

1 **Association between work attendance when experiencing fever or cold**
2 **symptoms and company characteristics and socioeconomic status in the COVID-19**
3 **pandemic in Japanese workers: a cross-sectional study**

4

5 Kazuyoshi Mizuki¹, M.D., Makoto Okawara¹, M.D., Ayako Hino², M.D., Ph.D., Hajime
6 Ando³, M.D., M.O.H., Ph.D., Tomohisa Nagata⁴, M.D., Ph.D., Seiichiro Tateishi⁵, M.D.,
7 Ph.D., Mayumi Tsuji⁶, M.D., Ph.D., Shinya Matsuda⁷, M.D., Ph.D., Yoshihisa Fujino¹,
8 M.D., M.P.H., Ph.D., for the CORoNaWork project

9

10 1 Department of Environmental Epidemiology, Institute of Industrial Ecological
11 Sciences, University of Occupational and Environmental Health, Japan

12 2 Department of Mental Health, Institute of Industrial Ecological Sciences, University
13 of Occupational and Environmental Health, Japan

14 3 Department of Work Systems and Health, Institute of Industrial Ecological Sciences,
15 University of Occupational and Environmental Health, Japan

16 4 Department of Occupational Health Practice and Management, Institute of Industrial
17 Ecological Sciences, University of Occupational and Environmental Health, Japan

18 5 Department of Occupational Medicine, School of Medicine, University of
19 Occupational and Environmental Health, Japan

20 6 Department of Environmental Health, School of Medicine, University of
21 Occupational and Environmental Health, Japan

22 7 Department of Preventive Medicine and Community Health, School of Medicine,
23 University of Occupational and Environmental Health, Japan

24

25 **Correspondence**

26 Yoshihisa Fujino, M.D., M.P.H., Ph.D.

27 Department of Environmental Epidemiology, Institute of Industrial Ecological Sciences,

28 University of Occupational and Environmental Health, Japan

29 1-1, Iseigaoka, Yahatanishiku, Kitakyushu, 807-8555, Japan

30 Tel: +81-93-691-7401

31 E-mail: zenq@med.uoeh-u.ac.jp

32

33 **Funding Sources**

34 This study was supported and partly funded by the research grant from the
35 University of Occupational and Environmental Health, Japan (no grant
36 number); Japanese Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare (H30-josei-ippan-002,
37 H30-roudou-ippan-007, 19JA1004, 20JA1006, 210301-1, and
38 20HB1004); Anshin Zaidan (no grant number), the Collabo-Health Study Group (no
39 grant number), and Hitachi Systems, Ltd. (no grant number) and scholarship donations
40 from Chugai Pharmaceutical Co., Ltd. (no grant number)

41

42 **Acknowledgments**

43 The current members of the CORoNaWork Project, in alphabetical order, are as
44 follows: Dr. Yoshihisa Fujino (present chairperson of the study group), Dr. Akira

45 Ogami, Dr. Arisa Harada, Dr. Ayako Hino, Dr. Hajime Ando, Dr. Hisashi Eguchi, Dr.
46 Kazunori Ikegami, Dr. Kei Tokutsu, Dr. Keiji Muramatsu, Dr. Koji Mori, Dr.
47 Kosuke Mafune, Dr. Kyoko Kitagawa, Dr. Masako Nagata, Dr. Mayumi Tsuji, Ms.
48 Ning Liu, Dr. Rie Tanaka, Dr. Ryutaro Matsugaki, Dr. Seiichiro Tateishi, Dr. Shinya
49 Matsuda, Dr. Tomohiro Ishimaru, and Dr. Tomohisa Nagata. All members are affiliated
50 with the University of Occupational and Environmental Health, Japan.

51

52 **Conflict of Interest**

53 None declared.

54

55 **Ethical Considerations and Disclosures**

56 This study was approved by the ethics committee of the University of Occupational and
57 Environmental Health, Japan (reference No. R2-079 and R3-006).

58

59 **Running Head Title**

60 Work attendance while sick and company features

61

62

63 **Abstract**

64 **Objective:** This study investigated the association between attending work while
65 experiencing fever or cold symptoms and workers' socioeconomic background and
66 company characteristics during the COVID-19 pandemic.

67 **Methods:** A cross-sectional online survey was performed. Of a total of 33,302
68 participants, 3,676 workers who experienced fever or cold symptoms after April 2020
69 were included. The odds ratios (ORs) of attending work while sick associated with
70 workers' socioeconomic background and company characteristics were evaluated using
71 a multilevel logistic model.

72 **Results:** The OR of attending work while sick associated with a lack of policy
73 prohibiting workers from working when ill was 2.75 (95%CI: 2.28–3.20, P<0.001).

74 **Conclusion:** This study suggests that clear company policies on work and illness can be
75 effective for preventing employees from attending work while sick.

76

77 **Keywords:** COVID-19, Japan, Occupational Health, sickness presenteeism

78 **Introduction**

79 Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19), the disease caused by SARS-CoV-2,
80 was first reported in China in December 2019. Since then, the disease has spread rapidly
81 all over the world. The World Health Organization (WHO) officially declared
82 COVID-19 a pandemic in March 2020,¹ and the government of Japan first declared a
83 state of emergency to minimize the rapid spread of COVID-19 in April 2020. The
84 Japanese population was requested to wash their hands, wear masks, and avoid the three
85 Cs: closed spaces, crowded places, and close-contact settings.

86 In addition to these countermeasures against infection in public places, the
87 Japanese government emphasized the importance of implementing infection control
88 measures in companies to prevent the spread of infection in society.^{2,3} This is because
89 workers engage in numerous activities that can lead to spread of infection, including
90 spending long hours in a small enclosed space with colleagues, engaging with
91 customers, sharing business supplies, and talking with various people. Thus, the
92 government and municipalities in Japan have required companies to take various
93 infection control measures. Some of the most common COVID-19 measures Japanese
94 companies have implemented include requesting that employees wear masks (94.2%),
95 disinfect their hands (88.3%) and refrain from attending work when sick (84.0%), as
96 well as disinfecting their workplaces (65.9%) and promoting telework (52.7%).⁴
97 Government bodies have also emphasized the importance of measuring body
98 temperature, which has been implemented by 72.8% of companies.

99 Countermeasures preventing employees with fever or cold symptoms from
100 attending work are particularly important infection control measures in the workplace.
101 Previous studies have reported that the most frequent symptom of COVID-19 is fever

102 and that the virus is most infectious when symptoms are present.^{5,6} Thus, individuals
103 who attend work while symptomatic for COVID-19 can easily infect their coworkers.
104 For this reason, many companies have developed and informed their employees of
105 policies related to working while symptomatic. In particular, some companies now
106 require workers to check and report their body temperature before and at work, and
107 have placed sensors at entrances to screen for people with fever.

108 Although most companies have introduced a policy prohibiting employees from
109 attending work while sick, some employees continue to attend work regardless. There is
110 little research on how often and why employees continue to attend work despite
111 experiencing fever or cold symptoms during COVID-19 outbreaks. The phenomenon of
112 continuing to work while sick is known as sickness presenteeism.⁷ Some possible
113 reasons for sickness presenteeism are unstable employment, lack of paid leave, and a
114 corporate tendency to praise attendance at work.⁸ In addition to sickness presenteeism,
115 employees who continue to attend work while sick during the COVID-19 pandemic
116 may have a low social status or poor work environment.

117 The objective of this study was to investigate the association between attending
118 work while experiencing fever or cold symptoms and workers' socioeconomic
119 background and company characteristics during the COVID-19 pandemic in Japan.

120 **Methods**

121 Study design

122 We conducted a cross-sectional study on the health of workers in Japan during
123 the COVID-19 epidemic using data from a prospective cohort study, the Collaborative
124 Online Research on Novel coronavirus and Work study (CORoNaWork study).⁹ This
125 study was conducted in accordance with the guidelines of the Declaration of Helsinki
126 and was approved by the Ethics Committee of the University of Occupational and
127 Environmental Health, Japan (reference No. R2-079 and R3-006). In addition, informed
128 consent was obtained via a form on the internet.

129 A survey was performed from December 22 to 26, 2020, and included 33,302
130 workers between the ages of 20 and 65 years at the time of the study. Based on
131 COVID-19 incidence data, participants were stratified by age, sex, occupation, and
132 region. After excluding 6,051 who provided invalid responses, 27,036 participants were
133 finally included. Details of the inclusion and exclusion criteria are provided in the
134 protocol.⁹ Briefly, participants who completed the survey in extremely short response
135 times, who were shorter than 140 cm, who weighed less than 30 kg, and who gave
136 inconsistent answers to multiple identical questions were excluded.

137

138 Assessment of attendance at work while sick

139 We asked the participants whether they attended work while experiencing fever
140 or cold symptoms using a single question: “Did you attend work while experiencing
141 fever or cold symptoms after April 2020?” Participants chose from one of the following
142 options: had no symptoms, remained absent from work, worked at home, attended work

143 with or without consulting the company. Participants who indicated they remained
144 absent from work or worked at home were categorized as being absent while sick.
145 Those who indicated they attended work with or without consulting the company were
146 categorized as attending work while sick.

147

148 Assessment of covariates

149 To examine the socioeconomic characteristics of individuals who attended work
150 while sick, we inquired about the following items: job type (mainly desk work; mainly
151 interpersonal communication; mainly physical work), company size (total number of
152 workers in the company where the respondent mostly worked [self-employed business
153 owner answered "1"]), marital status (married; unmarried; divorced/bereaved), annual
154 equivalent household income (household income divided by the square root of
155 household size), education (junior high school; high school; vocational school/college,
156 university or graduate school), and degree of economic difficulty (very difficult; slightly
157 difficult; comfortable).

158 To examine company characteristics, we inquired about the following items:
159 whether or not the company had a policy requesting that employees refrain from
160 attending work when they experience fever or cold symptoms, whether or not the
161 worker received support from their supervisor or colleagues, and whether or not the
162 worker had requested support from their company to continue working with a health
163 condition. We used the Japanese version of the Job Content Questionnaire (JCQ) to
164 assess the degree of support workers received from superiors and colleagues.¹⁰ Each
165 JCQ item is scored on a four-point scale from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 4 (*strongly agree*)

166 on the presence of support. Support from a supervisor or colleagues was assessed from a
167 total of four items, with total scores ranging from 4 to 16. Each sub-scale of support was
168 categorized into quartiles based on the distribution of scores in the sample.

169 As a community-level variable, we used the cumulative incidence of
170 COVID-19 in the prefecture of residence from the time of the survey until one month
171 before the survey. We obtained this information from the websites of public institutions.

172

173 Statistical analyses

174 We estimated odds ratios (ORs) of attending work while ill using a multilevel
175 logistic model nested by prefecture of residence. In the multivariate model, we adjusted
176 for sex, age, job type, number of employees in the workplace, and company policy on
177 attending work while ill. Stata (Stata Statistical Software: Release 16. College Station,
178 TX: StataCorp LLC.) was used for the analysis. A p-value less than 0.05 was considered
179 statistically significant.

180

181

182 **Results**

183 Table 1 shows participant characteristics by absence or attendance at work
184 while experiencing fever or cold symptoms. Of the 27,036 participants, 3,676
185 experienced fever or cold symptoms during the survey period. Among these, 2,853
186 (77.6%) were absent and 823 (22.4%) attended work while sick.

187 Table 2 shows the ORs of attending work while sick associated with
188 socioeconomic status estimated using a logistic model. In the multivariate analysis,
189 having a job that mainly involves labor, working at a small to medium-sized company
190 (10–99 employees or 100–999 employees), and being in a ‘very difficult’ financial
191 situation were associated with attending work while ill. The adjusted OR (aOR) of
192 attending work while ill among subjects whose job type involved mainly labor was 1.44
193 (95%CI: 1.19–1.74, $p < 0.001$). Similarly, the aOR of attending work while ill among
194 subjects who worked at small companies (10–99 employees) was 1.44 (95%CI:
195 1.10–1.87, $p = 0.007$), and 1.46 (95%CI: 1.11–1.91, $p = 0.006$) among those who worked
196 at medium companies (100–999 employees). Finally, the aOR of attending work while
197 ill among subjects with financial difficulties was 1.29 (95%CI: 1.03–1.62, $p = 0.027$).

198 Table 3 shows the ORs of attending work while sick associated with the
199 company environment estimated using a logistic model. In the age-sex-adjusted model,
200 a lack of a policy requesting that employees refrain from attending work while ill was
201 significantly associated with attending work while ill (OR=2.70, 95%CI: 2.28–3.20,
202 $p < 0.001$). A significant association was also observed in the multivariate analysis
203 (aOR=2.75, 95%CI: 2.30–3.28, $p < 0.001$). Lack of support from superiors or colleagues
204 was likewise significantly associated with attending work while ill in the multivariate
205 analysis. The aOR of attending work while ill among subjects with lower levels of

206 support from supervisors (JCQ: 4–7) was 1.70 (95%CI: 1.36–2.12, $p<0.001$).

207 Meanwhile, the aOR of attending work while ill among subjects with lower levels of

208 support from colleagues (JCQ: 4–8) was 1.47 (95%CI: 1.19–1.80, $p<0.001$).

209

210 **Discussion**

211 This study showed that about 20% of workers in Japan who experienced fever or
212 cold symptoms attended work during the COVID-19 pandemic. We found that a lack of
213 a company policy requesting that employees refrain from attending work when sick
214 increased inappropriate attendance. In addition, vulnerable socioeconomic status and
215 support from colleagues or supervisors were also associated with attending work when
216 sick.

217 Even during an infectious disease pandemic, some individuals continue to
218 engage in social activities despite showing disease-related symptoms. A study during
219 the 2009 swine-origin influenza A (H1N1) pandemic reported that 36% of diagnosed
220 cases attended work with a fever.¹¹ In our present study, 22% of Japanese workers who
221 experienced fever or common cold symptoms reported attending work while
222 symptomatic. An earlier study during the COVID-19 pandemic reported that 32.3% of
223 workers in London¹² and 62.2% in Japan¹³ attended work even if they showed
224 symptoms. Such behaviors can spread infection because workplaces are often crowded
225 and interactions between workers provide ample opportunity for infection. It is thus
226 necessary to implement countermeasures to prevent individuals from attending work
227 when they are sick.

228 This study showed that a lack of a policy prohibiting workers from attending
229 work while sick increased the number of individuals who did so. Because workplaces
230 inherently operate through a chain of command, a clear policy can be beneficial for
231 reducing inappropriate attendance at work. To effectively enforce such policies, many
232 companies additionally provide their employees with access to time off while ill. During
233 the influenza A (H1N1) epidemic, a strategy by companies to provide their employees

234 paid time off while symptomatic reduced inappropriate attendance.¹⁴ Even after
235 adjusting for job type and company size, the present study showed that introducing a
236 policy requesting that workers refrain from attending work when symptomatic also
237 reduced employee attendance while sick. This result suggests that company policies are
238 effective regardless of worker job types or company size. While many companies have
239 introduced a policy requesting that individuals refrain from attending work while sick
240 during the COVID-19 pandemic,⁴ small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) are less
241 likely to introduce such a policy compared to large companies.¹⁵ SMEs are unable to
242 establish such a policy because they experience greater difficulty guaranteeing
243 employees an income and employment.¹⁶ Our results provide evidence that all
244 companies, including SMEs, should implement more infection control measures,
245 including requests for workers to stay home while ill.

246 In this study, we found that worker attendance at work while sick increased
247 among those with lower levels of support from their supervisors and coworkers. This
248 finding is in line with previous studies on sickness presenteeism. Previous studies have
249 shown that a supportive work environment, including support from both supervisors and
250 coworkers, can reduce the incidence of sickness presenteeism because employees are
251 less likely to regard absenteeism due to sickness as inappropriate.^{17,18} A similar trend
252 has been observed in research conducted during the COVID-19 pandemic, which found
253 that support from supervisors or colleagues decreased the prevalence of sickness
254 presenteeism.¹⁹ The COVID-19 pandemic has reduced communication among workers
255 and increased loneliness, making support from supervisors and coworkers even more
256 critical during this period.²⁰

257 This study also showed that workers tended to attend work while ill if they had
258 unstable socioeconomic status. A previous study showed that those with unstable
259 socioeconomic status reported an intention to work despite COVID-19 infection,
260 including those with low income, lack of insurance, and lack of food security.²¹
261 Personal factors contributing to sickness presenteeism include the inability to say no to
262 work and financial difficulties, while work factors include excessive workload and lack
263 of replacements.^{8,22,23} The importance of providing support for workers in vulnerable
264 socioeconomic situations is increasingly emphasized, backed by the results of the
265 present study conducted during the COVID-19 pandemic. Thus, to prevent workers with
266 cold symptoms from attending work in the future, financial support and rights to paid
267 leave are imperative, especially for those in an unstable socioeconomic situation.

268 The present study indicates that companies should establish a policy that
269 prevents employees from attending work when they are sick. Inappropriate attendance
270 can facilitate the spread infection in society through the occurrence of clusters in the
271 workplace and contact with an unspecified number of people while commuting.
272 Nevertheless, some people continue to attend work while ill, especially those in
273 unstable socioeconomic situations and those working in SMEs. The present study
274 showed that a policy that prevents attendance at work while an employee is ill is
275 effective even after adjusting for individual socioeconomic conditions and the size of
276 the workplace, indicating that such a policy can be useful regardless of an individual's
277 socioeconomic status or company size. Financial support from the government would
278 further aid the implementation of such a policy in small-scale establishments.

279 This study has several limitations. First, because this was an Internet-based
280 study, and it is uncertain whether the results are generalizable. However, we selected

281 participants by occupation, region, and prefecture based on infection incidence to
282 minimize bias among the participants. Second, company policies on COVID-19
283 identified in this study were based on participant reports; it is possible that some
284 participants were unaware of their company's policies.

285 In conclusion, we showed that the absence of a company policy requesting that
286 employees refrain from attending work while sick is significantly associated with
287 increased attendance while experiencing fever or cold symptoms. We also showed that
288 individuals with an unstable socioeconomic status and lower level of support from their
289 supervisors and coworkers are more likely to attend work while sick. In the future, it is
290 crucial to encourage more companies to establish policies that request employees to
291 refrain from attending work while sick and to support those with unstable
292 socioeconomic status.

293 **References**

- 294 1. WHO Director-General' s opening remarks at the media briefing on COVID-19 - 11
295 March 2020. [cited 16 May 2021]. Available:
296 [https://www.who.int/director-general/speeches/detail/who-director-general-s-](https://www.who.int/director-general/speeches/detail/who-director-general-s-opening-remarks-at-the-media-briefing-on-covid-19---11-march-2020)
297 [opening-remarks-at-the-media-briefing-on-covid-19---11-march-2020](https://www.who.int/director-general/speeches/detail/who-director-general-s-opening-remarks-at-the-media-briefing-on-covid-19---11-march-2020)
- 298 2. CDC. Workplaces and Businesses. 2 Aug 2021 [cited 19 Aug 2021]. Available:
299 [https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/community/workplaces-businesses/in-](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/community/workplaces-businesses/index.html)
300 [dex.html](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/community/workplaces-businesses/index.html)
- 301 3. COVID-19guide210512koukai.pdf. Available:
302 <https://www.sanei.or.jp/images/contents/416/COVID-19guide210512koukai.pdf>
- 303 4. Sasaki N, Imamura K, Kataoka M, Kuroda R, Tsuno K, Sawada U, et al. COVID-19
304 measurements at the workplace in various industries and company sizes: a 2-month
305 follow-up cohort study of full-time employees in Japan. *Environmental and*
306 *Occupational Health Practice*. 2021;3. doi:10.1539/eohp.2020-0017-0A
- 307 5. Li L-Q, Huang T, Wang Y-Q, Wang Z-P, Liang Y, Huang T-B, et al. COVID-19 patients'
308 clinical characteristics, discharge rate, and fatality rate of meta-analysis.
309 *J Med Virol*. 2020;92: 577-583.
- 310 6. He X, Lau EHY, Wu P, Deng X, Wang J, Hao X, et al. Temporal dynamics in viral
311 shedding and transmissibility of COVID-19. *Nat Med*. 2020;26: 672-675.
- 312 7. Aronsson G, Gustafsson K, Dallner M. Sick but yet at work. An empirical study
313 of sickness presenteeism. *J Epidemiol Community Health*. 2000;54: 502-509.

- 314 8. Aronsson G, Gustafsson K. Sickness presenteeism: prevalence, attendance-pressure
315 factors, and an outline of a model for research. *J Occup Environ Med.* 2005;47:
316 958-966.
- 317 9. Fujino Y, Ishimaru T, Eguchi H, Tsuji M, Tateishi S, Ogami A, et al. Protocol
318 for a nationwide Internet-based health survey in workers during the COVID-19
319 pandemic in 2020. *bioRxiv. medRxiv*; 2021. doi:10.1101/2021.02.02.21249309
- 320 10. Kawakami N, Kobayashi F, Araki S, Haratani T, Furui H. Assessment of job stress
321 dimensions based on the job demands- control model of employees of
322 telecommunication and electric power companies in Japan: reliability and validity
323 of the Japanese version of the Job Content Questionnaire. *Int J Behav Med.* 1995;2:
324 358-375.
- 325 11. Nonaka D, Morikawa H, Arioka H, Kobayashi J, Shoda R, Mizoue T. Behavior of
326 Adult Influenza Patients during the 2009 Pandemic after Outpatient Clinic
327 Presentations at a Hospital in Tokyo, Japan. *Trop Med Health.* 2011;39: 83-85.
- 328 12. Jain V, Waghorn M, Thorn-Heathcock R, Lamb P, Bell A, Addiman S. Attendance
329 at London workplaces after symptom onset: a retrospective cohort study of staff
330 members with confirmed COVID-19. *J Public Health* . 2021.
331 doi:10.1093/pubmed/fdaa239
- 332 13. Machida M, Nakamura I, Saito R, Nakaya T, Hanibuchi T, Takamiya T, et al.
333 The actual implementation status of self-isolation among Japanese workers during
334 the COVID-19 outbreak. *Trop Med Health.* 2020;48: 63.
- 335 14. Miyaki K, Sakurazawa H, Mikurube H, Nishizaka M, Ando H, Song Y, et al. An

336 effective quarantine measure reduced the total incidence of influenza A H1N1 in
337 the workplace: another way to control the H1N1 flu pandemic. *J Occup Health*.
338 2011;53: 287-292.

339 15. Ishimaru T, Nagata M, Hino A, Yamashita S, Tateishi S, Tsuji M, et al.
340 Workplace measures against COVID-19 during the winter third wave in Japan: Company
341 size-based differences. *J Occup Health*. 2021;63: e12224.

342 16. Hasle P, Limborg HJ. A review of the literature on preventive occupational
343 health and safety activities in small enterprises. *Ind Health*. 2006;44: 6-12.

344 17. Miraglia M, Johns G. Going to work ill: A meta-analysis of the correlates
345 of presenteeism and a dual-path model. *J Occup Health Psychol*. 2016;21: 261-283.

346 18. Aronsson G, Hagberg J, Björklund C, Aboagye E, Marklund S, Leineweber C, et
347 al. Health and motivation as mediators of the effects of job demands, job control,
348 job support, and role conflicts at work and home on sickness presenteeism and
349 absenteeism. *Int Arch Occup Environ Health*. 2021;94: 409-418.

350 19. Chen JW, Lu L, Cooper CL. The Compensatory Protective Effects of Social
351 Support at Work in Presenteeism During the Coronavirus Disease Pandemic. *Front*
352 *Psychol*. 2021;12: 643437.

353 20. Toscano F, Zappalà S. Social Isolation and Stress as Predictors of
354 Productivity Perception and Remote Work Satisfaction during the COVID-19
355 Pandemic: The Role of Concern about the Virus in a Moderated Double Mediation.
356 *Sustain Sci Pract Policy*. 2020;12: 9804.

- 357 21. Tilchin C, Dayton L, Latkin CA. Socioeconomic Factors Associated With an
358 Intention to Work While Sick From COVID-19. *J Occup Environ Med.* 2021;63: 363-368.
- 359 22. Hansen CD, Andersen JH. Going ill to work--what personal circumstances,
360 attitudes and work-related factors are associated with sickness presenteeism?
361 *Soc Sci Med.* 2008;67: 956-964.
- 362 23. Biron C, Brun J-P, Ivers H, Cooper C. At work but ill: psychosocial work
363 environment and well-being determinants of presenteeism propensity. *J Public
364 Ment Health.* 2006;5: 26-37.

365 **Clinical significance**

366 This study showed that a lack of a policy requesting that employees refrain
367 from attending work while ill was associated with attendance at work while
368 experiencing fever or cold symptoms. Thus, such a policy is a beneficial
369 countermeasure for companies to prevent the spread of infection.

Table 1. Basic characteristics of the study subjects

	Absent while sick (n=2,853)		Attended work while sick (n=823)	
	n	%	n	%
Sex, male	1,271	44.5	387	47.0
Marital status, married	1,560	54.7	427	51.9
Job type				
Mainly desk work	1,513	53.0	387	47.0
Mainly interpersonal communication	728	25.5	193	23.5
Mainly labor	612	21.5	243	29.5
Annual equivalent household income (JPY)				
500,000–2,650,000	929	32.6	293	35.6
2,650,000–4,500,000	843	29.5	255	31.0
>4,500,000	1,081	37.9	275	33.4
Self-rated health, very good/good	1,107	38.8	244	29.6
Psychological distress (K6 ≥ 5)	1,574	55.2	512	62.2
Felt lonely (usually or always)	405	14.2	170	20.6
Requested support from company to continue working				
No	1,766	61.9	493	59.9
Yes, but I have not received support	714	25.0	254	30.9
Yes, and I have received support	373	13.1	76	9.2
Degree of economic difficulty				
Very difficult	363	12.7	153	18.6
Slightly difficult	908	31.8	242	29.4
Comfortable	1,582	55.5	428	52.0
Support from supervisor*	11 (8-12)**		10 (8-12)**	
Support from colleagues*	11 (9-12)**		10 (8-12)**	

* Support from supervisor or colleagues was evaluated using the Japanese version of the Japan Content Questionnaire (four items, total score range: 4-16). High scores indicate that the respondent strongly agreed that they received support.

** Median and interquartile range.

Table 2. Odds ratio of attending work while experiencing fever or cold symptoms associated with socioeconomic status

	Age-sex-adjusted				Multivariate*			
	OR	95% CI		p	aOR	95% CI		p
Job type								
Mainly desk work	reference				reference			
Mainly interpersonal communication	1.05	0.86	1.27	0.655	1.01	0.83	1.23	0.923
Mainly labor	1.55	1.29	1.87	<0.001	1.44	1.19	1.74	<0.001
Company size								
2-9	reference				reference			
10-99	1.22	0.95	1.58	0.125	1.44	1.10	1.87	0.007
100-999	1.09	0.84	1.40	0.529	1.46	1.11	1.91	0.006
≥1,000	0.84	0.65	1.09	0.193	1.22	0.92	1.61	0.162
Marital status								
Married	reference				reference			
Unmarried	1.30	0.99	1.70	0.058	1.20	0.91	1.58	0.207
Divorced/widowed	1.12	0.95	1.34	0.186	1.08	0.90	1.28	0.421
Annual equivalent household income (JPY)								
500,000-2,650,000	1.26	1.04	1.52	0.016	1.06	0.87	1.29	0.586
2,650,000-4,500,000	1.19	0.98	1.44	0.078	1.09	0.89	1.33	0.401
>4,500,000	reference				reference			
Education								
Junior high school	1.71	0.92	3.18	0.091	1.19	0.63	2.27	0.594
High school	1.23	1.03	1.47	0.024	1.13	0.93	1.36	0.215
Vocational school/college, university, graduate school	reference				reference			
Degree of economic difficulty								
Very difficult	1.55	1.25	1.93	<0.001	1.29	1.03	1.62	0.027
Slightly difficult	0.98	0.82	1.17	0.857	0.91	0.76	1.10	0.335
Comfortable	reference				reference			

* The multivariate model was adjusted for age, sex, job type, company size, company policy on attending work while ill

Table 3. Odds ratio of attending work while experiencing fever or cold symptoms associated with company characteristics

	Age-sex-adjusted			Multivariate*				
	OR	95%CI		p	aOR	95%CI		p
Policy requesting that employees refrain from attending work while ill								
Yes	reference				reference			
No	2.70	2.28	3.20	<0.001	2.75	2.30	3.28	<0.001
Support from supervisor**								
Very Low (4–7)	2.11	1.70	2.61	<0.001	1.70	1.36	2.12	<0.001
Low (8–10)	1.34	1.10	1.62	0.003	1.15	0.95	1.40	0.157
High (11)	1.41	1.08	1.84	0.012	1.35	1.03	1.78	0.030
Very High (12–16)	reference				reference			
Support from colleagues**								
Very Low (4–8)	1.74	1.43	2.13	<0.001	1.47	1.19	1.80	<0.001
Low (9–10)	1.28	1.04	1.59	0.022	1.16	0.93	1.44	0.194
High (11)	1.28	1.01	1.62	0.042	1.26	0.99	1.60	0.058
Very High (12–16)	reference				reference			
Requested support from company to continue working								
No	reference				reference			
Yes, but I have not received support	1.27	1.07	1.51	0.008	1.06	0.88	1.27	0.558
Yes, and I have received support	0.73	0.56	0.95	0.021	0.72	0.55	0.94	0.016

* The multivariate model was adjusted for age, sex, job type, company size, company policy on attending work while ill

** Support from supervisor or colleagues was evaluated using the Japanese version of the Japan Content Questionnaire (four items, total score range: 4-16). High scores indicate that the respondent strongly agrees that they received support.