

Sick Leave Availing Pattern, Reasons and Their Association of Socio-demographic Factors among Private University Staff in Kedah State, Malaysia

Abdul Nazer Ali^{1*}, Aw Wei Jun¹, Chuah Hui Ying¹ and Nazer Zulfikar Ahmed²

¹Faculty of Pharmacy, AIMST University, Malaysia.

²Cognizant Technology Solutions India Private Limited, Hyderabad, India.

Authors' contributions

This work was carried out in collaboration among all authors. All authors contributed toward data collection, data entry, analysis, drafting and critically revising the paper and agree to be accountable for all aspects of the work. Authors ANA and AWJ designed the study protocol, data collection tool and obtained ethical clearance. Author AWJ was involved in data collection and data entry. Authors ANA and AWJ performed the statistical analysis and wrote the first draft of the manuscript. Authors NZA and CHY managed the analyses, literature reviews, citations and references. All authors equally contributed, read and approved the final manuscript for submission.

Article Information

Editor(s):

(1) Dr. Carla Maria Ferreira Guerreiro da Silva Mendes, Centro Hospitalar de Setúbal, Portugal.

Reviewers:

(1) Romer C. Castillo, Batangas State University, Philippines.

(2) Vijaya Krishnan, MGM College of Physiotherapy, India.

Complete Peer review History: <http://www.sdiarticle4.com/review-history/55153>

Original Research Article

Received 02 January 2020

Accepted 08 March 2020

Published 18 March 2020

ABSTRACT

Aim: This study intends to investigate the 1) sick leave (SL) availing pattern, 2) the reasons for availing sick leave, and to evaluate 3) the association of sick leave with socio-demographic factors among a private University staff.

Study Design: A retrospective descriptive study design was employed in this study.

Place and Duration of Study: The study was conducted in a private University clinic, Kedah state, Malaysia among the University staff between September, 2018 and May, 2019.

Methodology: The data was obtained retrospectively from the University clinic, staff medical records between September, 2017 and August, 2018 (data retrieval period of employees) using a standardized, pre-validated data collection form consisting of socio-demographic data, SL data and reasons for SL. All temporary, permanent and contract employees belonging to academic, administrative and ancillary cadre were included in the study.

Results: A total of 78% (274/350) staff records met the inclusion criteria and 22% excluded for not completing service for one academic year of the study. The average age of the study population were 36 to 45 years, 80% were of Indian ethnicity, academic and ancillary staff comprised of 52% and 39% respectively. About 31% (85/274) of the study population did not avail any SL, whereas, 69% (189/274) were involved in at-least one SL during the study period. The study observed significant association ($P < .001$) between SL availed (31%) and SL not availed (69%) categories. The maximum sick leave availed during the study period was 74% (63/85) among 36 to 45 years. There was no significant association among SL availing pattern and socio-demographic factors. However, there were significant association between profession and country of origin under sick leave categories and socio-demographic factors ($P < .05$). Among the sick leave availed population, 36% (68/189) availed sick leave due to cough, fever, flu, sore throat or oral ulcer, 26% (49/189) due to abnormal uterine bleeding, pelvic pain or dysmenorrhea and 18% (34/189) due to diarrhoea and vomiting respectively.

Conclusion: Further investigation on sick leave utilization should be continued at the structural, organizational and individual levels. The increases of sick leave among young employees were considerably high and should be studied further. The increase in sick leave utilization among women is still unexplained as no research or data identified to explain it. Motivated, satisfied and fulfilled employees are far less likely to be sick and tired of work.

Keywords: Sick leave; availing pattern; reasons.

1. INTRODUCTION

Sick leave (SL) can be explained at different theoretical levels: the structural level, the organizational level, and the individual level. SL absence is a complex phenomenon affecting both quality of life and economical burden at different structural levels like the individual, the family, the company and the society [1-3]. Difficulties arise in a contractual relationship between the employers, when an employee is frequently on SL application. The effect of an employee absence may be lessened in a large organization by other employees' assistance and support, but the effect may be quite contrary in small organizations. SL is attributed to either genuine physical illness or due to stress at work place. A study by Bhui et al., reported adverse working conditions and management practices as common causes of work stress [4]. Stress-inducing management practices included unrealistic demands, lack of support, unfair treatment, lack of appreciation, conflicting roles, poor communication, lack of transparency and effort-reward imbalance [4].

SL abuse has become a growing challenge in Malaysia. According to a report in the news media, Malaysian employees in the private sector took an average of 4.2 days of medical leave, which is higher than the average in other countries [5]. According to the Malaysian Employers Federation, the then executive director indicated that SL was being abused. However, it is difficult to identify whether an employee has submitted the fake SL [6].

Whitaker stated that the decision to resume work after SL is related to real and perceived job conditions like a person's SL behaviour, health beliefs, motivation to resume work and job satisfaction [7].

Though there are several ways of measuring sickness absence, there still exists lack of standardized methods for doing so [8]. National definitions vary in the forms of SL considered, the criteria for inclusion and exclusion, differences in the populations being compared, and the accuracy of sickness absence data collected [9]. The concept of disease, as it is understood in connection with sickness absence, differs substantially between health professionals and employees. Solli discussed capability based health and disease concepts with reference to 'value of neutral and scientific concept', which was often used by professionals, whereas, 'value of laden and relational concept' was often referred to by employees [10]. These concepts contribute to a better understanding of how disease justifies sickness absence at the individual and the organizational levels.

In a study concerning employees about common health problems and work in the public sector, Buck (2011) found that perception was important in influencing sickness absence and sickness presentism. The employees acknowledged that health problems would impact on work in a variety of ways, including performance, colleague's work and inter personal relationship in the workplace [11].

1.1 Outcome Measures

This study intends to investigate the sick leave availing pattern, the reasons for availing sick leave, and to evaluate the association of sick leave with socio-demographic factors among private University staff.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

2.1 Study Design, Setting, Area and Population

A retrospective descriptive study design was employed in the study. The study was conducted in a private University clinic, among the university employed academic, administrative and ancillary staff, in the AIMST University, Kedah state, Malaysia.

2.2 Modality of Obtaining Response, Inclusion Criteria, Sample Size and SL Categorization

The data was obtained from the University clinic staff medical records using a standardized, pre-validated data collection form consisting of socio-demographic data, SL data and reasons for SL. All permanent, temporary and contract staff under the employment during the University academic session 2017/18 (September 2017 to August 2018) were included in the study. From the total University staff population, the sample size was calculated using an automated Raosoft sample size calculator which used Cohen statistical power analysis method [12,13]. The estimated sample size was calculated at 95% CI, 5% margin of error with 50% response distribution and the minimum required sample size was 227 employee data's rounded off to 225. In this study, the sick leave was categorized into three groups: < 6 days of SL, 6 to 8 days SL and > 8 days SL during the period studied.

2.3 Statistical Analyses

The analysis was performed using IBM SPSS statistics for windows (version 23). Descriptive statistics using frequency and percentage distribution was used for summarizing the data. Chi-square test was used for detecting the significance levels, $P < .05$ was considered significant. All percentage displayed in the text or in parentheses are with no decimal places as per APA reporting guideline recommendation [14].

3. RESULTS

Out of 350 staff medical profiles reviewed, a total of 78% (274/350) of patient's medical records which met the inclusion criteria were considered for this study. The 22% drop-outs was mainly due to exclusion criteria or not in service for the complete academic session (year of the study) of the University.

3.1 Socio-demographic Data of the Study Population

The average age of the study population (31%) was 36 to 45 years. There was no significant difference in gender distribution; however 80% were of Indian ethnicity. Regarding the profession, academic and ancillary staff comprised of 52% and 39% respectively. About 65% were of Malaysian origin followed by 31% Indian origin (Table 1).

Table 1. Socio-demographic characteristics of the study population

Variables (N=274)	N (%)
Age	
≤25	5 (2)
26-35	64 (23)
36-45	84 (31)
46-55	61 (22)
56-65	41 (15)
>65	19 (7)
Gender	
Male	138 (51)
Female	135 (49)
Race	
Malay	34 (12)
Chinese	7 (3)
Indian	219 (80)
#Others	13 (5)
Profession	
Academic Staff	141 (52)
Administrative Staff	25 (9)
Ancillary Staff	107 (39)
Country of origin	
Malaysia	178 (65)
India	84 (31)
#Others	11 (4)

#Bangladeshi, Burmese and/or Myanmar origin

3.2 Comparison of Sick Leave Availing Pattern among Socio-demographic Factors

About 31% (85/274) of the study population did not avail any SL whereas, 69% (189/274) were involved in at-least one SL during the study

period (academic session 2017/18 - one year). The study observed significant difference [$\chi^2 (1, N = 274) = 39.47, P < .001$] between SL availed (31%) and SL not availed (69%) study population. The maximum sick leave availed during the study period was 74% (63/85) among 36 to 45 years old. There was no significant difference among either genders (68% and 70%) availing SL, however, 70% (155/220) of the Indian ethnicity did. Regarding the profession of the study population, 52% of academic and 39% ancillary staff, availed SL respectively. About 65% from Malaysian origin and 31% from Indian origin availed SL (Table 2). There were no significant differences in sick leave availing pattern among the socio-demographic factors ($P > .05$).

3.3 Association of Sick Leave Categories with Socio-demographic Factors

In this study, the sick leave was categorized as: < 6 SL days, 6 to 8 SL days and > 8 SL days. This study observed a significant difference in the SL availing pattern among the study population [$\chi^2 (3, N = 274) = 301.83, P < .001$]. The number of participants who took 'NO' SL were 85/274 for the whole academic year; SL of

< 6 days was the highest (182/274). The number of participants who took 6 to 8 SL days and >8 SL days were 4/182 per academic session (one year) respectively. There was a significant association ($P < .05$) among the profession and country of origin among the SL category and socio-demographic factors (Table 3).

3.4 Reasons for Sick Leave

In this study, 69% (189/274) availed any sick leave during the entire academic session of 2017/18. Among the sick leave availed population, 36% (68/189) availed sick leave due to cough, fever, flu, sore throat or oral ulcer followed by 26% (49/189), due to abnormal uterine bleeding, pelvic pain or dysmenorrhea and 18% (34/189) due to diarrhoea and vomiting, respectively (Table 4).

3.5 Overall Sick Leave Availing Pattern among Study Population

The monthly SL availing pattern from September, 2017 to August, 2018 (per academic year) among the study population is illustrated in Fig. 1.

Table 2. Sick leave availing pattern among socio-demographic factors

Variables	SL Not Taken N(%) (N=85)	SL Taken N(%) (N=189)	*P value
Age			
≤25	1(20)	4(80)	.71
26-35	21(33)	43(67)	
36-45	22(26)	63(74)	
46-55	23(38)	38(62)	
56-65	12(30)	28(70)	
>65	6(32)	13(68)	
Gender			
Male	45(32)	94(68)	.63
Female	40(30)	95(70)	
Race			
Malay	9(26)	25(74)	.28
Chinese	3(43)	4(57)	
Indian	65(30)	155(70)	
#Others	8(62)	5(38)	
Profession			
Academic Staff	51(36)	91(64)	.16
Administrative Staff	4(16)	21(84)	
Ancillary Staff	30(28)	77(72)	
Country of origin			
Malaysia	52(29)	127(71)	.15
India	27(32)	57(68)	
#Others	6(55)	5(45)	

*Chi square test; #Bangladeshi, Burmese and/or Myanmar




Fig. 1. Monthly sick leave availing pattern per academic year (September 2017 to August 2018)

Table 3. Comparison of sick leave categories with socio-demographic factors

Variables	Sick Leave taken/academic session (one year)				*P value
	Zero (N=85)	< 6 days (N=181)	6-8 days (N=4)	>8 days (N=4)	
Age					
≤ 25	1(20)	4(80)	0(0)	0(0)	.48
26-35	21(33)	41(64)	1(2)	1(2)	
36-45	22(26)	59(69)	3(4)	1(1)	
46-55	23(38)	37(61)	0(0)	1(2)	
56-65	12(30)	27(68)	0(0)	1(3)	
> 65	6(32)	13(68)	0(0)	0(0)	
Gender					
Male	45(32)	90(65)	2(1)	2(1)	.27
Female	40(30)	91(67)	2(1)	2(1)	
Race					
Malay	9(26)	24(71)	0(0)	1(3)	.15
Chinese	3(43)	3(43)	0(0)	1(14)	
Indian	65(30)	149(68)	4(2)	2(1)	
*Others	8(62)	5(38)	0(0)	0(0)	
Profession					
Academic Staff	51(36)	88(62)	1(1)	2(1)	<.001*
Administrative Staff	4(16)	19(76)	0(0)	2(8)	
Ancillary Staff	30(28)	74(69)	3(3)	0(0)	
Country of origin					
Malaysia	52(29)	121(68)	3(2)	3(2)	.04*
India	27(32)	55(65)	1(1)	1(1)	
*Others	6(55)	5(45)	0(0)	0(0)	

*Chi square test, P < .05 is significant; *Bangladeshi, Burmese and/or Myanmar origin

Table 4. Reasons for sick leave (N = 189)

Reasons	Reasons for SL taken N (%)
Cough, fever, flu, sore throat or oral ulcer	68(36)
Diarrhoea, vomiting	34(18)
Injury & skeletal muscle pain	18(10)
Giddiness, head-ache, chest pain, dyspnea	8(4)
Infection	6(3)
Extended leave	6(3)
Abnormal uterine bleeding, pelvic pain or dysmenorrhea	49(26)

4. DISCUSSION

This study did not take into account the long term maternal leave or leave due to hospitalization and sick leave availed anywhere other than the University clinic.

4.1 SL Based on Age

In this study, the average age, 36 to 45 years recorded the highest number of sick leave taken (63/189). This might be due to the number of participants in this particular age range were the highest (84/274). Theoretically, sick leave pattern should increase as the age increases [15]. However, averages can cover some important variations: older employees are more likely to attend work. If they have sickness absence, it tends to be for a relatively longer time. A study in Belgium revealed, the youngest employees have the greatest frequency of sickness absence, while older employees on average were absent for longer duration [15]. One probable explanation could be the younger employees may use short absences as a form of escape from the work demands, while older employees become accustomed to these demands and go absent for mostly health reasons. Rhodes found consistent age related differences among work attitudes and behaviours', but could not identify any causal factors [16].

4.2 SL Based on Gender

The sick leave taken among females (94/189) were higher than the males, although the number of male participants were marginally higher (138 out of 274). Bekker found that although female seemed to have more number of sick leaves taken than men; this varied by country, age, profession and mostly seemed restricted to short term leave [17].

There are many different theories as to the reasons for gender differences in sick leave, for example the theory of double working women (paid work with family obligations). However, Mastekaasa found that the association between having children and sickness absence was weak [18]. In a review of the literature regarding the relationship between sick leave and gender, Kristensen and Bjerkedal found that only part of the difference in sick leave could be explained by absence due to pregnancy [19]. A study by Smeby (2009) found that gender differences in sick leave could not be explained by work-related factors or by general health or mental distress

[20], however, in contrast Laaksonen et al. [21] found that differences in occupations held by women and men explained a substantial part of excess in sick leave among females [21].

4.3 SL Based on Race

In race, the number of sick leave taken by Indians was the highest (155/189) which could be probably explained because of the maximum study populations being Indians (219/274).

4.4 SL Based on Profession

The number of sick leave taken by academic staff was the highest (91/189). This might be due to the working environment of ancillary staff which was more prone to get sick than academic and administrative staff. The concept of disease (SL) is often misunderstood between professionals (academic and administrative staff) and employees (ancillary staff). Solli [10] discussed the health and disease concepts, which may contribute to a better understanding of how disease justifies sickness absence at the individual and organizational level. In a study concerning attitudes and beliefs of employees in the public sector about common health problems and work, Buck et al. (2011) found that, others perception were important in influencing sickness absence and sickness presentism [22]. The study found a high degree of consensus among employees who acknowledged that 'health problems would impact on work in a variety of ways, including performance, colleagues' work, and inter-personal relationship in the workplace' [22]. On the other hand, Barnes study on the common health problems and work, reported that moral pressure is the associated concept of legitimate illness and its impact on work were the major themes of common health problems and work [23].

Occupational groups whose everyday tasks are to provide care or welfare services (or teach or instruct) have a substantially increased risk of sickness presentism and of higher sick leave [24]. Various studies have also indicated that perceived high occupational stresses are predictive for sickness absence [25]. A significant proportion of all SL may be due to illness caused by working conditions and heavy physical work; difficult work postures and low job control [26]. Mehlum stated that employees who suffer from work-related illnesses have a greater need for SL than employees with similar illnesses caused by factors other than their work [26].

Psychosocial work environment is also important to understand and explain SL and presentism. A study on work related psychosocial risk factors for long term sick leave underlined the characteristics of work and the workplace, such as physical and psychosocial risk factors, safety/accident risk, the organizational work environment, management, general well-being, etc. [27]. Different forms of stress, somatic, behavioural, emotional, and cognitive were all found to be moderately correlated to SL [28]. Significant predictors for long-term SL were high levels of role conflict, emotional demands and low support from leadership. The risk for SL was higher in women, older employees and less educated.

4.5 Country of Origin

As the academic staff population were mostly expatriates, the country of origin was included in this study. The local Malaysian employees were the highest to avail the sick leave (127/189) among the study population. The study outcome relates to the concerns of the Malaysian Employees Federation, that the Malaysian employees in private sector avail sick leave higher than the average SL in other countries.

4.6 Reason for SL

The number of sick leave taken due to cough, flu, fever, sore throat and oral ulcer were the highest (50/107). The Star reported in tropical countries, common cough, flu, fever and sore throat occurs pretty much all around the year, with the peak season occurring during April to June and October to January [29]. Staying out from work may even save other employees from catching their illness or spreading infection around the work place. It is also difficult to be productive at work, when sick. Some appropriate reasons to stay home on SL are contagious illness like diarrhoea, severe sore throat, flu, conjunctivitis, certain rashes, common cold with uncontrollable cough, all highly infectious and also communicable. Sick presentism in these conditions could rather cause collateral damage to other co-staff and the work atmosphere. Hence it is better on sick leave than sick presentism with communicable illness.

5. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, we attempted to evaluate the sick leave availing pattern and reason for SL in a

private University. The age range between 36 to 45 years and female employees, staff of Indian origin and ancillary staff availed higher SL than others. The reasons for most sick leaves taken were cough, flu, fever, sore throat or oral ulcer. Lastly, the number of participants who took less than 6 days/year of SL was the highest which indicate that the staff in AIMST University utilized the SL, fair and honestly and no excessive SL usage was identified.

Further investigation on SL utilization should be continued at the structural, organizational and/or individual levels. The increase of SL among young employees was considerable high and should be further explored. The increases in SL utilization among women are still unexplained as no much research data are available to explain it. Motivated, satisfied and fulfilled employees are far less likely to be sick and tired of work.

6. STUDY LIMITATIONS

Though all efforts were taken to cover all sick leaves availed among the study population, sick leave certificates submitted from private clinics or dental clinics were not accounted in this study. Most staff residing outside campus seldom used the University clinic for their health issues, thus their sick leave history may also not be part of this data. Thus we cannot generalize the study outcome to the entire university staff population, and is only limited to those who availed the University clinic services.

CONSENT

It is not applicable.

ETHICAL APPROVAL

The research proposal was submitted to the AIMST University Human Ethical Committee and the ethical clearance was obtained. Further, permission from the head of AIMST clinic was obtained before data collection was initiated.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

We are grateful to the management of AIMST University, Malaysia and the head, University clinic in-charge for their permission and encouragement extended for carrying out this study and appreciate their cooperation rendered to complete this study.

COMPETING INTERESTS

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

REFERENCES

1. Taylor PJ. Aspects of sickness absence. Current approaches of occupational medicine. Bristol: Wright. 1979;322-8.
2. Marmot M, Feeney A, Shipley M, North F, Syme SL. Sickness absence as a measure of health status and functioning: from the UK Whitehall II study. *Journal of Epidemiology & Community Health*. 1995; 49(2):124-30.
3. Alexandersson K. Sickness absence in a Swedish county: With reference to gender, occupation, pregnancy and parenthood. Doctoral dissertation, Linköpings University; 1995.
4. Bhui K, Dinos S, Galant-Miecznikowska M, de Jongh B, Stansfeld S. Perceptions of work stress causes and effective interventions in employees working in public, private and non-governmental organisations: A Qualitative study. *Bjpsych Bulletin*. 2016;40(6):318-25. DOI: 10.1192/pb.bp.115.050823
5. New Straits Times, Wednesday; 2008. Available:<http://www.mef.org.my/Search.aspx?query=sick%20leave>
6. Sin Chew Daily Thursday, 3 March; 2016. Available:http://www.mef.org.my/news/mefitn_article.aspx?ID=521&article=SinChew160303a
7. Whitaker SC. The management of sickness absence. *Occupational and Environmental Medicine*. 2001;58(6):420-4.
8. Hensing G, Alexanderson K, Allebeck P, Bjurulf P. How to measure sickness absence? Literature review and suggestion of five basic measures. *Scandinavian Journal of Social Medicine*. 1998;26(2): 133-44.
9. Gimeno D, Bültmann U, Benavides FG, Alexanderson K, Abma FI, Ubalde-Lopez M, et al. Cross-national comparisons of sickness absence systems and statistics: Towards common indicators. *The European Journal of Public Health*. 2014; 11;24(4):663-6.
10. Solli HM. Ability-based notions of health and disease in the Norwegian social security system. 2011;131(11):1097-100.
11. Buck R, Porteous C, Wynne-Jones G, Marsh K, Phillips CJ, Main CJ. Challenges to remaining at work with common health problems: What helps and what influence do organisational policies have?. *Journal of Occupational Rehabilitation*. 2011;21(4): 501-12.
12. Raosoft I. Sample size calculator. Available:<http://www.raosoft.com/samplesize.html>
13. Cohen J. Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences. 2nd; 1988.
14. American psychological association. Publication manual of the American Psychological Association. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association; 2010.
15. EUROFOND. Absence from work. European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions; 2010. Available:<http://eurofound.europa.eu/observatories/eurwork/comparativeinformation/absence-from-work>
16. Rhodes SR. Age-related differences in work attitudes and behavior: A review and conceptual analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*. 1983;93(2):328.
17. Bekker MH, Rutte CG, Van Rijswijk K. Sickness absence: A gender-focused review. *Psychology, Health & Medicine*. 2009;14(4):405-18.
18. Mastekaasa A. Parenthood, gender and sickness absence. *Social Science & Medicine*. 2000;50(12):1827-42.
19. Kristensen P, Bjerkedal T. Gender differences and social gradients in sickness absence 2000-03 among Norwegians born 1967-76. (In Norwegian, English abstract). *Norwegian Journal of Epidemiology*. 2009;19:179-91. Available:<http://www.ntnu.no/ojs/index.php/norepid/article/viewFile/589/555>
20. Smeby L, Bruusgaard D, Claussen B. Sickness absence: Could gender divide be explained by occupation, income, mental distress and health?. *Scandinavian Journal of Public Health*. 2009;37(7):674-81.
21. Laaksonen M, Mastekaasa A, Martikainen P, Rahkonen O, Piha K, Lahelma E. Gender differences in sickness absence-the contribution of occupation and workplace. *Scandinavian Journal of Work, Environment and Health*. 2010;1:394-403.
22. Buck R, Porteous C, Wynne-Jones G, Marsh K, Phillips CJ, Main CJ. Challenges to remaining at work with common health problems: What helps and what influence

- do organisational policies have?. Journal of Occupational Rehabilitation. 2011;21(4): 501-12.
23. Barnes MC, Buck R, Williams G, Webb K, Aylward M. Beliefs about common health problems and work: A qualitative study. Social Science & Medicine. 2008;67(4): 657-65.
24. Aronsson G, Gustafsson K, Dallner M. Sick but yet at work. An empirical study of sickness presenteeism. Journal of Epidemiology & Community Health. 2000; 54(7):502-9.
25. Moreau M, Valente F, Mak R, Pelfrene E, De Smet P, De Backer G, et al. Occupational stress and incidence of sick leave in the Belgian workforce: The Belstress study. Journal of Epidemiology & Community Health. 2004;58(6):507-16.
26. Mehlum IS. How much sick leave is work-related?. Tidsskrift for den Norske laegeforening: Tidsskrift for praktisk medicin, ny raekke. 2011;131(2):122-5. Available:<https://tidsskriftet.no/en/2011/01/how-much-sick-leave-work-related> DOI: 10.4045/tidsskr.10.0665
27. Aagestad C, Johannessen HA, Tynes T, Gravseth HM, Sterud T. Work-related psychosocial risk factors for long-term sick leave: a prospective study of the general working population in Norway. Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine. 2014;56(8):787-93.
28. Nielsen ML, Kristensen TS, Smith-Hansen L. The intervention project on absence and well-being (IPAW): Design and results from the baseline of a 5-year study. Work & Stress. 2002;16(3):191-206.
29. The Star; 2015. Available:<https://www.star2.com/family/children/2015/07/23/its-flu-season-heres-how-not-to-get-sick/>

© 2020 Ali et al.; This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Peer-review history:
The peer review history for this paper can be accessed here:
<http://www.sdiarticle4.com/review-history/55153>