

MANAGEMENT

PRESENTEEISM: A RESEARCH ON TYPE A AND TYPE B PERSONALITY AND DEMOGRAPHIC FEATURES

Geliş Tarihi: 8.11.2019 Kabul Tarihi: 4.12.2019

Nihan YAVUZ* ORCID ID: 0000-0002-1603-2520

Ayten KAYHAN** ORCID ID: 0000-0002-3615-4525

ABSTRACT

The concept of personality, which differs from in many ways, is the basis for the differentiation of individuals' behavior. The Presenteeism behavior, which can be shown up in the business environment by individuals, has become an important concept especially in terms of businesses. Because of the small number of studies dealing with personality traits and concepts of presenteeism which means being at work in spite of feeling ill, together, this study especially aims to contribute to the literature by examining presenteeism behavior in terms of A and B type of personality characteristics. The main purpose of this study is to examine whether presenteeism has changed to A and B personality characteristics, and also to investigate Presenteeism behavior according to the demographic characteristics of the participants. The sample of the research consists of 157 participants who were reached with the convenience sampling method. According to the results of the study, Presenteeism behavior is more common in the participants with Type A personality than the participants with Type B. In addition; women compared to men; managers compared to employees; young people compared to the elderly; low level of education compared to high level of education, show more Presenteeism behavior than the ones with.

Keywords: *Presenteeism, Personality, Type A and Type B Personality Traits.*

YÖNETİM

(İŞTE VAR OLAMAMA) PRESENTEEİSM DAVRANIŞI: A VE B KİŞİLİK ÖZELLİKLERİ VE DEMOGRAFİK ÖZELLİKLER ÜZERİNE BİR ARAŞTIRMA

ÖZET

Birçok yönden farklılık göstermenin temelinde yer alan kişilik kavramı, bireylerin davranışlarının da farklılaşmasına zemin oluşturmaktadır. Bireylerin çalışma ortamlarında gösterebilecekleri davranışlar arasında yer alan Presenteeism davranışı, özellikle son zamanlarda işletmeler açısından incelenmesi önem arz eden bir kavram haline gelmiştir. Kişilik özellikleri ile hasta iken işe gelme durumunu tanımlayan presenteeism kavramlarını birlikte inceleyen az sayıda çalışma olması nedeniyle bu çalışma, özellikle A ve B tipi kişilik özellikleri yönünden presenteeism davranışının incelenmesi ile literatüre katkı sağlamayı amaçlamaktadır. Bu kapsamda yapılan çalışmanın ana amacı, presenteeism davranışının A ve B tipi kişilik özelliğine göre farklılaşıp farklılaşmadığını incelemek ve yine katılımcıların Presenteeism davranışlarının demografik özelliklerine göre farklılıklarını araştırmaktır. Kolayda örnekleme yöntemi ile ulaşılan 157 katılımcı araştırmanın örneklemini oluşturmaktadır. Araştırma sonuçlarına göre; A tipi kişilik özelliklerine sahip katılımcılarda Presenteeism davranışı daha fazla görülmektedir. Buna ek olarak; kadınların erkeklere oranla; yöneticilerin çalışanlara oranla; gençlerin yaşlılara oranla; eğitim seviyesi düşük olanların yüksek olanlara oranla daha fazla Presenteeism davranışı gösterdikleri sonuçlarına ulaşılmıştır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: *Presenteeism (işte var olamama), Kişilik, A ve B Tipi Kişilik Özellikleri.*

* Arş.Gövr., İstanbul Ticaret Üniversitesi, İşletme Fakültesi, İşletme Bölümü, nyavuz@ticaret.edu.tr.

** Öğr.Gövr., İstanbul Üniversitesi, ayten.kayhan@istanbul.edu.tr.

1. INTRODUCTION

The most recent conception about presenteeism being at work, coming to work while ill (Aronsson et al., 2000; Johns, 2010). Despite having health problems, individuals physically at work but their performance above the normal capacity. This presenteeism behavior occurs about many reasons such as job stress, fear of losing the job, time pressure, a sense of responsibility, hard work (Miraglia M and Kinman G., 2017).

During recent years, the notion of presenteeism is investigated by researchers and also it has been becoming the most important conception for companies. In this study this notion expresses and its relation between personality characteristics through the literature review. Fewer studies showed up the relation between personality and presenteeism. Most of them are concerning big five personality traits. On the other hand, there is not any research study about the differences between A and B type of personality and presenteeism. Thus, the main purpose of this study is to examine whether presenteeism has changed to A and B type of personality characteristics. The discrepancy of Presenteeism behavior according to the demographic characteristics is the other purpose of the study.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

For individual and organizational reasons, employees may want to go to work even though they are sick. Factors such as sense of responsibility, relationships with colleagues, personality, working order can come to the fore in presenteeism. Personality that shapes human behavior and constitutes its character can be at the forefront of these factors. In this part, the concepts of presenteeism and personality will be explained in depth.

2.1. Presenteeism

Presenteeism, known as with the simplest definition being at work while ill (Aronsson et al., 2000; Johns, 2010), is also defined as while physically at work with the presence of health problems and demonstrating decreased performance cognitively (Aronsson and Gustafsson, 2005; Meerding et al., 2005; Schultz and Edington, 2007). Besides; although individuals have health problems, it is defined as the loss of confidential efficiency of them in this process (Burton et al., 2004). According to Koopman et al. (2002: 14), Presenteeism; although employees are physically being ready to work, the quality and the efficiency of work show up under the normal capacity.

Presenteeism can show up with various reasons such as some kind of health problems, individual or business-related factors, employee backup, time pressure, insufficient financial resources (Aronsson and Gustafsson, 2005; Widera et al., 2010; Miraglia M and Kinman G., 2017). Hansen and Andersen (2008) discussed the factors affecting presenteeism with three dimensions: organizational factors (time pressure, control over tasks, relationships with colleagues, employment

situation), individual factors (family life, financial situation, excessive dependency, socio-demographic characteristics) and attitudes (attitudes against absenteeism).

Considering presenteeism in terms of socio-demographic characteristics, features such as gender, age and education are important, but their presence differs. When evaluated in terms of gender, it was determined that women exhibit more Presenteeism behavior than men (Aronsson et al., 2000; Theroell et al., 2003; Burton et al., 2004; Aronsson and Gustafsson, 2005; Johns, 2010; Coşkun, 2012).

According to the previous studies, the elderly, with the effect of physical health problems Presenteeism behavior of elderly individuals is seen more than youths (Burton et al., 2004; Dew and Taupo, 2009; Coşkun, 2012; Kim et al., 2016). When the Presenteeism concept is examined in terms of education, it is determined that the Presenteeism is less seen in more educated individuals (Burton et al., 2004, s.38–45).

Presenteeism may differentiate according to the concept of personality based on individual differences. In studies on the relationship between personality and presenteeism; it was found that there was a negative correlation between presenteeism and responsibility, extraversion, and compatibility dimensions of personality and it was revealed that responsibility dimension of personality trait is one of the premises of Presenteeism (Patel et al., 2012; Nandi and Nandi, 2014; Matsushita et al., 2015). In the study conducted by Aronsson and Gustafsson (2005), it was concluded that Presenteeism was seen more on employees who were unable to say “no”. It would not be wrong to say that individuals who have a tendency to exhibit this behavior are pushing themselves to do their job even though they feel sick. According to the previous studies, openness trait of big five personality characteristics has positive but insignificant impact on presenteeism, agreeableness trait of big five personality characteristics has negative and insignificant impact on presenteeism, also other traits of conscientiousness, emotional stability and open to experience have positive impact on presenteeism (Ulu et al., 2016). The same results in another study revealed that conscientiousness trait effect presenteeism positively (Yıldız et al., 2017).

Cause of the small number of studies conducted with Presenteeism and personality, this study aims to reveal the new knowledge in terms of A and B types of personality characteristics.

2.2. Personality

According to the personality based on “individual differences” the behavior and characteristics of individuals can be changed and affected (Premuzic, 2014; Mount et al., 2005). Personality can also be defined as a relatively permanent pattern of thoughts, feelings, and behavior that distinguish individuals from each other and allow them to differentiate (Roberts and Mroczek, 2008). Personality is an image of some kind of factors that effect an individual’s perception, mentality and behavior forms (Yelboğa, 2006). The personality characteristics separate people from each

other transfer through genetically and it is also constructed by growing up in different environments and circumstances (Yeşilyaprak, 2014).

Personality; determines the psychological, behavioral and cognitive structure in the form of persistent tendencies with the interaction of individuals with the environment and makes sense of who the individual is (Morgan et al., 2005; Parks and Guay, 2009).

Personality can be defined as a pattern of emotions, thoughts and behavior come from the characteristics related to environmental, substantial and cognitive features. So in other words personality features are some behavior special exhibiting by individuals and make them original (Özsoy and Yıldız, 2013). Physiological, hereditary and environmental characteristics are effective in the formation of personality (Robbins and Judge 2012; Parks and Guay, 2009). Different theories and personality types have been introduced introduced to explain the formation of personality, what is effective, and what phenomena exist in the formation of individual characteristics. One of these theories and personality types is the A and B Type personality traits that try to explain the behavior of individuals on two bases.

2.2.1. Type A and Type B Personality

It is not wrong to say that job demands, job harmony and thoughts can be shaped according to the types of personality; considering that personality is related to the behavior of the individual in his / her private life and his / her behavior in his / her work life. This situation can also be reflected in the individual's business behavior, and it can be said that Presenteeism one of the business environment behavior may affect whether it is seen or not.

From human resources management perspective, personality has a big impact on selecting the right candidate to the right position, testing the candidates whether they are appropriate for the relevant position and also whether the position meets the candidates' expectations or not (Özsoy and Yıldız, 2013).

According to personality type A; individuals who are impatient, aggressive, act quickly in a short time, are prone to do many things at the same time, do not like waiting, unable to manage the free time, obsessive about the numbers which help them to show their success, competitive and success-oriented.

They always want to feel time pressure and design their life in this manner. The quantity of business is more important than the quality of it. They work hard and too much time in managerial positions to show their competitiveness (Robbins and Judge, 2013).

Type B individuals have the opposite characteristics than Type A individuals. These people are less competitive, living with less time pressure, not suffering from impatience, moving without feeling guilty, not being in a hurry, less stress-prone individuals (Robbins and Judge, 2013; Batıgün and Şahin, 2006; Durna, 2004).

3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

When the literature is reviewed, it is seen that the behavior of Presenteeism is a subject that has been recently examined. It has been observed that the number of studies that deal with personality traits and Presenteeism behavior is less, and these studies are mostly about the Big Five Personality Traits. In this case, it is thought to make a difference with this study which is concerning Type A and Type B personality traits.

In this study, it is aimed to examine the differences in Presenteeism behavior of white collar employees working in the banking sector in Istanbul, according to their personality and demographic characteristics.

In the study, the questionnaire was used as a data collection tool; in its first part, the demographic information of the participants, in the second part Presenteeism scale statements and the third party the personality type statements were asked. Before the survey was carried out, the participants were given explanations and the questions were answered in participants' workplace.

The technique used to calculate the number of samples has been determined to represent the most appropriate number of samples at least fivefold or tenfold of statements on the scale (Bryman and Cramer, 2001). This information was used to determine the number of samples to be used in the study. The Presenteeism scale used in the study consists of 6 statements and also, A-and B-type personality characteristics scale were determined by using 7 statements with two opposite side of statements included. In this context, it is thought that the number of samples obtained from 157 participants is sufficient. In this study, the Presenteeism scale, which was formed by Koopman and his colleagues (2002) from 6 statements, was used. The scale of 6 statements was measured in the questionnaire by using a quaternary Likert type scale (1: Definitely Disagree 5: Certainly Agree). In order to reveal the characteristics of Type A and Type B personality, the scale which is known as Bortner Rating Scale has 7 statements with two opposite sides of statements included and totally 14 statements (Carroll, 1992, s.13) was used. The evaluation is made by calculating the threefold of the points according to the responses given on the scale. If the score is more than 100, it means Type A personality, if it is less than 100, it means type B personality (Aktaş, 2001).

3.1. Analysis of Data and Results

SPSS 22 statistical package program was used to analyze the data. According to the purpose of the study; Frequency analysis for demographic findings; independent two-sample t-test for gender and position at the company variables; one-way ANOVA test for education, income and age variables was used. And finally two independent sample t-test were applied to examine the Presenteeism behavior according to the Type A and B personality traits.

In the research, 84 participants (53.5%) were female and 73 participants (46.5%) were male. The distribution of the participants according to age groups was found in

35 participants (22.3%) 30 years and under, 104 participants (66.2%) between 30-40 years of age and 18 participants (11.5%) between 30-40 years of age. The distribution of the participants according to education level was found in 27 participants (17.2%) high school; 44 participants (28.0%) associate's degree; 61 participants (38.9%) graduate degree and 25 participants (15.9%) postgraduate degree. The evaluation according to the position at work, 73 participants (46.5%) as executive; 84 participants (53.5%) as employee. Finally, according to monthly income levels, 19 participants (12.1%) 2.500 TL and less; 60 participants (38.2%) between 2.501-5.000 TL; 33 participants (21.0%) between 5.001-7.500 TL; 31 participants (19.7%) between 7.501-10.000 TL and 14 participants (8.9%) 10.000 TL and more.

Table 1: Demographic Characteristics of Participants

Gender	Number	Percentage	Position at the company	Number	Percentage
Female	84	53,5	Executive	73	46,5
Male	73	46,5	Employee	84	53,5
Total	157	100,0	Total	157	100,0
Age	Number	Percentage	Monthly Income	Number	Percentage
30 years and under	35	22,3	2.500 TL and under	19	12,1
Between the ages of 30-40	104	66,2	2.501 TL-5.000 TL	60	38,2
Between the ages of 40-50	18	11,5	5.001 TL-7.500 TL	33	21,0
Total	157	100,0	7.501 TL-10.000 TL	31	19,7
Education	Number	Percentage	10.000 TL and above	14	8,9
High School	27	17,2	Total	157	100,0
Associate's Degree	44	28,0			
Graduate Degree	61	38,9			
Postgraduate	25	15,9			
Total	157	100,0			

The reliability test result of the Presenteeism scale used in the study is shown in Table 2. The scale is considered to be a reliable scale in the field of social sciences in terms of Cronbach's alpha value > 0,7.

Table 2: Reliability Test Result of the Presenteeism Scale

	Expression Numbers	Cronbach Alpha
Presenteeism	6	0,876

3.2. Tests for the Difference

In the analysis where the mean level of the scale dimensions is sought, the independent sample t test was used when using two-choice variables, while the one-way variance analysis (Anova-F test) was used when using more than two-choice

variables. In Table 3 and Table 4, whether the behavior of Presenteeism significantly differentiates according to personality type was investigated. It was concluded that there was a statistically significant difference between the variables because the F value was higher than 0.05, and the p value was lower than 0.05. According to the information given in Table 4, individuals with Type A personality (2,9140) exhibit more Presenteeism behavior than individuals with Type B personality (2,4219).

Table 3: Difference Test Results Regarding the Difference of Presenteeism Behavior According to Personality Type

		Levene's Test		t test	
		F	P.	t	P.
Presenteeism	Equal variances assumed	0,197	0,658	3,384	0,001
	Equal variances not assumed			3,368	0,001

Table 4: Average Levels of Presenteeism Behavior According to Personality Type

	Personality	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Presenteeism	Type A	93	2,9140	0,88588
	Type B	64	2,4219	0,90898

Table 5 and Table 6 examined whether Presenteeism behavior was significantly different according to gender. The value of significance F is greater than 0.05, the variances are homogeneous; and the level of significance of p value is less than 0.05 it is concluded that since there was a statistically significant difference. According to the information given in Table 6; women (3,1270), more presenteeism behavior is observed in comparison to men (2,2374).

Table 5: The Results of the Difference Test Regarding the Difference of Presenteeism Behavior by Gender

		Levene's Test		t test	
		F	P.	t	P.
Presenteeism	Equal variances assumed	0,002	0,966	-6,835	0,000
	Equal variances not assumed			-6,856	0,000

Table 6: Average Levels According to Gender Differences of Presenteeism Behavior

	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Presenteeism	Male	73	2,2374	0,79491
	Female	84	3,1270	0,82895

In Table 7 and Table 8, it is examined whether the behavior of Presenteeism is significantly different according to the position at the company. Since the value of F value is greater than 0.05, it is concluded that the variances are homogeneous and P value is less than 0.05, and there is a statistically significant difference in terms of position at the company. According to the information given in Table 8; there are more presenteeism behavior in executives (3,4909) compared to employees (2,0377).

Table 7: Difference Test Results Regarding the Difference of Presenteeism Behavior According to Position at the Company

Levene's Test		t test			
		F	P.	t	P.
Presenteeism	Equal variances assumed	0,564	0,454	15,839	0,000
	Equal variances not assumed			15,899	0,000

Table 8: Average Levels According to the Difference of Presenteeism Behavior According to Position at the Company

	Position	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Presenteeism	Executive	73	3,4909	0,55687
	Employee	84	2,0377	0,58732

In Table 9 and Table 10, it is examined whether the behavior of Presenteeism is significantly different according to education level. ANOVA test significance level; there is significantly difference between high school and graduate education level and high school and postgraduate education level. In addition; there are statistically significant differences between associate's degree and graduate degree; between associate's and postgraduate education level. Presenteeism behavior, although there is not much difference between groups; with the highest numbers are high school (3,5370) and associate's degree (3,5379); and it is followed by graduate (2,0628) and postgraduate degree (1,9600). Depending on this situation, it will not be wrong to say that Presenteeism behavior decreases as the level of education increases. In other words, there is negative relation between them.

Table 9: Difference Test Results Regarding the Difference of Presenteeism Behavior According to the Education Levels of Participants

Presenteeism					
	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	88,233	3	29,411	99,550	0,000
Within Groups	45,202	153	0,295		

Table 10: Average Levels According to the Differences of Presenteeism Behavior According to the Education Levels of Participants

Presenteeism			
	N	Mean	Std.Dev.
High School	27	3,5370	0,43934
Associate's Degree	44	3,5379	0,51573
Graduate Degree	61	2,0628	0,55541
Postgraduate	25	1,9600	0,65313

In Table 11 and Table 12, it is examined whether the behavior of Presenteeism differentiated significantly according to age. According to ANOVA test; there were significant differences between participants aged 30 years and under and between 40 and 50 years of age. In addition to this, there were statistically significant differences between 30-40 and 40-50 years of age. Presenteeism behavior is mostly seen in the participants aged 30 years and under (2,8571); and it is seen in the participants between 30-40 (2,7708) and 40-50 years of age (2,1019). Depending on this situation; it will not be wrong to say that the behavior of Presenteeism decreases as the age progresses.

Table 11: Difference Test Results Regarding the Difference of Presenteeism Behavior According to the Age of the Participants

Presenteeism					
	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	7,798	2	3,899	4,779	0,010
Within Groups	125,637	154	0,816		

Table 12: Average Levels of Presenteeism According to the Different Age of Participants

Presenteeism	N	Mean	Std.Dev.
30 years and under	35	2,8571	1,01391
Between the ages of 30-40	104	2,7708	0,85275
Between the ages of 40-50	18	2,1019	0,96362

The analysis of whether there is a significant difference between Presenteeism behavior of the participants and their income situation is examined. Since the variance of the group was not distributed homogeneously and the level of significance increased above 0.05 (sig. = 0.471), it was not included in the study because of the fact that the ANOVA test was not statistically significant. Therefore, it can be said that Presenteeism behavior does not make a significantly difference according to the monthly income level of the participants.

CONCLUSION

In this study, whether Presenteeism behavior differentiates according to the demographic characteristics and personality types of individuals is investigated. First of all, it was examined whether there is a difference in Presenteeism behavior of individuals after determining which type of personality they will be evaluated in. As a result, it was concluded that individuals with A type of personality exhibited more Presenteeism behavior than individuals with B type of personality. In addition; women compared to men; managers compared to employees; young people compared to the elderly; low level of education compared to a high level of education, show more Presenteeism behavior than the ones with.

The results of this study were parallel with the study of Burton, Pransky et al., (2004) with the study of the gender variable, as study results of Aronsson et al.(2000), Theroell et al.(2003), Burton, Pransky et al.(2004), Aronsson and Gustafsson, (2005), and Johns (2010). When looking through the age variables, Burton, Pransky et al.(2004) Dew and Taupo, (2009), Kim et al.(2016) found different results compared to this study results. Especially in terms of personality characteristics, the presence of more Presenteeism behavior of individuals with A type of personality characteristics can be evaluated to support the results when considering the success-oriented, impatient, business-oriented and competitive structures of individuals. In future studies, the behavior of Presenteeism can be examined within the framework of different sectors, different personality types and demographic variables and contribute to the literature.

REFERENCES

Aktaş, Aliye M. (2001). “Bir Kamu Kuruluşunun Üst Düzey Yöneticilerinin İş Stresi ve Kişilik Özellikleri”, *Ankara Üniversitesi Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi Dergisi*, 8(56): 26-42.

Allport, Gordon W. (1961). *Pattern and Growth in Personality*, New York Holt: Rinehart and Winston Inc.

Aronsson, Gunnar, Gustafsson, Klas, Dallner, Margareta (2000). “Sick But Yet at Work. An Empirical Study of Sickness Presenteeism”, *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health*, 54(7): 502-509.

Aronsson, Gunnar, Gustafsson, Klas (2005). “Sickness Presenteeism: Prevalence, Attendance-Pressure Factors and An Outline of a Model for Research”, *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, 47(9): 547- 579.

Bryman, Alan, Cramer, Duncan (2001). *Quantitative Data Analysis with SPSS 12 and 13: A Guide for Social Scientists*, Londra ve New York: Taylor and Francis Group.

Burton, Wayne N., Pransky, Glenn, Conti, Daniel J., Chen, Chin-Yu, Edington, Dee W. (2004). “The Association of Medical Conditions and Presenteeism”, *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, 46 (6): 38-45.

Carroll, Douglas (1992). *Health Psychology Stress Behaviour and Disease*. London: The Falmer Press.

Coşkun, Özlem (2012). *İki işyerinde İşe Devamsızlık ve Kendini İşe Verememede Etkili Faktörlerin Değerlendirilmesi*, (Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi). Ankara Üniversitesi/Halk Sağlığı Anabilim Dalı, Ankara.

Dew, Kevin, Taupo, Trina (2009). “The Moral Regulation of The Workplace: Presenteeism and Public Health”, *Sociology of Health & Illness*, 31(7): 994-1010.

Durak Batıgün, Ayşegül, Şahin, Nesrin H. (2006). “İş Stresi ve Sağlık Psikolojisi Araştırmaları İçin İki Ölçek: A-Tipi Kişilik ve İş Doyumu”, *Türk Psikiyatri Dergisi*, 17 (1): 32-45.

Durna, Ufuk (2004). “Stres, A ve B Tipi Kişilik Yapısı ve Bunlar Arasındaki İlişki Üzerine Bir Araştırma”, *Yönetim ve Ekonomi*, 11 (1): 191-206.

Hansen, Claus D. and Andersen, Johan H. (2008). “Going Ill to Work – What Personal Circumstances, Attitudes and Work-Related Factors are Associated with Sickness Presenteeism?”, *Social Science & Medicine*, 67(6): 956-964.

Johns, Gary (2010). “Presenteeism in The Workplace: A Review and Research Agenda”, *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 31(4): 519-542.

Kim, Joohyun, Suh, Eunyoung E., Ju, Sejin, Choo, Hyunsim, Bae, Haejin, Choi, Hyungjin (2016). "Sickness Experiences of Korean Registered Nurses at Work: A Qualitative Study on Presenteeism", *Asian Nursing Research*, 10 (1): 32-38.

Koopman, Cherly, Pelletier, Kenneth R., Murray, James F., Sharda, Claire E., Berger, Marc L., Turpin, Robin S., Hackleman, Paul, Gibson, Pamela, Holmes, Danille M., Bendel, Talor (2002). "Stanford Presenteeism Scale: Health Status And Employee Productivity", *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, 44(1): 14-20.

Meerding, W, Ijzelenberg, Wilhelmina, Koopmanschap, M. A., Severens, Hans, Burdorf, Alex (2005). "Health Problems Lead to Considerable Productivity Loss at Work Among Workers with High Physical Load Jobs", *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology*, 58(5): 517-523.

Miraglia Mariella, Kinman Gail (2017). "Presenteeism: the hidden costs of working while sick", *The Psychologist*, 30: 36-41.

Mount, Michael K., Barrick Murray R., Scullen, Steve M., Rounds, James (2005). "Higher-Order Dimensions of The Big Five Personality Traits and The Big Six Vocational Interest Types", *Personnel Psychology*, 58: 447-478.

Parks, Laura, Guay, Russell P. (2009). "Personality, Values, and Motivation", *Personality and Individual Differences*, 47 (7): 675-684.

Premuzic, Tomas Chamorro (2014). "Personality and Individual Differences", B. Bıçakçı (Çev.). İstanbul: İstanbul Ticaret Üniversitesi Yayınları.

Robbins, Stephen P., Judge, Timothy A. (2013). *Örgütsel Davranış*. çev. İnci Erdem, Ankara: Nobel Yayıncılık, 14. Basım.

Roberts, Brent W., Mroczek, Daniel (2008). "Personality Trait Change in Adulthood", *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 17(1): 31-35.

Schultz, Alyssa B., Edington, Dee W. (2007). "Employee Health and Presenteeism: A Systematic Review", *Journal of Occupational Rehabilitation*, 17 (3): 547-579.

Theorell, Töres, Oxenstierna, Gabriella, Westerlund, H., Ferrie, Penelope J., Hagberg, James, Alfredsson, Lars (2003). "Downsizing of Staff is Associated with Lowered Medically Certified Sick Leave in Female Employees", *Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, 60(9), e9-e9.

Ulu, Seher, Özdeveoğlu, Mahmut, Ardiç, Kadir (2016). "Kişilik Özelliklerinin Hasta İlen İşe Gelme (Presenteizm) Davranışı Üzerindeki Etkileri: İmalat Sanayiinde Bir

Araştırma”, *Erciyes Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, 47, :167-181.

Widera, Eric, Chang, Anna, Chen, Helen L. (2010). “Presenteeism: A Public Health Hazard”, *Journal of General Internal Medicine*, 25(11): 1244-1247.

Yıldız, Harun, Yıldız, Bora, Zehir, Cemal, Altındağ, Erkut, Moloğlu, Vedat, Kitapçı, Hakan (2017). “Impact on Presenteeism of the Conscientiousness Trait: A Health Sector Case Study”, *Social Behavior and Personality: an international Journal*, 45 (3): 399-411.