (of six) and was scored according to USDA classifications: high/marginal food security (raw score 0-1); low food security (2 – 4); and very low food security (5 – 6). Cronbach’s alpha was > 0.7 for all scales except quantitative work demands, which was 0.67 (52).

We 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

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.25.22274276; this version posted June 28, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

scale was collapsed to three points: agreement; neither agreement nor disagreement; and disagreement.

Theoretical Approach: The Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) (53) and Total Worker Health (TWH) models (54,55) guided analyses. The JD-R model suggests that job resources can mitigate the negative health impacts of workplace demands (53). We therefore hypothesized that resources such as organizational safety climate (defined as employees' shared perceptions of their organization's prioritization of worker safety (50,56) and paid sick leave would reduce the likelihood of reporting presenteeism intentions. The Total Worker Health approach (55) considers external (non-workplace) factors that impact worker well-being. Our conceptual model (presented in Ceryes et al., 2021 (2)) 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 (College Station, Texas USA) for quantitative analyses. Statistics included Chi^2 or Rank Sum tests (significance value $p < 0.05$) as well as Spearman's rank and Pearson's correlation coefficients to identify collinearity and bivariate logistic regression to assess correlations according to presenteeism intention status. Adjusted logistic regression models were used to examine associations with workplace characteristics. Variables associated with the outcome, presenteeism intention, at the level of $P<.05$ were retained in the multivariable model (age, gender, food system sector, organization size, hourly status).

Additional covariate inclusion was informed by *a priori* conceptual associations (race, ethnicity, geographic location). We included food security status and perspectives on reopening the economy based on free-text data (described below) and bivariable associations ($P <0.05$). The final model estimated associations between presenteeism intentions and workplace, and non-workplace characteristics while controlling for age, race, ethnicity, gender, food system sector, organization size,

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.25.22274276; this version posted June 28, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

and hourly status. Akaike's Information Criteria (AIC) values were used to assess model fit, and variance inflation factors assessing multicollinearity were all less than four (mean = 1.43) (57).

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 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 presenteeism intentions; thus, we analyzed responses to elaborate on our quantitative findings (58), an approach used previously in survey-based presenteeism studies (59). Comments informed covariate selection by narrowing variables considered for analyses. For example, responses frequently mentioned food insecurity and perspectives on opening the economy; therefore, we retained those variables. We also used comments to choose between highly correlated variables (e.g., food security status over annual household income), and when interpreting and discussing quantitative results.

The lead investigator (CAC) conducted two close reviews of free-text data, taking notes before coding responses and organizing them into themes (60) and excluding non-substantive comments (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. Respondents offering comments were compared to those who did not and to the full sample to identify potential biases. We analyzed presenteeism-related text responses as a whole and by sector, by subgroups according to reports of presenteeism, and by benefits and working conditions. Qualitative memos tracked CAC's reactions to comments (61).

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

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.25.22274276; this version posted June 28, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

RESULTS

Quantitative Results: Table 1 presents analytic sample demographics. Respondents were primarily female (64.8%), not Hispanic/Latinx (90.0%), white (86.0%), non-union (79.6%), working full-time (64.8%) and of average age 45.9 years (SD 11.2). Most worked in restaurant/service (43.3%) and retail (34.9%), with the fewest in distribution (2.4%). Almost all (95.9%) had worked in-person in the past month before taking the survey. Nearly a third (32.7%) were 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. Analytic sample demographics resembled those of the overall study 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)

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.25.22274276; this version posted June 28, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

< $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 (79.6)	
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)	

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.25.22274276; this version posted June 28, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

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)	
Percentages may not add to 100% due to rounding.		

Presenteeism: Of 2,535 respondents, 8.8% agreed that they would attend work if sick with COVID-19, but these differed greatly by sector. 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%), (x^2=45.31, p<0.001). Appendix 4 shows comparisons between groups reporting presenteeism intentions versus not, by variables of interest.

Benefits: Of 2,527 respondents, 27.7% reported paid sick leave access, 30.1% reported "easier" access to sick leave since March 11th, 2020, and 14.0% had received free workplace COVID-19 testing since the pandemic declaration.

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

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.25.22274276; this version posted June 28, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

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

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.25.22274276; this version posted June 28, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

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.Ref = Reference

After adjustment, respondents reporting high levels of organizational safety climate were half as likely to report presenteeism intentions compared to those reporting lower scores (adjusted odds ratio [aOR] 0.52, 95% CI 0.37, 0.75). Workers with high levels of work demands had 49% greater odds of reporting presenteeism intentions relative to those reporting lower levels (aOR 1.49, 95% 1.03, 2.16). Food production workers had higher odds of reporting presenteeism intentions relative to retail workers (aOR 3.96; 95% CI 1.98, 7.92). Paid sick leave was not associated with presenteeism intentions.

Respondents reporting low or very low food security were more than twice as likely to report presenteeism intentions relative to those reporting marginal/high food security (aORs 2.06, 95% CI 1.35, 3.13 and 2.31, 95% CI 1.50, 3.13, respectively). Respondents agreeing or strongly agreeing that it was "worth the health risk" to reopen the economy had higher odds of reporting presenteeism intentions relative to those disagreeing with this statement (aOR 2.43, 95% CI 1.58, 3.73).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.25.22274276; this version posted June 28, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Free Text Results: Overall, 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 substantive comments. Responses ranged from 1 to 233 words, with 23-word median length. Production workers had the lowest word count (13 words) and retail the highest (24 words). Workers who commented were less likely to work in food production, report 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 relating to presenteeism and workplace COVID-19 spread. While a few workers described adequate sick pay if symptomatic or COVID-19-positive, others described insufficient policies and benefits, including lacking paid sick leave. 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 isolation 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). Others described policies providing only partial sick pay, or requiring employees to find shift coverage, use personal vacation time, obtain doctors' notes, or abide penalty-driven attendance systems. For example, a processing worker described: *"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]."*

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.25.22274276; this version posted June 28, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Culture: Even if employers had official policies supporting those who stayed home, employees described cultural factors which communicated an expectation to work when symptomatic. For example, workers cited concerns about employer retaliation for using sick leave: *"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 related job insecurity, *"Even if you don't get fired for calling out … they'll find something else to fire you for… "*

Some comments described instances where policies meant to discourage COVID-19 presenteeism were unclear or not followed, including symptomatic co-workers working 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, workers cited economic instability, stemming from insufficient wages, as a driver for presenteeism. Many comments mentioned the need 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 about having used up 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 viewed COVID-19 as exaggerated or not a credible health threat. As one processing worker 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."*

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.25.22274276; this version posted June 28, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

DISCUSSION

Our findings identify workplace and non-workplace conditions associated with food system workers' intentions to work while ill and provide insights into this decision. While our results are specific to the COVID-19 pandemic context, we believe they have relevance for both infectious disease outbreak planning and mitigating the spread of more quotidian contagions.

Given rapid changes in infection rates, resources available for worker protection, and scientific knowledge about COVID-19 throughout 2020 and 2021, it is important to view these results in their temporal context. This study occurred during the first four to six months of the pandemic, when vaccines were unavailable, after initiation of federal paid sick leave policies, and before eviction moratoriums and unemployment insurance enhancements expired (62). Because of rapid U.S. case rate increases and news coverage emphasizing disease severity during these months (63), respondents may have perceived COVID-19 as more severe than other illnesses and planned to remain home. As the pandemic continued and many states prioritized "reopening," 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 greater prevalence of presenteeism intentions among these workers.

Workplace Factors associated with Presenteeism Intentions

Organizational Safety Climate: Workers with high safety climate scores, indicating they perceived their employers valued and prioritized maintaining employees' safety, 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 (38,64,65) and builds on previously established connections between safety climate and COVID-19 safety perceptions (2).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.25.22274276; this version posted June 28, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Free-text data elaborated on how organizational safety climate constructs, here including employees' shared perceptions of safety priorities, policies, and procedures; managerial commitment to safety; employee behavioral norms, and worker safety activity participation (50), could influence presenteeism intentions. For example, comments describing managers who ignored COVID-19 safety policies indicate a lack of empowerment to participate in safety activities and policy enforcement. Organizational safety climate is often studied regarding its effects on injury prevention, but these findings suggest its underlying constructs could represent important intervention targets for reducing illness-related presenteeism.

Sick Leave: The lack of association between sick leave access and presenteeism intentions after adjustment was surprising. Workers' comments describing cultural and organizational barriers to using sick leave, even if it is "officially" established, provide one interpretation of this finding. Descriptions of retaliation and penalties barring workers from accessing sick leave indicate that some employees are not empowered to use it. Such barriers have been documented among restaurant workers (45), and we expand these findings to include other food system workers. Our results diverge from those of Schneider and colleagues' (2021), who found that increasing paid sick leave reduced COVID-19 presenteeism among restaurant workers at the Olive Garden fast-casual restaurant chain. We suggest the difference could again relate to empowerment because Olive Garden's paid sick leave expansion occurred following "significant public scrutiny," (36), their employees might have felt more able to access their newfound benefits than workers whose employers were not being scrutinized.

Work Requirements: Notably, 32.7% of respondents reported being told they were "required" to work during the COVID-19 pandemic. Because these workers lacked choice, this circumstance would not typically be considered presenteeism. Sensitivity analysis estimates of reported presenteeism, stratified by requirement to work, did not meaningfully differ from our primary results. Research should assess the physical and mental health impacts of requirements to work during the COVID-19 pandemic.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.25.22274276; this version posted June 28, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Sector differences: After controlling for demographics and job characteristics, production workers were more likely to report presenteeism intentions relative to retail workers. This finding could relate to reduced risk perceptions due to these workers' open-air working environments and not interacting with customers. Alternatively, H-2A visa holders (meaning those in the United States on temporary agricultural work visas) might feel obliged to attend work while ill in order to remain in the country (66). Research is needed to explore this association further. We did not identify other sector-specific differences or note differential comment content by sector, though production workers were less likely to provide comments than workers in 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 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 (67), 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 (68) during early pandemic waves.

Risk Perceptions: Workers who felt it was "worth the health risk" to reopen the economy were twice as likely to report presenteeism intentions. Comments suggested some respondents did not trust public health messaging about COVID-19's severity, and/or felt the benefits of working, including financial

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.25.22274276; this version posted June 28, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

stability, outweighed COVID-19 exposure risks. This finding highlights connections between effective and consistent public health messaging and reducing infectious disease spread.

Future research and recommendations:

Longitudinal studies should further examine the association between workplace culture and presenteeism, especially whether shifts in workplace safety climate can decrease the spread of workplace and community infectious disease. Research is also needed to explore ways to empower employees to fully participate in developing and enacting policies, such as paid sick leave and symptom checks, especially in the context of top-down federal or state policy mandates and prolonged emergencies or pandemics.

This study suggests that worker food insecurity represents a major driver of COVID-19 presenteeism intentions. We therefore endorse instituting and evaluating policies that improve workers' overall financial stability to prevent presenteeism and accompanying disease transmission. These policies 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, benefitted work to those who want it (69). Such actions would not only contribute to public health and food system stability but could also reduce food businesses' presenteeism-related economic losses, which are estimated to be substantial (29). Finally, we advocate for heightened external accountability around workplace safety protocols and practices, including proactive worksite inspections and statutory worker protections, especially for "essential" workplaces. It would be informative to track presenteeism and its associated influences and outcomes in a longitudinal manner should a similar national disaster occur in the future.

While this large national survey addresses the experience of a unique worker population that is critical to our food supply, there are some expected limitations. As with many other Internet-based surveys,

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.25.22274276; this version posted June 28, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

our sample overrepresented white, female, and high-income individuals (70,71). Despite efforts to minimize missing data, thus increasing sample size and diversity, few participants identified as African American and Hispanic/Latinx or other Black/Indigenous/People of Color (BIPOC) individuals. These groups are of great interest because they are believed to be more subject to the negative impacts of COVID-19 (72). This study may have underestimated levels of risk factors or the existence of presenteeism intentions, especially among these populations. Future studies must focus on including these groups.

Use of free text data always presents the challenge of interpretation, especially when a single coder reviews the responses. However, our text analyses related directly to our validated scales and served the purpose of expanding, clarifying, and prioritizing those results.

This cross-sectional study was conducted during the early stages of the pandemic, when COVID-19 knowledge and risk perception were evolving, and anxiety was high. Although the design does not allow for causal inferences, results during this critical period indicate participants' perceptions of causal relationships between several risk factors and presenteeism decisions.

CONCLUSIONS:

The COVID-19 pandemic has highlighted U.S. society's reliance on food system workers to maintain national food security. Despite their heightened risks for COVID-19 morbidity and mortality, many food system workers indicated they would attend work while ill during the early COVID-19 pandemic. Often, they felt that they had no choice. This research suggests that interventions targeting workplace safety climate and food insecurity among food system workers could reduce presenteeism, therefore protecting the national food supply and the public's health during the COVID-19 pandemic and in other disaster or infectious illness scenarios. Addressing barriers to staying home when ill, like improving safety climate and mitigating or eliminating vulnerabilities such as food insecurity, could enable food

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.25.22274276; this version posted June 28, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

system workers to make decisions that protect both themselves and their workplaces. Reducing presenteeism is critical for creating optimal worker health outcomes, public health outcomes, and maintaining a functioning food system.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.25.22274276; this version posted June 28, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Declarations:

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

Consent for Publication: Not applicable.

Availability of Data and Materials: The datasets used and/or analysed during the current study are available from the corresponding author on reasonable request.

Competing Interests: The authors declare no competing interests.

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, a National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health training grant (T42 OH0008428), and the Ruth Freeman Memorial Scholarship Fund. The funders had no role in study design; data collection, analysis, or interpretation; or decision to publish.

Authors' Contributions: Conceived study, obtained funding: RAN. Designed the study: RAN, CAC, DJB. Data collection: CAC, RAN. Led data analysis and manuscript writing: CAC. Contributed to analysis: RAN, ALW, JA. Participated in writing and revisions: RAN, AJW, JA, DJB.

Acknowledgments: We thank the researchers at the Labor Occupational Health Program at the University of California, Berkeley, Celeste Monforton from George Washington University, and Jeffrey Johnson for their survey development contributions. We thank United Commercial and Food Worker Union and Food Chain Workers Alliance representatives, Martha Ojeda, and other food workers for providing survey input, and Bytes.co for survey dissemination collaboration. Thank you to Dr. Steven Harvey for free-text analysis guidance, and to Joelle Robinson and Erin Biehl for their contributions to study activities including recruitment, coding, and incentive administration.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.25.22274276; this version posted June 28, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

References

1. U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. Essential work: Employment and outlook in occupations that protect and provide [Internet]. 2021 [cited 2021 Sep 9]. Available from: https://www.bls.gov/careeroutlook/2020/article/essential-work.htm

2. Ceryes C, Robinson J, Biehl E, Wirtz AL, Barnett DJ, Neff R. Frequency of Workplace Controls and Associations With Safety Perceptions Among a National Sample of US Food Retail Workers During the COVID-19 Pandemic. J Occup Environ Med [Internet]. 2021 Jul [cited 2021 Jul 11];63(7):557–64. Available from: https://journals.lww.com/joem/Fulltext/2021/07000/Frequency_of_Workplace_Controls_and_Associations.3.aspx

3. Chang S, Pierson E, Koh PW, Gerardin J, Redbird B, Grusky D, et al. Mobility network models of COVID-19 explain inequities and inform reopening. Nature. 2020;

4. Faghri PD, Dobson M, Landsbergis P, Schnall PL. COVID-19 Pandemic: What Has Work Got to Do With It? J Occup Environ Med [Internet]. 2021 Apr 1 [cited 2021 Sep 13];63(4):e245–9. Available from: https://journals.lww.com/joem/Fulltext/2021/04000/COVID_19_Pandemic__What_Has_Work_Got_to_Do_With.21.aspx

5. Taylor CA, Boulos C, Almond D. Livestock plants and COVID-19 transmission. Proc Natl Acad Sci [Internet]. 2020 Dec 15 [cited 2021 Aug 31];117(50):31706–15. Available from: https://www.pnas.org/content/117/50/31706

6. Johns G. Presenteeism in the workplace: A review and research agenda. J Organ Behav [Internet]. 2010 May 1 [cited 2021 Nov 16];31(4):519–42. Available from: https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1002/job.630

7. Kinman G, Grant C. Presenteeism during the COVID-19 pandemic: risks and solutions. Occup Med (Chic Ill) [Internet]. 2020 Nov 18 [cited 2021 Sep 15]; Available from: https://academic.oup.com/occmed/advance-article/doi/10.1093/occmed/kqaa193/5986708

8. Milligan WR, Fuller ZL, Agarwal I, Eisen MB, Przeworski M, Sella G. Impact of essential workers in the context of social distancing for epidemic control. PLoS One [Internet]. 2021 Aug 1 [cited 2021 Sep 14];16(8):e0255680. Available from: https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0255680

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

10. Baker MG. Nonrelocatable Occupations at Increased Risk During Pandemics: United States, 2018. Am J Public Health [Internet]. 2020 Aug 1 [cited 2020 Nov 12];110(8):1126–32. Available from: /pmc/articles/PMC7349441/?report=abstract

11. Food Chain Workers Alliance. No Piece of the Pie [Internet]. 2016 [cited 2020 May 21]. Available from: www.foodchainworkers.org

12. Fan W, Qian Y. Native-immigrant occupational segregation and worker health in the United States, 2004e2014. 2017 [cited 2021 Oct 5]; Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2017.04.029

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.25.22274276; this version posted June 28, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

13. Neff R. Introduction to the US Food System: Public Health, Environment, and Equity [Internet]. 1st ed. Neff R, editor. Introduction to the US Food System: Public Health, Environment, and Equity. San Francisco: John Wiley & Sons, Incorporated; 2015 [cited 2022 Feb 10]. 237–261 p. Available from: https://www.ebooks.com/en-us/book/1813350/introduction-to-the-us-food-system/roni-neff/

14. Williams DR, Mph JAL, Davis Mph BA, Vu C. Understanding how discrimination can affect health. Health Serv Res. 2019;54:1374–88.

15. Webster RK, Liu R, Karimullina K, Hall I, Amlôt R, Rubin GJ. A systematic review of infectious illness Presenteeism: prevalence, reasons and risk factors. BMC Public Health [Internet]. 2019 Jun 21 [cited 2021 Aug 26];19(1). Available from: /pmc/articles/PMC6588911/

16. U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. Agricultural Workers: Occupational Outlook Handbook [Internet]. 2020 [cited 2020 May 20]. Available from: https://www.bls.gov/ooh/farming-fishing-and-forestry/agricultural-workers.htm

17. U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. Food and Tobacco Processing Workers [Internet]. Occupational Outlook Handbook. 2021 [cited 2021 Nov 15]. Available from: https://www.bls.gov/ooh/production/food-and-tobacco-processing-workers.htm

18. U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. Food and Beverage Serving and Related Workers: Occupational Outlook Handbook [Internet]. 2020 [cited 2020 May 20]. Available from: https://www.bls.gov/ooh/food-preparation-and-serving/food-and-beverage-serving-and-related-workers.htm

19. U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. Union Members Summary - 2021 A01 Results [Internet]. Economic News Release. 2021 [cited 2022 Feb 23]. Available from: https://www.bls.gov/news.release/union2.nr0.htm

20. Goldman S, Martin R. Essential and in Crisis: A review of the public health threats facing farmworkers in the US [Internet]. 2021 [cited 2021 Aug 31]. Available from: 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

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

22. Guillory J, Wiant KF, Farrelly M, Fiacco L, Alam I, Hoffman L, et al. 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. J Med Internet Res [Internet]. 2018 Jun 1 [cited 2020 Dec 2];20(6). Available from: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/29914861/

23. Newman KL, Leon JS, Newman LS. Estimating Occupational Illness, Injury, and Mortality in Food Production in the United States: A Farm-to-Table Analysis. J Occup Environ Med. 2015 Jul;57(7):718–25.

24. Azaroff LS, Levenstein C, Wegman DH. Occupational injury and illness surveillance: conceptual filters explain underreporting. Am J Public Health. 2002 Sep;92(9):1421–9.

25. Leigh JP, Du J, McCurdy SA. An estimate of the U.S. government's undercount of nonfatal occupational injuries and illnesses in agriculture. Ann Epidemiol. 2014 Apr 1;24(4):254–9.

26. U.S. Occupational Safety and Health Administration. Small farming operations and exemption

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.25.22274276; this version posted June 28, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

from OSHA enforcement activity under CPL 02-00-051. | Occupational Safety and Health Administration [Internet]. 2007 [cited 2021 Sep 14]. Available from: https://www.osha.gov/laws-regs/standardinterpretations/2007-07-16

27. Tran M, Sokas RK. The Gig Economy and Contingent Work: An Occupational Health Assessment. J Occup Environ Med [Internet]. 2017 Apr 1 [cited 2021 Sep 14];59(4):e63. Available from: /pmc/articles/PMC5374746/

28. Gunter MM. An update on SOII undercount research activities. Mon Labor Rev. 2016;2016(9).

29. Hemp P. Presenteeism: At Work-But Out of It. Harv Bus Rev [Internet]. 2004 [cited 2021 Nov 29]; Available from: https://www.npg-rsp.ch/fileadmin/npg-rsp/Themen/Fachthemen/Hemp_2004_Presenteeism.pdf

30. Clayton ML, Smith KC, Neff RA, Pollack KM, Ensminger M. Listening to food workers: Factors that impact proper health and hygiene practice in food service. Int J Occup Environ Health. 2015 Oct 1;21(4):314–27.

31. Widera E, Chang A, Chen HL. Presenteeism: A public health hazard. J Gen Intern Med [Internet]. 2010 Nov 12 [cited 2021 Nov 29];25(11):1244–7. Available from: https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11606-010-1422-x

32. Norton DM, Brown { L G, Frick R, Carpenter } L R, Green AL, Tobin-D'angelo || M, et al. Managerial Practices regarding Workers Working while Ill 3. J Food Prot. 2015;78(1):187–95.

33. Sumner S, Green Brown L, Frick R, Stone C, Carpenter LR, Bushnell L, et al. Factors Associated with Food Workers Working while Experiencing Vomiting or Diarrhea. J Food Prot. 2011;74(2):215–20.

34. Arcury TA, O'Hara H, Grzywacz JG, Isom S, Chen H, Quandt SA. Work Safety Climate, Musculoskeletal Discomfort, Working While Injured, and Depression Among Migrant Farmworkers in North Carolina. Am J Public Health [Internet]. 2012 May [cited 2021 Sep 15];102(Suppl 2):S272. Available from: /pmc/articles/PMC3358567/

35. Lipscomb HJ, Mcdonald MA, Dement JM, Schoenfisch AL, Epling CA. Are We Failing Vulnerable Workers? The Case of Black Women in Poultry Processing in Rural North Carolina. NEW Solut [Internet]. 2007 [cited 2018 Dec 31];17(1). Available from: https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.2190/D410-2KM2-51R2-08HM?casa_token=T4x0bseHsUYAAAAA%3A8M-tMAcW7Sz6pXoJiMVAns05u8lXA8MFKP_LMvBmmbZaYhPQbW0czH6880fRnzOZ7pq2PzwqlUfj_Q

36. Schneider D, Harknett K, Vivas-Portillo E. Olive Garden's Expansion Of Paid Sick Leave During COVID-19 Reduced The Share Of Employees Working While Sick. Health Aff. 2021;40(8):1328–36.

37. Tilchin C, Dayton L, Latkin CA. Socioeconomic factors associated with an intention to work while sick from COVID-19. J Occup Environ Med [Internet]. 2021 Apr 2 [cited 2021 Aug 26];63(5):343–68. Available from: https://journals.lww.com/joem/Fulltext/2021/05000/Socioeconomic_Factors_Associated_With_an_Intention.2.aspx

38. Probst TM, Lee HJ, Bazzoli A, Jenkins MR, Bettac EL. Work and Non-Work Sickness Presenteeism: The Role of Workplace COVID-19 Climate. J Occup Environ Med [Internet]. 2021 May 10 [cited 2021 Sep 15];63(8):713. Available from: /pmc/articles/PMC8327763/

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.25.22274276; this version posted June 28, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

39. U.S. Centers for Disease Control. COVID View Summary ending on July 25, 2020 [Internet]. 2020 [cited 2021 Nov 19]. Available from: https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/covid-data/covidview/past-reports/07312020.html

40. U.S. Centers for Disease Control. COVID-19 Guidance: Businesses and Employers [Internet]. 2020 [cited 2021 Oct 6]. Available from: https://web.archive.org/web/20210630153208/https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/community/guidance-business-response.html

41. Sinclair RR, Allen T, Barber L, Bergman M, Britt T, Butler A, et al. Occupational Health Science in the Time of COVID-19: Now more than Ever. Occup Heal Sci [Internet]. 2020 Jun [cited 2020 Nov 12];4(1–2):1–22. Available from: /pmc/articles/PMC7266131/?report=abstract

42. Stephenson J. COVID-19 Outbreaks Among Food Production Workers May Intensify Pandemic's Disproportionate Effects on People of Color. JAMA Heal Forum [Internet]. 2020 Jun 1 [cited 2021 Sep 14];1(6):e200783–e200783. Available from: https://jamanetwork.com/journals/jama-health-forum/fullarticle/2767667

43. U.S. Department of Labor. Families First Coronavirus Response Act: Employee Paid Leave Rights [Internet]. 2020 [cited 2021 Oct 6]. Available from: https://www.dol.gov/agencies/whd/pandemic/ffcra-employee-paid-leave

44. Congressional Research Service. Unemployment Insurance Provisions in the CARES Act [Internet]. 2020 [cited 2021 Oct 6]. Available from: https://crsreports.congress.gov

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

46. Schlitz H. Meatpacking workers say attendance policy forces them to work with potential Covid-19 symptoms - Investigate MidwestInvestigate Midwest [Internet]. Midwest Center for Crisis Reporting. 2020 [cited 2021 Nov 18]. Available from: https://investigatemidwest.org/2020/10/20/meatpacking-workers-say-attendance-policy-forces-them-to-work-with-potential-covid-19-symptoms/

47. Office of the President of the United States. 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 [Internet]. 2020 [cited 2021 Nov 18]. Available from: 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/

48. U.S. Occupational Safety and Health Administration. Guidance on Preparing Workplaces for COVID-19. 2020.

49. Burr H, Berthelsen H, Moncada S, Nübling M, Dupret E, Demiral Y, et al. The Third Version of the Copenhagen Psychosocial Questionnaire. Saf Health Work. 2019 Dec 1;10(4):482–503.

50. Hahn SE, Murphy LR. A short scale for measuring safety climate. Saf Sci. 2008 Aug;46(7):1047–66.

51. Economic Research Service U. U.S. Household Food Security Survey Module: Six-Item Short Form [Internet]. 2012 [cited 2021 Aug 6]. Available from: https://www.ers.usda.gov/media/8282/short2012.pdf

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.25.22274276; this version posted June 28, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

52. Robert A Peterson. A Meta-Analysis of Cronbach's Coefficient Alpha. J Consum Res [Internet]. 1994 Sep [cited 2020 Nov 19];21. Available from: https://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/2489828.pdf?casa_token=0YCpPTZE0J4AAAAA:buq57Wr4lp_HpJ83i_zbG2N4ytAEDDoLcbqQ7Wo797Odl2lEmlqceqbw53q1BWplupUQFp11Ddum5j68MHBNP_RJWNvUKh1DJBWg_nGCDKErmREbjp8

53. Bakker AB, Demerouti E. The Job Demands-Resources model: state of the art. J Manag Psychol [Internet]. 2007 Apr 3 [cited 2020 Nov 12];22(3):309–28. Available from: https://www.emerald.com/insight/content/doi/10.1108/02683940710733115/full/html

54. Sorensen G, Dennerlein JT, Peters SE, Sabbath EL, Kelly EL, Wagner GR. The future of research on work, safety, health and wellbeing: A guiding conceptual framework. Soc Sci Med. 2021 Jan 1;269:113593.

55. Schill AL, Chosewood LC. The NIOSH Total Worker Health™ program: an overview. J Occup Environ Med [Internet]. 2013;55. Available from: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/24284752/

56. Zohar D. Safety climate in industrial organizations: Theoretical and applied implications. J Appl Psychol. 1980 Feb;65(1):96–102.

57. Kim JH. Multicollinearity and misleading statistical results. Korean J Anesthesiol [Internet]. 2019 Dec 1 [cited 2020 Dec 16];72(6):558–69. Available from: /pmc/articles/PMC6900425/?report=abstract

58. O'Cathain A, Thomas KJ. "Any other comments?" Open questions on questionnaires – a bane or a bonus to research? BMC Med Res Methodol 2004 41 [Internet]. 2004 Nov 8 [cited 2021 Oct 12];4(1):1–7. Available from: https://bmcmedresmethodol.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/1471-2288-4-25

59. Chambers C, Frampton C, Barclay M. Presenteeism in the New Zealand senior medical workforce-a mixed-methods analysis. NZMJ [Internet]. 2017 [cited 2021 Sep 21];130:1449. Available from: www.nzma.org.nz/journal

60. Charmaz K. Constructing Grounded Theory: A Practical Guide through Qualitative Analysis [Internet]. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications Ltd.; 2006 [cited 2019 Feb 20]. Available from: https://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=2ThdBAAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PP1&dq=charmaz+2006&ots=fZnRaMpGDV&sig=wdugVgOYgRtfLJuPhWN3fdIJquc#v=onepage&q=charmaz 2006&f=false

61. Saldaña J. The coding manual for qualitative researchers [Internet]. 2nd ed. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications Ltd.; 2015 [cited 2019 Feb 20]. Available from: https://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=ZhxiCgAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PP1&dq=the+coding+manual+for+qualitative+researchers+saldana&ots=ylW96FSYaY&sig=9wnG7K71fy7hEIKRJAUvx81szhk

62. Sherfinski D. "Don't let us die": U.S. gig workers brace for unemployment benefits cliff | Reuters [Internet]. Reuters. 2021 [cited 2021 Oct 29]. Available from: https://www.reuters.com/article/health-coronavirus-usa-unemployment/dont-let-us-die-u-s-gig-workers-brace-for-unemployment-benefits-cliff-idUSL8N2Q13KK

63. Mach KJ, Salas Reyes R, Pentz B, Taylor J, Costa CA, Cruz SG, et al. News media coverage of COVID-19 public health and policy information. Humanit Soc Sci Commun 2021 81 [Internet].

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.25.22274276; this version posted June 28, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

2021 Sep 28 [cited 2021 Oct 29];8(1):1–11. Available from: https://www.nature.com/articles/s41599-021-00900-z

64. Bronkhorst B, Vermeeren B. Safety climate, worker health and organizational health performance: Testing a physical, psychosocial and combined pathway. Int J Work Heal Manag. 2016;9(3):270–89.

65. Liu B, Lu Q, Zhao Y, Zhan J. Can the Psychosocial Safety Climate Reduce Ill-Health Presenteeism? Evidence from Chinese Healthcare Staff under a Dual Information Processing Path Lens. Int J Environ Res Public Health [Internet]. 2020 Apr 2 [cited 2021 Oct 25];17(8). Available from: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/32344791/

66. Lauzardo M, Kovacevich N, Dennis A, Myers P, Flocks J, Morris JG, et al. An Outbreak of COVID-19 Among H-2A Temporary Agricultural Workers. Am J Public Health [Internet]. 2021 Apr 1 [cited 2021 Oct 29];111(4):571. Available from: /pmc/articles/PMC7958039/

67. Minkoff-Zern L-A. Hunger amidst plenty: farmworker food insecurity and coping strategies in California. Int J Justice Sustain [Internet]. 2014 [cited 2021 Oct 26];19(2):204–19. Available from: https://www.tandfonline.com/action/journalInformation?journalCode=cloe20

68. Tai DBG, Shah A, Doubeni CA, Sia IG, Wieland ML. The Disproportionate Impact of COVID-19 on Racial and Ethnic Minorities in the United States. Clin Infect Dis [Internet]. 2021 Feb 16 [cited 2021 Sep 14];72(4):703–6. Available from: https://academic.oup.com/cid/article/72/4/703/5860249

69. Scheiber N. Despite Labor Shortages, Workers See Few Gains in Economic Security - The New York Times [Internet]. The New York Times. 2021 [cited 2022 Feb 2]. Available from: 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

70. Ali SH, Foreman J, Capasso A, Jones AM, Tozan Y, Diclemente RJ. 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 Med Res Methodol [Internet]. 2020 [cited 2021 Feb 22];20(116). Available from: https://doi.org/10.1186/s12874-020-01011-0

71. Lehdonvirta V, Oksanen A, Räsänen P, Blank G. Social Media, Web, and Panel Surveys: Using Non-Probability Samples in Social and Policy Research. Policy & Internet [Internet]. 2020 Apr 29 [cited 2020 Dec 27];poi3.238. Available from: https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/poi3.238

72. Waltenburg MA, Rose CE, Victoroff T, Butterfield M, Dillaha JA, Heinzerling A, et al. Coronavirus Disease among Workers in Food Processing, Food Manufacturing, and Agriculture Workplaces. Emerg Infect Dis [Internet]. 2021 Jan 1 [cited 2022 Jan 28];27(1):243. Available from: /pmc/articles/PMC7774547/