



# EMPLOYEES' MENTAL HEALTH AND PRODUCTIVITY AND ITS IMPACT ON TASK PERFORMANCE IN ORGANIZATIONS

Natasha Sagar<sup>1</sup>, Dr. Rajender Singh<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Research Scholar, OPJS University, Churu Rajasthan

<sup>2</sup>Professor, OPJS University, Churu Rajasthan

## Abstract

In the context of both public and private sector enterprises, this research looks at how workers' emotional health affects their productivity on the job. An examination of the psychological health of workers, related institutional issues, and their effect on productivity is at the heart of a comparison of public and private enterprises. Workplace reality is supported by the results of this research, which indicate that positions in the private sector are demanding and stressful, adversely affecting the mental health of employees; if stress levels rise over a certain threshold, performance begins to decline. However, in public sector businesses, the internal climate is more laid-back and less stressful, therefore workers' mental health and productivity are not at risk. Thus, "happy" employees outperform their "less happy" counterparts in terms of productivity. The retention and higher performance of human capital depend on their good physical and mental health. According to the findings, frequent interventions are needed to evaluate workers' mental health and come up with methods for striking a balance between high performance standards, ambitious organizational objectives, and other stresses inside the institution.

**Key words:** Task Performance, Mental Health, Psychological Wellbeing.

## INTRODUCTION

In this extra research, we catalogue the strength of the evidence supporting the effectiveness of evaluations of twenty-one different types of workplace therapies and provide a unified approach for analysing this data, "Review of Evidence of Interventions to Reduce Mental Ill-health in the Workplace." For best results, we would lay out the possible return on investment for each of these actions. This study shows, however, that our understanding of how these treatments affect the mental health and/or occupational outcomes of workers is restricted by a lack of systematic information. In our search for organizational-level treatments that have a modest to substantial impact on workers' mental health and occupational results, we came up empty. Interventions at all other levels were supported by sufficient evidence.

According to the WHO's report from 2014, mental health is defined as "a state of well-being in which every individual can flourish to the fullest extent of their potential, cope effectively with the normal stresses of life, and make a positive contribution to their community and to the world at large." Happiness and fulfillment in life are at the heart of psychological health, which has recently been a major research and policy priority for sociologists, economists, and legislators. An further research on the relationship between mental health and productivity at work found that greater PWB is associated with higher job performance-enhanced potential and improved productivity. Performance on the work is most strongly related to one's subjective PWB. Though some research has shown a correlation between psychological health and productivity on the job, this research has not yet pinpointed how much variation there really is between

different states of mental wellness. According to reference [1], workers' physical, mental, and social health are all negatively impacted by occupational pressures, and this has repercussions at the workplace as well as in the rest of their lives. There is a correlation between exposure to high stresses and the likelihood of experiencing a relapse of mental illness, which may have far-reaching consequences for an individual's personal and professional life. When an employee's mental and physical health are both strong, they are able to do their best work in a welcoming, low-stress atmosphere.

For a government to accomplish its strategic and operational objectives, it must have organizations in the public sector. The numerous government agencies that make up the public sector serve the public good by providing essential services to the general populace. The private sector, on the other hand, is made up of both for-profit businesses looking to maximize profits for their owners and non-profit organizations focused on doing good in the world. In a similar vein, Bashir and Sufiyan Zilli [3] argue that more study has to be done in the area of psychological wellness and productivity at work, with a particular focus on the influence of PWB on the results of employees' jobs. This study focuses on how an individual's state of mind affects their ability to do their work, both in terms of their task performance and their overall contextual performance.

## Workplace Health Promotion

### Cost assumptions

We assume that the intervention is providing exercise courses at work to 20% of the staff and then do sensitivity analyses on the premise that the proportion is really 50%. We base our calculations on the same assumptions made by PriceWaterhouseCoopers (20) in their analysis for beyondblue, namely that classes would cost \$120 for the whole 20-week session. A maximum of 10 workers are assigned to each group.

### Return on Investment

A health promotion program has a favorable return on investment for both small and big businesses (table 12). The ROI for small and medium-sized businesses is \$2.86, while it is \$4.01 for huge corporations. These numbers would still be encouraging even if the impact sizes were considerably less (a 10% drop in absenteeism and presenteeism) and the investment expenditures were substantially greater (\$200 per class). A 50% assumption of adoption has no effect on the ROI.

**Table 1: Return on investment for workplace health promotion\**

	SME	Large employer
Number of employees affected	10	200
Change in absenteeism		
Days	-0.6	-0.8
Benefit per employee	\$119	\$232
Change in presenteeism		
% affected	-7.6	-7.2
Benefit per employee	\$568	\$730
Total benefit	\$6,866	\$192,396
Total investment	\$2,400	\$48,000
ROI	2.86	4.01

## Benefit Assumptions

To better understand the effects of health promotion treatments, Kuoppala and Lamminpää (19) analyzed 46 papers (including 14 randomized controlled trials). On average, absenteeism dropped by 20%, while "work ability" rose by 40%. Our best guess is that the latter is a result of a corresponding decline in presenteeism. This translates to a decrease of 0.84 absentee days and an increase of 7.2 percent in the percentage of employees reporting presenteeism behavior among workers at large companies (a decrease of 0.58 absentee days and a decrease of 7.2 percent in the presentee rate among workers at small and medium businesses).

## LITERATURE REVIEW

Hogg, B., Moreno-Alcázar, A., Tóth, M.D. *et al.* (2022), There were translations of the survey into six tongues. For this survey, we utilized Qualtrics, an online platform for collecting responses. We used descriptive statistics to examine the numbers, and theme analysis to make sense of the text. In all, 65 experts out of 146 were polled (42% response rate). Findings show that just 26.2% of experts believe workers may openly discuss mental health concerns, and that 81.5% of experts believe there is a large or medium unmet need for assistance for workers with mental health issues. Staff members rated psychoeducational resources, in-person seminars, and CBT-based therapies as the most likely to be adopted. 67.7% of experts found the suggestions for managers on what to do if an employee has mental health difficulties to be helpful. Numerous specialists have stressed the need of awareness campaigns (78.5%) and seminars led by those who have personal experience with mental illness (80%). Experts from various nations and fields all gave similar responses. Results from this international poll of experts indicate a pressing need for programs that promote positive mental health at work and combat stigma. An intervention consisting of many parts using various resources is encouraged.

The authors Ishikawa, Kohara, and Nushimoto are Y. (2022), In the study, first-time participants are paired with counselors at random. Since job-seekers have varied degrees of difficulty obtaining employment, this random assignment results in unanticipated workloads, adding stress to the duties of career counselors. We next compare the replies from the counselors' daily records on mental health issues with the data from the random assignment of job counseling. We use a panel data format and a fixed-effects model to account for the counselors' time-invariant observed heterogeneities. Counselors' mental health is evaluated using both self-reported and objective measures, such as blood pressure and pulse. The findings show that the stress brought on by dealing with recently assigned difficult job searchers has a negative impact on the objective measures of counselors' mental health, but has little to no effect on their perceptions of their own mental well-being. This finding hints that the mental health impacts of workplace stress might build up over time, even if the worker isn't consciously aware of it.

Lagerveld, S.E., Bültmann, U., Franche, R.L., et al (2011), With this study, we want to better understand the factors influencing the WP and WF of now sad workers by analysing the relevant literature. Thirty studies were found that investigated the root causes of WP (N = 19) or WF (N = 11). For all outcomes, reports on associations with disorder-related variables were more common than those with individual or occupational factors. These associations held true for WP: The link between a prolonged depressive episode and job impairment was supported by the available data. The correlations between older age, a history of sick leave, and work incapacity were supported by moderate evidence, as were those between more severe types of depressive illness, the presence of co-morbid mental or physical issues, and longer age. Work limitations for WF with severe depression were associated with work limits, but increasing productivity was associated with clinical recovery. Because almost half of the studies were cross-sectional, few genuine future connections could be determined. Conclusion Our findings may be utilized to guide the development of future studies and evidence-based treatments aimed at improving WP and WF among depressed employees. More longitudinal research is needed to determine the elements, both at work and at home, that may be changed to reduce the likelihood of WP and WF.

Researchers Evans-Lacko, S., and Knapp, M. (2016), Financial burdens of depression-related work absences and tardinesses were calculated for eight countries. We also looked at how poor productivity is affected by personal, organizational, and social variables. This is the first research that we are aware of that looks at the effects of depression on workplace productivity in a wide range of nations, both culturally and economically. South Korea had the lowest yearly absenteeism cost at \$181 per person, while Japan had the most at \$2674. The United States (\$5524) and Brazil (\$5788) had the greatest mean presenteeism expenses

per person. When compared to absenteeism, the costs of presenteeism are often five to ten times greater. These results imply that workplace depression has a significant global economic effect, both in absolute terms and as a percentage of national GDP in every country studied.

## METHODOLOGY

### Research Design

Financial and accounting experts from a range of Indian businesses participated in a correlational study to examine the links between work satisfaction and success.

### Sampling and Data Collection

Information was gathered via the use of predetermined survey questions. Three hundred seventy-four finance and accounting experts from public and private sector businesses were included in the sample. There were a total of 420 questionnaires sent out, with 374 usable ones for an 89% response rate.

### Measures

Respondents' ages, genders, job titles, years of service, and the nature of their current employer's sector (public or private) were all collected using a demographics questionnaire. The Inventory of Psychological Health (PWBS). In order to quantify PWB, we employed the Ryff Scale of Psychic Well-Being (version 18, 48 items). The six factors that make up the scale are as follows: freedom, meaningful work, satisfying relationships, control over one's physical surroundings, and continuous development. It has been a 1–6 Likert scale. In order to ensure precise scoring of the dimensions tested, the 8 negatively phrased questions will be reverse scored in the final scoring method. Scores closer to 100 indicate more happiness.

### Job performance

A scale developed by Vera Silva Carlos and Ricardo Gouveia Rodrigues, based on the widely accepted viewpoint on job performance's contextual and task-related dimensions, was used in this study. The 7-point Likert scale was chosen since it has been proven reliable for use across many industries and cultural contexts. Contextual performance is comprised of eight dimensions, including persistent effort, collaboration, organisational conscientiousness, personal traits, and interpersonal and relationship abilities, while task performance consists of three dimensions: job knowledge, organisational skills, and efficiency.

### Procedure

The evaluation measures used in the study were chosen after thorough investigation and the collecting of psychometric information for the reliability, validity, and scoring methods. The questionnaire and a demographics sheet were sent to the participants. According to the grading rubric the authors provide, the questions were graded. The statistical work was performed in SPSS. The findings are broken down into a descriptive section and an inferential section using statistics. Mean, standard deviation, and frequency percentages represented descriptive analysis, while inferential statistics followed. Regression analysis was used to explore hypotheses about the correlation between workers' states of mind and their task and environmental competence. As an added step, a regression analysis was conducted to zero in on which personal work environment (PWE) characteristics had the greatest influence on both task and context-based job performance. PWB-job performance correlations in the public and private sectors were analyzed using one-way analysis of variance and comparative correlation analysis. This was accomplished by separating information gathered from the governmental sector and the commercial sector (including MNCs and local organizations).

### Data Analysis

Frequencies and percentages of respondent demographic profile information, Cronbach's alpha of variables, descriptive statistics, correlation coefficient, regression analysis, One-way ANOVA, and Post Hoc Tukey's test are all displayed in the following paragraphs, along with their respective interpretations.

**Table 2: Demographic Profile of the Respondents**

Characteristics		Percentage
Age	18-24 years	9.1
	25 to 34 years	42.8
	35 to 44 years	17.1
	45-years and above	31.0
Gender	Male	73.5
	Female	26.5
Job Tenure	0-5 years	69.8
	6-10 years	18.7
	11-15 years	6.7
	16 years and above	4.8
Sector Type	Public	17.9
	Private (MNC)	33.2
	Private (Local)	48.9

The breakdown of the 374 financial and accounting experts that participated is shown in Table 2. Workers are mostly male (73.5% of the total) and the majority are between the ages of 25 and 34 (42.8%). Most respondents (69.8%) have been with their current employer for less than five years, while just 4.8% have been with their current employer for more than sixteen years. Even more striking was that almost half of them (48.9%) found employment in privately-owned businesses in their respective communities.

A Cronbach's alpha test was performed to establish the internal consistency and reliability of the study's variables, and the findings indicated that all of the variables are above the cutoff value of 0.700. (See Table 3). The results agree with the advice of specialists.

**Table 3: Cronbach's Alpha of the Variables Used**

Variables	Abbr.	No. of Items	Cronbach's alpha
<b>Autonomy</b>	PWBA	3	0.83
<b>Environmental Mastery</b>	PWBEM	3	0.86
<b>Personal Growth</b>	PWBPG	3	0.85
<b>Positive Relation w/Others</b>	PWBPR	3	0.88
<b>Purpose in Life</b>	PWPIL	3	0.87
<b>Self-Acceptance</b>	PWBSA	3	0.91
<b>Job Performance - Task</b>	JPT	12	0.76
<b>Job Performance - Contextual</b>	JPC	17	0.81

### Descriptive Statistics

The mean, standard deviation, skewness, and kurtosis of the scaled questionnaire data were calculated using descriptive statistics. The lowest ratings (1.0) were given for the variables PWBA, PWBPG, PWPIL, and PWBSA, while the highest rating (5.0) was given to JPC. Standard deviations between .670 and .998 and means between 3.333 and 4.743 are within a reasonable range (See Table 4). Mean rating for JPC is greatest ( $y = 4.743$ ), same as it is for PWPIL ( $x = 3.330$ ), which likewise has the highest response rate.

**Table 4: Descriptive Statistics, Skewness and Kurtosis of the Research Constructs**

Variables	N	Min	Max	Mean	Std. Deviation	Skewness	Kurtosis
PWBA	374	1.00	6.00	3.914	.941	-.452	.203
PWBEM	374	1.33	6.00	3.954	.871	-.218	.152
PWBPG	374	1.00	6.00	4.063	.998	-.565	.894
PWBPR	374	1.67	6.00	3.556	.952	.560	.167
PWPIL	374	1.00	6.00	3.330	.919	.282	.619
PWBSA	374	1.00	6.00	3.936	.899	-.414	.714
JPT	374	1.75	6.17	4.543	.670	-.312	.603
JPC	374	2.41	6.76	4.743	.738	-.427	.675

In addition, the values for Skewness and Kurtosis were all within the standard deviation of the mean, demonstrating that the constructs are normally distributed in the Univariate setting.

**Table 5: Correlation Coefficient of the Main Variables**

Sector	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Min	Max
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Public	67	4.2235	.75428	.06772	3.4884	3.7587	1.83	6.00
Private (MNC)	124	3.6832	.68343	.06137	3.5618	3.8047	1.78	4.78
Private (Local)	183	3.9287	.68324	.05051	3.8290	4.0283	1.78	4.83
Total	374	3.7926	.67406	.03485	3.7241	3.8612	1.78	6.00

Average, SD, low, and high ratings from respondents are shown in Table 5. The results show that the average rating is greatest for the public sector (4.2235), then the private (local) sector, and finally the private (MNC) sector (3.6832). Minimum responses were received from the Private (MNC) and Private (Local) sectors, both at 1.78, with the Private (Local) sector receiving the most responses.

Table 6 shows that at an F-ratio of 12.415, with a significance level of  $p=0.0000.01$ , seventeen percent of the PWB variables accounted for the variations in performance on the job. PWBA and PWBPIIL are the only two constants out of the six. Conversely, PWBEM, PWBPR, PWBPIIL, and PWBSA were not significantly affected.

**Table 6: Effect of Psychological Well-being Variables on Job Performance**

Independent variables	Slope	Std. error	t-ratio	prob.
PWBA	.176	.044	3.99	.000
PWBEM	.023	.045	.51	.611
PWBPG	.175	.043	4.12	.000
PWBPR	-.042	.043	-.98	.328
PWBPIIL	.007	.046	.14	.886
PWBSA	-.060	.046	-1.32	.187
Constant	3.416			
R2	= .17			
F-ratio	= 12.415	$p < .05$		
n	= 374			

One-way ANOVA tests with a 95% confidence level were conducted to differentiate between the various industry types with regards to PWB, JPC, and JPT (See Table 7). Government, Corporations, and Other Private Organizations Make Up This Sector Type (Local).  $F(2, 371) = 7.737$ ,  $p=0.001$  indicates a statistically significant difference in how respondents rated their experiences with PWB across the public, private (MNC), and private (local) sectors. There is no significant variation in respondents' attitudes regarding JPC across industries ( $F(2, 371) = 1.656$ ,  $p=0.192$ ), suggesting that people's perspectives on job performance in context are consistent across fields.  $F(2, 371) = 0.513$ ,  $p=0.599$  indicates there is also no significant variation in respondents' opinions of work performance across tasks. This also implies that there is no difference in respondents' beliefs that the job performance-task is the same whether one is working in the public, private (MNC), or private (Local) sectors.

**Table 7: One-Way ANOVA Result on Significant Difference of the Sector Type and PWB, JPC, and JPT**

Sector Type		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
PWB	Between Groups	6.785	2	3.393	7.737	.001
	Within Groups	162.688	371	.439		
	Total	169.473	373			
JPC	Between Groups	1.803	2	.901	1.656	.192
	Within Groups	201.893	371	.544		
	Total	203.695	373			
JPT	Between Groups	.463	2	.231	.513	.599
	Within Groups	167.380	371	.451		
	Total	167.843	373			

Since there is a discernible difference between industry and PWB, we ran a Post-Hoc Tukey's test on this latter variable. Table 8 shows that there is a statistically significant difference between the public sector and the private (Local) sector ( $p=0.004$ ) and between the private (MNC) and private (Local) sector ( $p=0.004$ ), but no such difference exists between the public sector and the private (MNC) sector ( $p=.823$ ). Meaning that the Public sector has a greater rate of psychological well-being ( $x = 4.2235$ ) than either the Private (Local) or Private (MNC) sectors ( $x = 3.9287$ ) or  $x = 3.6832$  respectively. As a result, the Private (Local) sector has better mental health than the Private (MNC) sector.

**Table 8: Post-Hoc Tukey's Test on Significant Difference between Sector Type and PWB**

Sector		Mean Difference	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Public	Private (MNC)	-.05969	.10041	.823	-.2960	.1766
	Private (Local)	-.30511*	.09456	.004	-.5276	-.0826
Private (MNC)	Public	.05969	.10041	.823	-.1766	.2960
	Private (Local)	-.24541*	.07702	.004	-.4267	-.0642
Private (Local)	Public	.30511*	.09456	.004	.0826	.5276
	Private (MNC)	.24541*	.07702	.004	.0642	.4267

\*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.



In conclusion, descriptive statistics demonstrated that the various conceptions studied were acceptable. The results of the correlation test between PWB, JPT, and JPC all showed positive associations between the three variables. The connection between PWB and JPC was the strongest of the three. Job performance on the task was shown to be strongly affected by the PWB variables PWBA and PWBPG, whereas job performance in the context of the organization was found to be considerably impacted by the PWB variables PWBA, PWBPG, and PWBSA. However, when comparing the sector type to the PWB, JPT, and JPC variables, the results showed that there was a substantial difference between the sector type and PWB but not the other two variables. Finally, In a study that compared the PWB experienced by workers in several industries, researchers discovered that the public sector and the private (local) sector, as well as the private (MNC) and private (local), had quite different experiences.

## DISCUSSION

The research found that regardless of the industry that someone works in, a high level of psychological well-being is significantly associated with higher levels of productivity. The positive correlations between PWB and task performance in both fields were supported by the correlational data, meaning that the higher the PWB of workers, the better their task performance. A whopping 92% of Australasian workers agreed with the statement "a happy worker is likely to be a productive worker" in a recent research [17]. Employees with greater PWB also engage in a higher amount of extra-role or contextual performance, which is an interesting finding. A major tenet of [20]'s concept of happy disposition on the job, this idea was thought to have "the largest influence on actions that are undertaken by one's own free choice" (p. ). Poor mental health has been linked to decreased productivity in the workplace [6], [11], and related conditions include depression, anxiety, emotional disease, and poor performance. A favorable association between PWB and evaluations of work performance was also confirmed by the source cited in [12]. It follows that raising employees' subjective levels of happiness has a positive effect on their productivity on the job. That's why it's crucial for supervisors to start caring about their workers' emotional well-being in addition to their physical fitness. It is for this reason that [23] believes that many businesses should organize their people-management efforts "with the stated purpose of boosting performance by promoting employee well-being". According to the data, workers are more likely to do their best work when they are given opportunities to exercise discretion and develop professionally, and when they are treated with respect and dignity.

## CONCLUSION

Conclusion Differences in organizational culture and stress reported by the employee may account for most of the discrepancy between the PWB - performance relationship of workers in the public and private sectors (local and MNCs). According to reference [53], an organization's culture is the "whole picture" of how the workplace affects its workers. It is well recognized [3] that there are significant differences between the two kinds of organizations in terms of structure, system, social-psychological environment, and general climate. In the public sector, performance management methods are shaped less by the person than by a number of institutional elements, as shown by the literature [55]. Employees in the public sector had the same impression [46]. Promotions in the public sector are often granted based on seniority rather than performance or merit. In turn, workers lose interest in achieving their full potential. Employees at private and multinational corporations (MNCs) are motivated to constantly improve their work since their pay is tied to how much they contribute to the company and how well they meet its objectives.

## REFERENCES

1. Evans-Lacko, S., Knapp, M. (2016), Global patterns of workplace productivity for people with depression: absenteeism and presenteeism costs across eight diverse countries. *Soc Psychiatry Psychiatr Epidemiol* **51**, 1525–1537. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00127-016-1278-4>
2. Lagerveld, S.E., Bültmann, U., Franche, R.L. *et al.* (2011), Factors Associated with Work Participation and Work Functioning in Depressed Workers: A Systematic Review. *J Occup Rehabil* **20**, 275–292. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10926-009-9224-x>
3. Ishikawa, Y., Kohara, M. & Nushimoto, A. (2022), Job stress and mental health among social workers: evidence from a field experiment at a public employment support institution in Japan. *JER* **73**, 123–146. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s42973-021-00100-z>

4. Hogg, B., Moreno-Alcázar, A., Tóth, M.D. *et al.* (2022), Supporting employees with mental illness and reducing mental illness-related stigma in the workplace: an expert survey. *Eur Arch Psychiatry Clin Neurosci* . <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00406-022-01443-3>
5. Shimizu, T., Mizoue, T., Takahashi, H., Shazuki, A., Kubota, S., Mishima, N., Nagata, S. (2013). Relationships among self-management skills, communication with superiors, and mental health of employees in a Japanese worksite. *Industrial Health*, 41:335–337.
6. M. George, and S. Brief, “Feeling good-doing good: A conceptual analysis of the mood at work organizational spontaneity relationship,” *Psychological Bulletin*, vol. 112, no. 2, pp. 310-329, 1992.
7. G. Giorgi, M. Shoss, and A. Di Fabio, “Editorial: From Organizational Welfare to Business Success: Higher Performance in Healthy Organizational Environments,” *Front Psychol*, vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 720, 2017.
8. A.M. Grant, M.K. Christianson, and R.H. Price, “Happiness, Health, or Relationships? Managerial Practices and Employee Well-Being Tradeoffs,” *Academy of Management Perspectives*, vol. 21, no. 3, pp. 51-63, 2007
9. Rosenfield, Sarah, and Dawne Mouzon. 2013. Gender and mental health. In Carol S. Aneshensel, Jo C. Phelan and Alex Bierman (Eds.), *Handbook of the Sociology of Mental Health* (2nd ed.), pp. 277-96. Dordrecht (Netherlands): Springer.
10. OECD. 2012. *Sick on the Job? Myths and Realities about Mental Health and Work*, Mental Health and Work. Paris: OECD Publishing
11. Milner, Allison, Peter Butterworth, Rebecca Bentley, Anne M. Kavanagh, and Anthony D. LaMontagne. 2015. Sickness absence and psychosocial job quality: An analysis from a longitudinal survey of working Australians, 2005–2012. *American Journal of Epidemiology* 181(10): 781-88.
12. Lesuffleur, Thomas, Jean-François Chastang, Nicolas Sandret, and Isabelle Niedhammer. 2014. Psychosocial factors at work and sickness absence: Results from the French National SUMER Survey. *American Journal of Industrial Medicine* 57(6): 695-708.
13. Hilton, Michael F., Paul A. Scuffham, Judith Sheridan, Catherine M. Cleary, and Harvey A. Whiteford. 2018. Mental ill-health and the differential effect of employee type on absenteeism and presenteeism. *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine* 50(11): 1228-43.
14. Frijters, Paul, David W. Johnston, and Michael A. Shields. 2014. The effect of mental health on employment: Evidence from Australian panel data. *Health Economics* 23(9): 1058- 71.
15. Deery, Stephen, Janet Walsh, and Christopher D. Zatzick. 2014. A moderated mediation analysis of job demands, presenteeism, and absenteeism. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology* 87(2): 352-69.