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Abstract

This study examines how servant leadership dampens the relationship between work pressure and the presenteeism of hotel employees. A questionnaire was utilized to obtain information from the staff of five-star hotel chains in Sharm-ElSheik in Egypt. A variety of sampling methods "A self-selection sample, a convenient sampling, a snowball sample" were used. 390 valid responses were gathered and analyzed using PLS-SEM. The results showed a negative relationship between servant leadership with work pressure and the presenteeism of hotel employees. The results also indicated that servant leadership plays a moderating role and dampens the positive relationship between work pressure and presenteeism. The research provides a theoretical contribution to bridging the gap in studies related to servant leadership, presenteeism, and work pressure in the hotel context. Practically, the research provides hotel management with recommendations to properly deal with presenteeism and work pressure besides maximizing the benefits of servant leadership. Limitations and potential directions for future research were presented.
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Introduction

Management in hospitality organizations, due to the highly competitive environment, is worried about keeping a healthy staff capable of providing services that match hotel customers’ expectations (Chia and Chu, 2017). Employees who are in good physical and mental health will deliver services effectively and efficiently, which will enable the delivery of high-quality services. Presenteeism is among the most significant new issues facing workers in the hospitality business (Arslaner and Boylu, 2017). Presenteeism is a novel idea in workplace health (Brown et al., 2011). Presenteeism is described as going to work despite having an illness or health problem for which it is suggested to stay at home and take a leave (Ariza-Montes et al., 2021).

Presenteeism is a hot issue in organizational behavior research, and it has been linked to productivity loss (Hemp, 2004). Presenteeism accounts for 74% of all health-related lost time, but absenteeism accounted for just 26% (Willingham, 2008). According to estimates, presenteeism costs firms in the United States over $150 billion each year. These expenses were incurred as a result of lost production and sales opportunities, as well as poor customer service. Presenteeism accounts for two-thirds of overall employee sickness costs, and it can lead to absenteeism if not treated properly (Merrill et al., 2012). Presenteeism, in particular, is regarded as a silent threat in hospitality enterprises (Arjona-Fuentes et al., 2019 & Khairy, 2020). The presence of presenteeism among hotel employees may result in hotels losing their competitive edge or being less productive due to the necessity to satisfy the various demands of multiple parties (Arjona-Fuentes et al., 2019).

Work pressure is one of the aspects of the working environment in the hospitality business that is a precursor to presenteeism (Stamolampros et al., 2019 & Teo et al., 2020). Work pressure is a growing issue in the workplace, having detrimental consequences on human health and psychological well-being (Eurofound, 2017 & Agotnes et al., 2021). Hotel workers experience several causes of work pressure, including poor compensation, a high workload, long and irregular work hours, and role stress (Burke et al., 2013); as a result, they are more likely to demand and seek care and support from their leaders (Ling et al., 2017).

Effective leadership has long been the focus of management and leadership researchers because it plays a crucial role in fostering the growth of both businesses and workers (Day et al., 2004). According to Jacques et al. (2015) and Ling et al. (2017), servant leadership is a promising approach for the hospitality sector because it fosters harmonious connections between leaders and followers while encouraging followers’ personal growth (Van Dierendonck, 2011).

Servant leadership encompasses all aspects of leadership, including ethical and relational aspects, as well as situational, transformational, and personal aspects (Coetzer et al., 2017; Wirawan et al., 2020; Batoool et al., 2021). This style of leadership ensures long-term results at both the personal and organizational levels (Coetzer et al., 2017). It emphasizes altruism, moral behavior, and service over self-interest (Iqbal et al., 2020). It focuses on the needs of followers to encourage them to work hard and achieve success.

Despite the importance and consequences of presenteeism, there is very little research on the topic in the hospitality business (Chia and Chu, 2017 & Knani, 2022), making it a relatively unexplored area of study that needs more investigation (McGregor et al., 2016 & Ariza-Montes et al., 2021). The dearth of literature on presenteeism in the hotel industry regards that the phenomenon is subjective, understudied, and underreported (Arslaner & Boylu, 2017; Chia & Chu, 2017; Arjona-Fuentes et al., 2019; Ariza-Montes et al., 2021). Additionally, although receiving a lot of attention in the management literature, servant leadership has not gotten enough attention in the literature on hospitality (Wu et al., 2013). This is problematic, because the hospitality sector is a multibillion-
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dollar industry that serves millions of people globally (Hinkin, 2005), and servant leadership is claimed to be a particularly effective style of leadership for fostering the success of hospitality organizations (Brownell, 2010). This pushed academics to urge further research on servant leadership in the hotel industry (Huang et al., 2016).

New research is also required to produce policies that address the health issues that hotel employees face, reduce the stressful and unhealthy working environments, and emphasize the importance of servant leadership in supporting hotel staff. The high costs of presenteeism make this a pressing requirement (Arslaner and Boylu, 2017). Therefore, the purpose of this study is to reveal how servant leadership could dampen work pressure and presenteeism. An examination of presenteeism in the hospitality sector may give insights into human resource practices that management may use, making leaders and managers capable of ensuring the health and well-being of followers, particularly during times of high work pressure, and helps management to operate hotels better and make better decisions to minimize the presenteeism behavior of their workers.

Theoretical background and hypotheses development

Presenteeism

Presenteeism is becoming more prevalent in the workplace. The academic literature has mostly used two basic ways to comprehend the issue of presenteeism: the European approach and the American approach (Lohaus & Habermann, 2019; Neto et al., 2017; Ariza-Montes et al., 2021). The first approach "the American school" focuses on the impact of this phenomenon on lower productivity as a result of people's health issues or their attendance at work while sick (Arjona-Fuentes et al., 2019 & Ariza-Montes et al., 2021). The majority of the research on this approach has concentrated on the effects of sickness on productivity loss (Knani, 2022), and described presenteeism as a decline in productivity caused by an employee's poor health, who is unable to work at the expected level. According to the second approach “the European school”, presenteeism is described as attending work despite being ill; this approach is focused on what causes or motivates presenteeism (Conway et al., 2016 & Lohaus and Habermann, 2019). Despite the different terminologies and approaches, scholars currently agree that presenteeism is the phenomenon of employees who, despite symptoms and poor health that should trigger rest and absence from work, continue to show up at work (Gosselin et al., 2013; Baeriswyl et al., 2017; Knani, 2022).

Work pressure

Work pressure is a growing issue in the workplace, having detrimental consequences for human health and psychological well-being (Eurofound, 2017; Agotnes et al., 2021). Work pressure is a cognitive condition that is associated with the expected execution of work duties and anxiety about one’s capacity to perform the work satisfactorily (Roe and Zijlstra, 2000 & Van Loon and Jakobsen, 2018). Work pressure may also refer to increasing job demands (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007), which are described as "higher job demands that result in physical, psychological, social, or organizational facets of the job necessitating ongoing psychical and psychological effort (van Woerkom et al., 2016 & Ren and Chadee, 2017).

Servant leadership

The notion of servant leadership was initially introduced by Greenleaf (1977). It is described as a leadership style in which leaders are motivated by the desire to serve others and acknowledge their moral responsibility not just for the success of the business but also to all organizational stakeholders, including their subordinates and customers (Greenleaf, 1977; van Dierendonck, 2011 & Huang et al., 2016). According to the servant leadership theory, a servant leader has an altruistic character in favor
of his or her followers and helps them grow and learn by offering chances to experience and enhance their material and spiritual state (Eva et al., 2019 & Darvishmotevali and Altinay, 2022). In other words, servant leadership focuses on serving others rather than persons striving to serve the leader, and a servant leader is someone whose goal is to serve others and guarantee that their needs are satisfied (van Dierendonck, 2011).

There has been significant growth in research on the theory of servant leadership (van Dierendonck, 2011; Wu et al., 2013). The rising number of high-profile incidents involving greedy and selfish business leaders might be a cause for this heightened interest (Huang et al., 2016). Servant leadership is a leadership style promoted by service organizations that prioritizes the interests and needs of employees over the interests and requirements of individuals and organizations (Huertas-Valdivia et al., 2022; Elkhwesky et al., 2022). When compared to other leadership styles, servant leadership is very compatible with "serving others" (Kauppila et al., 2022), which is the key business necessity of service organizations (Qiu et al., 2020 & Hu et al., 2022).

**Hypotheses development**

The hotel business is particularly unpredictable when it comes to consumer needs (Youn et al., 2017). To assist guests in solving difficulties, hotel employees are frequently obliged to go above and beyond their basic duties (Wang, 2009). Given the everyday uncertainty of job responsibilities and satisfying the immediate expectations and needs of hotel guests, work pressure in the hospitality business is well-documented (Zhao and Ghiselli, 2016 & Chia and Chu, 2017). As a consequence of their high workloads (Karatepe & Aleshinloye, 2009), lengthy workdays (Zhao et al., 2016), and difficulty in managing work and family commitments (Choi & Kim, 2012), employees who need to respond quickly and efficiently to these factors may experience work pressure (Knani, 2022). In addition, the hotel industry is also labor-intensive, with high work pressure and a variety of demands (Ariza-Montes et al., 2017; Arjona-Fuentes et al., 2019; Knani, 2022), which may all contribute to presenteeism (Chia & Chu, 2016). Employees who are under work pressure may feel a need to regulate their job demands and are more likely to engage in presenteeism (Chia and Chu, 2017 & Khairy, 2020). Moreover, one of the main issues in the hospitality industry is work pressure brought on by extended work hours. This strain prevents employees from getting enough rest and personal time, which makes them more pressured and increases their risk of experiencing mental and physical health issues (Arslaner and Boylu, 2017). According to Böckerman and Laukkanen (2009), extended workweeks, working shifts, and continuing full-time employment all raise the presenteeism rate. Furthermore, due to the hotel industry's seasonal nature, employees' fear of losing their employment may lead to work pressure (McNamara et al., 2011). Job insecurity might also contribute to presenteeism (Arslaner and Boylu, 2017). Despite having health issues, some workers may choose to report to work out of fear of losing their jobs. When workers are ill and unable to work, it's critical that they don't worry about losing their jobs or that their pay won't be reduced (Arslaner and Boylu, 2017). Therefore, the support provided by the organizations to their employees may support them psychologically, reduce their pressure, and prevent presenteeism. Accordingly, the following hypothesis was formulated:

**H1: There is a positive relationship between work pressure and presenteeism.**

A crucial asset in every business is its leaders and managers, who have to protect the health and well-being of their subordinates, especially during periods of intense work pressure (Agotnes et al., 2021). Several empirical research in the hospitality field has looked at the beneficial effects of servant leadership on followers' attitudinal and behavioral results (i.e. Huang et al., 2016; Bao et al., 2018; Ye et al., 2019; Elche et al., 2020; Qiu et al., 2020; Darvishmotevali and Altinay, 2022). To help their subordinates reach their full potential, leaders must practice servant leadership which emphasizes the
role of leaders to do so (Liden et al., 2015 & Hanaysha et al., 2022). A manager with a servant-leader character may meet their employees' needs, facilitate their intrinsic happiness, and establish altruistic principles and a culture of public service in them (Greenleaf, 1998 & Shim et al., 2021) and hence, reduce work pressure. Moreover, presenteeism in the workplace is associated with ineffective leadership (Leineweber et al., 2011; Krpalek et al., 2014; Ariza-Montes et al., 2021). Enhancing the working atmosphere and reducing work pressure are two benefits of leaders' support (Yang et al., 2016 & Knani, 2022). Presenteeism is highly adversely linked with supervisor support (Miraglia and Johns, 2016 & Yang et al., 2016). According to Kinman and Wray (2018), a rise in manager or leader support is associated with a drop in presenteeism incidents. The reasoning for this is that being in a supportive work environment gives employees a resource they may use to feel at ease when taking time off work to recover from diseases (Miraglia & Johns, 2016). Accordingly, the following hypotheses were formulated:

H2: There is a negative relationship between servant leadership and work pressure.

H3: There is a negative relationship between servant leadership and presenteeism.

The social exchange theory, which places a strong emphasis on the prosperity and support of subordinates, serves as the theoretical foundation for servant leadership (Greenleaf, 1998 & Hanaysha et al., 2022). The social exchange theory generally helps us understand the reciprocal connections between leaders and their subordinates in the workplace (Jaiswal & Dhar, 2017). The theory argues that followers often react in the same manner that their leaders do. That is, if a leader shows concern for them, encourages them, and assists them when necessary, the followers will do the same (Shareef & Atan, 2018), and this, in turn, will reduce their pressure at work and also presenteeism. Moreover, a negative correlation between presenteeism and social support is discovered by Hansen and Andersen (2008) and (Knani, 2022). According to Yang et al. (2016), high levels of work support may help reduce the negative impacts of work pressure and its effect on presenteeism. When sick, employees may worry that they may lose their jobs, or they may worry that there will be any compensation reductions (Arslaner and Boylu, 2017). As a result, the assistance provided by the organizational leaders to their employees may benefit them psychologically, reduce their pressure at work, and eliminate presenteeism as well. Accordingly, the following hypothesis was formulated:

H4: Servant leadership moderates the relationship between work pressure and presenteeism.

The conceptual framework and hypotheses of the study are presented in figure (1) below.
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Methodology

Measures

Presenteeism. To assess employees' presenteeism, a 6-item Stanford Presenteeism Scale (Koopman et al., 2002) was employed; for example, "at work, I was able to focus on achieving my goals despite my health problem" and "despite having my health problem, I was able to finish hard tasks in my work."

Work pressure. Work pressure was measured with a five-item scale adapted from Spector and Jex (1998) and Ren and Chadee (2017). For instance; “How frequently are you required to work very hard”, and “How frequently does your job give you little time to complete tasks”.

Servant leadership. Servant leadership was measured by the seven-item scale developed by Liden et al. (2015). For example; “My leader prioritizes my needs before his or her own”, and “To gain success, my leader would never sacrifice ethical values”.

Sampling and data collection

A questionnaire was utilized to obtain information from the staff of five-star hotel chains in Sharm-ElSheik in Egypt. Chain hotels are qualified to provide hotel services internationally, have a higher workload than other hotel categories, and have diverse departments with appropriate human resources, that’s why five-star hotel chains were chosen for this study. The questionnaire was divided into two sections. The first part included the demographic profile of the respondents, while the second covered the items from the investigated latent variables. The survey was conducted in Arabic, and variables were assessed using validated scales based on existing literature. To assure translation quality, the back-translation approach was applied. The survey was referred to two independent bilingual experts to translate an English version into Arabic and then back to English. All questions were evaluated using a Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).

An online survey and a self-administrated survey were used to disseminate the questionnaire. A variety of sampling methods were used. A self-selection sample was first created by handing out the questionnaire on-site and disseminating the link online through the LinkedIn site. Second, a convenient sampling method was adopted by delivering the link to surveyors directly through their LinkedIn accounts. Third, a snowball sample was applied by asking certain employees to forward the link to their hotel-based coworkers. During June and July 2022, a total of 390 (273 online plus 117 self-administrated) valid responses were collected and used in the final analysis of the study. Regarding the sample characteristics (Table 1), out of 390 respondents, just over 87.6% (n=342) of respondents were male, around 48.21% (n = 188) were 20 to < 30 years old, roughly 60.77% (n=137) had bachelor's degree, 53.59 % (n = 209) were married. 46.15 % (n = 180) had 4–7 years of tenure in their hotels. About two-thirds (n = 276) belong to the front office and food and beverage departments. Employees were suffering from Back problems (n = 87, 22.31%), Insomnia (n = 76, 19.49%), and Arthritis (n = 76, 19.49%) more than other health problems.
Table (1): Respondents’ profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Tenure</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>87.69</td>
<td>1–3 years</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>14.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>12.31</td>
<td>4–7 years</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>46.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>41.54</td>
<td>Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>53.59</td>
<td>Front Office</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>34.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>Food and Beverage</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>36.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary or secondary school</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>17.44</td>
<td>Housekeeping</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>22.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor Degree</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>60.77</td>
<td>Health Problem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master/Ph.D. Degree</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>21.79</td>
<td>Blood pressure</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>7.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 to &lt; 30</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>48.21</td>
<td>Heart Disease</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 to &lt; 40</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Back problems</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>22.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 to &lt; 50</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>11.28</td>
<td>Diabetes</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 and more</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>Gastritis</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>19.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Arthritis</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>12.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Insomnia</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>19.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Asthma</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis and results

To assess the measurement and structural model, as well as to verify the research hypotheses, the current study used the PLS-SEM approach using WarpPLS software 7.0 (Kock, 2020). PLS-SEM is a frequently applied analytical approach in a variety of contexts, including tourism and hospitality research (Amaro and Duarte, 2015 & Hair et al., 2020). Two processes are required to execute PLS-SEM: assessing the measurement model and the structural model (Manley et al., 2020). The WarpPLS 7.0 program includes 10 model fit and quality indices (see table 2). As a result, it is possible to conclude that the 10 model fit and quality indices requirements were achieved.

Table (2): Model fit and quality indices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Assessment</th>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Supported/Rejected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average path coefficient (APC)</td>
<td>0.285, P=0.011</td>
<td>P&lt;0.05</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average R-squared (ARS)</td>
<td>0.269, P=0.015</td>
<td>P&lt;0.05</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average adjusted R-squared (AARS)</td>
<td>0.233, P=0.027</td>
<td>P&lt;0.05</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average block VIF (AVIF)</td>
<td>3.428</td>
<td>acceptable if &lt;= 5, ideally &lt;= 3.3</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average full collinearity VIF (AFVIF)</td>
<td>3.394</td>
<td>acceptable if &lt;= 5, ideally &lt;= 3.3</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenenhaus GoF (GoF)</td>
<td>0.429</td>
<td>small &gt;= 0.1, medium &gt;= 0.25, large &gt;= 0.36</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sympon's paradox ratio (SPR)</td>
<td>0.750</td>
<td>acceptable if &gt;= 0.7, ideally = 1</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The measurement model

All constructs and related indicators were evaluated for both reliability and validity to evaluate the measurement model (see Table 3). Since loadings are greater than 0.7, strong correlations with latent variables have been confirmed (Manley et al., 2020).

Table (3): Confirmatory factor analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Item Loading</th>
<th>Item R-Square</th>
<th>Mean *</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Servant Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead1</td>
<td>0.736</td>
<td>0.542</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>.976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead2</td>
<td>0.807</td>
<td>0.651</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>.808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead3</td>
<td>0.790</td>
<td>0.624</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>.942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead4</td>
<td>0.845</td>
<td>0.714</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>.862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead5</td>
<td>0.874</td>
<td>0.764</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>.976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead6</td>
<td>0.896</td>
<td>0.803</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>.954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead7</td>
<td>0.899</td>
<td>0.808</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>.962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presenteeism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presen.1</td>
<td>0.703</td>
<td>0.494</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>.559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presen.2</td>
<td>0.719</td>
<td>0.517</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presen.3</td>
<td>0.767</td>
<td>0.588</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presen.4</td>
<td>0.818</td>
<td>0.669</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presen.5</td>
<td>0.839</td>
<td>0.704</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presen.6</td>
<td>0.738</td>
<td>0.545</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work pressure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JS.1</td>
<td>0.850</td>
<td>0.722</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JS.2</td>
<td>0.909</td>
<td>0.826</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JS.3</td>
<td>0.740</td>
<td>0.548</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JS.4</td>
<td>0.722</td>
<td>0.521</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JS.5</td>
<td>0.773</td>
<td>0.598</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* mean score : Low: 1.00 to 2.33, Average (Moderate): 2.34 to 3.66, High: 3.67 to 5.00

Additionally, the composite reliability values (ranging from 0.894 to 0.962) are greater than 0.7 (see Table 4), indicating construct reliability (Manley et al., 2020). Furthermore, the extracted average variance (AVEs) values are greater than 0.5 (see Table 4), confirming convergent validity (Hair et al., 2020).
Table (4): Measurement model.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Composite reliability</th>
<th>AVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Servant Leadership</td>
<td>0.962</td>
<td>0.696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presenteeism</td>
<td>0.894</td>
<td>0.586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work pressure</td>
<td>0.899</td>
<td>0.643</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition, the square roots of AVEs were employed following Fornell and Larcker’s (1981) method, which states that discriminant validity requires that the square root of each latent variable's AVEs be larger than the correlation with the other latent variables (see Table 5). As a result of the findings, discriminant validity was achieved in this study.

Table 5. Discriminant validity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Servant Leadership</th>
<th>Presenteeism</th>
<th>Work pressure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Servant Leadership</td>
<td>0.834</td>
<td>-0.082</td>
<td>0.114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presenteeism</td>
<td>-0.082</td>
<td>0.692</td>
<td>-0.393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work pressure</td>
<td>0.114</td>
<td>-0.393</td>
<td>0.750</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The structural model and hypotheses testing

To assess the structural model, the path coefficients (β), the p values, and R2 values were measured (see Figure 2).

![Figure 2](final results of the study)

The empirical findings indicated that work pressure has a positive and significant effect on employee presenteeism (β=0.41, P=0.02), supporting H1. Servant leadership also has a negative and significant effect on work pressure (β=-0.23, P<0.01) and employee presenteeism (β=-0.25, P=0.04), hence, H2 and H3 are accepted. In addition, servant leadership has a significant moderating effect on the relationship between work and presenteeism (β=0.44, P<0.01), it dampens the positive relationship between the two variables (see figure 3). This result confirms H4. Furthermore, servant leadership clearly explained 19% of the variance of work pressure, whereas, servant leadership and work pressure explained 35% of the variance in employee presenteeism.
The empirical findings of the current research indicated that work pressure could lead to presenteeism. More pressure at work push employees to engage more in presenteeism. More specifically, this study revealed that work pressure has a positive and significant relationship with hotel employee presenteeism. This finding is in line with the findings of prior studies (e.g., Chia & Chu, 2016; Arslaner and Boylu, 2017; Chia and Chu, 2017; Khairy, 2020) where the more pressured employees at work increase their risk of experiencing mental and physical health issues, and hence, engage in presenteeism. Moreover, regarding the level of work pressure and presenteeism, the current study reported that hotel employees have slightly high levels of work pressure (3.28 ±.73) and presenteeism (3.65 ±.56). These findings confirm the findings of prior studies (e.g., McNamara et al., 2011; Zhao and Ghiselli, 2016; Youn et al., 2017) which argued that the hotel industry's nature in terms of seasonality, labor-intensiveness, and unpredictability leads to work pressure and presenteeism. Employees' attempts to offer exceptional service and delight customers might lead to increased work pressure and physical and mental tiredness (Knani, 2022).

In addition, the current study assumed that there is a negative relation between servant leadership with work pressure and presenteeism. The findings confirmed these hypotheses and indicated that servant leadership will decrease work pressure and presenteeism in hotel organizations. These results support the findings of prior studies (e.g., Krpalek et al., 2014; Miraglia and Johns, 2016; Yang et al., 2016; Ariza-Montes et al., 2021; Agotnes et al., 2021; Shim et al., 2021; Knani, 2022). Servant leadership seeks to foster a pleasant working environment. Servant leaders recognize their subordinates who perform a good job and allow employees to report grievances and ambitions. The leaders also are expected to develop employee responsibility at work whenever there are changes in the organization, such as changes in rules or management. These actions are anticipated to minimize workplace stress among employees (Suhartanti and Prasetyanto, 2021). In addition, the social learning theory states that followers will view their leader as a model for learning from which to imitate and analyze their attitudes and behavior. Since the philosophy of servant leadership is based on serving other stakeholders, subordinates may tend to behave in a serving supportive manner toward each other, hence, reducing pressure in the workplace. The reduced level of work pressure is consequently associated with a reduced level of presenteeism. Furthermore, servant leaders tend to meet their subordinates' needs and understand how to balance workload and their subordinates’ intrinsic state “i.e. being a victim of presenteeism”, thus support from the leader is associated with a decrease in presenteeism incidents. This is because having a supportive workplace environment.
provides workers with a tool they may use to feel at ease while taking time off work to recover from illnesses (Miraglia & Johns, 2016).

Additionally, the results of the current research demonstrated that servant leadership significantly moderates the relationship between work pressure and presenteeism. In specific words, servant leadership dampens the positive relationship between work pressure and presenteeism. The social exchange theory, which forms the theoretical basis for servant leadership, may be used to analyze this finding (Greenleaf, 1998 & Hanaysha et al., 2022). Social exchange theory is used to interpret workplace human behavior. It explains how employees establish and sustain relationships based on the perceived potential advantages they experience. The relationship between a leader and his or her subordinates is an example of social exchange at work, in which the leader provides benefits to their followers in the form of an agreeable and supportive working environment, which the subordinates must reciprocate, and this, in turn, may be reflected on their attitude and behaviors. Employees who perceive their managers as a servant leaders recognize that they already have a real benefit and perceive the workplace as a supportive environment. As a result, the perceived pressure at the workplace tends to be decreased, which consequently minimizes presenteeism.

Theoretical implications
This study makes several theoretical contributions. First, the study responds to calls made by McGregor et al. (2016), Arslaner and Boylu (2017), Chia and Chu (2017), Ariza-Montes et al. (2021), and Knani (2022) for more research on presenteeism and servant leadership in the hospitality industry. The study makes significant contributions to the body of knowledge exited on the concepts of servant leadership and presenteeism in the context of hospitality businesses. Second, the study's main contribution is its argument and confirmation that servant leadership in the hospitality business reduces the positive relationship between work pressure and presenteeism. Third, it provides a theoretical framework based on the hotel industry in the distinct culture of Egypt as one of the Middle Eastern nations; this might help improve Middle Eastern and Egyptian-specific approaches to organizational leadership and coping with work pressure and presenteeism. Consequently, our research's findings address needs and enrich hospitality research.

Managerial implications
There are several useful practical implications to this study. First, hotel managers need to recognize that presenteeism and job pressure are two major aspects of the workplace environment that are affected by servant leadership. Therefore, hotel managers with a servant leadership character are the most qualified to assume the management position in a hotel environment where they can most effectively aid the staff in reducing work pressure and presenteeism. This is a crucial issue because only a few hotel chains, such as Ritz-Carlton and Starwood, have incorporated servant leadership ideas into their corporate philosophies (Ling et al., 2016, 2017). Additionally, many characteristics and qualities of servant leaders, such as caring for employees and self-sacrifice, have been recognized as competencies of hotel managers. As a result, hotel chains throughout the world should incorporate training on servant leadership and follower requirements into their development programs. Second, to create a supportive workplace culture and counter the belief that employees must present to work at any cost, hotels should recruit managers who are qualified based on the servant leadership model. Those managers have the responsibility to make it clear that working while unwell runs counter to the company's health and wellbeing policy. Such a strategy aims to establish new ways of thinking, acting, and responding to presenteeism in addition to changing the ways employees work. Third, to avoid future presenteeism problems, hotels must encourage managers and supervisors to increase their understanding of workplace health and to implement well-being programs. This is very essential because, even though many hospitality firms have created wellness initiatives and programs for their
staff, recent studies have shown that staff members lack the time to engage in these program activities (Zhang et al., 2020 & Knani, 2022).

**Limitations and further research**

This study has some limitations that need to be addressed in future research. First, this study emphasized only the role of servant leadership in damping the relationship between work pressure and presenteeism. Further studies would be needed to investigate the effect of other leadership styles (e.g., prosocial leadership). Other work and non-work-related elements such as emotion control, the absenteeism policy, and work-life balance needs to be examined in a future study to see how they influence presenteeism and work pressure. Second, this study is quantitative and relies on survey methodology. Given the complexity of presenteeism (Miraglia and Johns, 2016), qualitative research is especially necessary to fully explore the idea and dynamics of presenteeism as well as to comprehend the thoughts and feelings of presenteeists. Third, this study adopts self-reporting technique to examine work pressure, presenteeism and employees perception of servant leadership. Because presenteeism is challenging to detect, identify, and even manage in the hospitality business (Knani, 2022), further studies are required to provide us proactive techniques “i.e. human resources practices” which able to detect the potential symptoms of presenteeism rather than managing its consequences. In addition, due to social desirability bias, longitudinal research is necessary to better understand the phenomenon of presenteeism, servant leadership, and work pressure in hotel context. Finally, because this study was done in the setting of Egyptian hotel sector, the current work's generalizability to other industries or nations became a disadvantage. As a result, further comparative studies could be conducted.
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