CHAPTER V

RESULT AND DISCUSSION
In the present investigation, the role of quality of working life in determining the absenteeism behaviour of White-collar-workers and Blue-collar-workers was studied.

The experimental study was conducted on 500 subjects by adopting two randomised group design. Group-1 consisted of 250 White-collar-workers, randomly selected from two-large scale industries, `Mohta Electro Steel' and `T.I.T.' situated in Bhiwani district. Group-2 comprising of 250 Blue-collar-workers was also randomly selected from these two industries. The particulars of the population and the procedure followed in drawing the sample have been discussed in detail in Chapter-IV. The data were collected by using `Work and Life Attitudes Survey' and the raw scores on eight components of quality of working life for both the groups were taken separately (Appendices B-1 and C-1). The attendance record for previous two years of these workers was noted down.

Since, the working days of each worker were different, so raw data were converted into percentages, which were further subjected to the arc-sine transformation for further analysis (Appendices B-2 and C-2).

The results were subjected to statistical analysis to find out whether the various hypotheses formulated in Chapter III are verified or not.
FIG. 5 SHOWING THE MEAN QUALITY OF WORKING LIFE (QWL) SCORES OF WHITE COLLAR WORKERS AND BLUE COLLAR WORKERS.
While comparing the mean quality of working life scores of the White-collar-workers (349.82) and Blue-collar-workers (288.24) depicted in Figure 5, it is quite obvious that these two categories of the workers have different levels of quality of working life. Rather White-collar-workers seem to have better level of working conditions. To test the significance of difference between means, t-test was applied.

Table - 1

Showing the significance of difference on t-test between the means of QWL scores of Group-1 (WCWs) and Group-2 (BCWs).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>t-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group-1 (WCWs)</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>349.82</td>
<td>28.009**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group-2 (BCWs)</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>288.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** p < .01

Since the mean difference between these two groups were significant at .01 level, it could be said that White-collar-workers have better quality of working life than the Blue-collar-workers.

Similarly the mean absenteeism rate of White-collar-workers and Blue-collar-workers depicted in Figure 6 were compared by employing t-test.
FIG. 6 SHOWING THE MEAN ABSENTEEISM RATE OF WHITE COLLAR WORKERS (WCWs) AND BLUE COLLAR WORKERS (BCWs)
Table - 2

Showing the significance of difference on t-test between the means of absenteeism rate of Group-1 (WCWs) and Group-2 (BCWs).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>t-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group-1 (WCWs)</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>13.22</td>
<td>-21.55**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group-2 (BCWs)</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>19.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** p < .01

The t-value (-21.55) is statistically significant (p < .01) and this infers that Blue-collar-workers have higher absenteeism rate than White-collar-workers.

It is quite clear from above discussed results that White-collar-workers have more OWL scores than Blue-collar-workers and Blue-collar-workers have more absences than White-collar-workers. From these results the first hypothesis of the present study has been verified.

In case of absenteeism, studies have reported that the people on higher level jobs are less likely to the absent than those who hold low level jobs (Baumgartel & Sobol, 1969; Hrebiniaik & Roteman, 1973; Waters & Roach, 1973; Yolles, Carone, & Krinsky, 1975).
The White-collar-workers have better working conditions especially those who are on higher positions have more job security and intrinsic job characteristic as autonomy, variety, significance etc. Moreover, people on higher level jobs can have more easily short absences from work. The White-collar-workers get the opportunity to sit around the office and talk, can take slightly longer lunch and can even run personal errands during the day. On the other hand, Blue-collar-workers don’t get such opportunities and have to take full or half day leave for some personal urgency. They generally work under poorer conditions, noisy atmosphere, under continuous threat of job insecurity. When an assembly line worker is absent even for some hours, it is quite noticeable but White-collar-workers especially on higher levels possess the autonomy to have short absences without being noticed or they may be present on work situation but they may be ‘working privately’. This makes their total absences fewer than absences of Blue-collar-workers.

So, this difference may be due to different nature of their working conditions which leads to the different absenteeism behaviour.
Hence, the first hypothesis stating that White-collar-workers and Blue-collar-workers would differ significantly on their quality of working life scores and their absenteeism levels is hereby supported.

Further for determining the interaction between quality of working life (IV) and absenteeism (DV), multiple regression analysis was applied on the scores of the eight components of quality of working life and absenteeism rate of both White-collar-workers and Blue-collar-workers. The obtained F-values are shown in Table-3.

Table-3

Showing the F-values of the Group-1 (WCWs) and Group-2 (BCWs) on multiple regression analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>F-values</th>
<th>Level of significance</th>
<th>Standard error of regression</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group-1 (WCWs)</td>
<td>8.002</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group-2 (BCWs)</td>
<td>13.002</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The F-values for Group-1 and Group-2 are highly significant. This shows that absenteeism rate of these two groups depend upon the quality of working life of these employees. In other words, the quality of working life determines the absenteeism behaviour of the factory employees irrespective of their class.
These highly significant F-values of Group-1 and Group-2 provide the rough idea of the relative contribution of eight components of QWL on absenteeism behaviour. For determining the degree of relationship of each of the component of QWL with absenteeism, product moment correlations were calculated.

We may now pass on to the discussion of individual effect of these eight components on absenteeism in light of their r-values. The obtained r-values are shown in Table-4.

**Table 4**

Showing the correlation coefficients between eight components of QWL and absenteeism rate of Group-1 (WCWs) and Group-2 (BCWs).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Components of QWL</th>
<th>r-values for Group-1 (WCWs)</th>
<th>r-values for Group-2 (BCWs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work involvement</td>
<td>-.83**</td>
<td>-.89**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic Job Motivation</td>
<td>-.70**</td>
<td>-.77**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Intrinsic job characteristics</td>
<td>-.68**</td>
<td>-.57**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Order Need</td>
<td>-.71**</td>
<td>-.81**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>-.73**</td>
<td>-.77**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life satisfaction</td>
<td>-.61**</td>
<td>-.75**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happiness</td>
<td>-.49**</td>
<td>-.52**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Rated Anxiety</td>
<td>.65**</td>
<td>.81**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** p < .01
FIG. 7 SHOWING THE CORRELATION CO-EFFICIENTS BETWEEN EIGHT COMPONENTS OF QUALITY OF WORKING LIFE AND ABSENTEEISM IN CASE OF WHITE COLLAR WORKERS.
FIG. 8 SHOWING THE CORRELATION CO-EFFICIENTS BETWEEN EIGHT COMPONENTS OF QUALITY OF WORKING LIFE AND ABSENTEEISM IN CASE OF BLUE-COLLAR WORKERS.
These correlation co-efficients are also shown in graphical form in Figure 7 & 8.

The first component of quality of working life is work involvement. Scores of work involvement of both White-collar-workers and Blue-collar-workers were correlated with their absenteeism rate and r-values for Group 1 (WCWs) is -.83 and for Group 2 (BCWs) is -.89 (shown in Table 4). Both the values were statistically significant indicating that work involvement is inversely related to absenteeism.

Before going into the indepth discussion on this relationship, investigator wishes to clarify some misconceptions about the definition of work involvement. It is usually confused with job involvement. Although, both the terms are closely related but there is a difference. Work involvement refers to involvement to work in general and job involvement concentrates on involvement in one’s present job. The main reason given for this confusion is multidimensional definition and the measure given by Lodahl & Keiner (1965). The focus of the items of Lodahl & Keiner measure is mainly upon a person’s present job where as their definition was more in terms of work in general. Generally the studies consider them as identical terms.
The present results of significant correlation between work involvement and absenteeism got the support from Robinowitz and Hall (1977) who reported negative involvement-absence relationship.

Nicholson (1977) proposes that job involvement directly affects attendance motivation which in turn directly affects absence frequency.

Cheloha and Farr (1982), Ilgen and Hollenback (1977), Kanungo (1980), Mobley et. al. (1979) and Saal (1978) also reported an inverse relationship between involvement and absenteeism.

Boal and Cidambi (1984); and Steers and Rhodes (1984) also recognised that job involvement is promising attitudinal predictor of frequency of absence than duration.

Brooke (1986) also suggests that work involvement is related to job involvement and both work and job involvement affect absenteeism. In a recent study, Mathieu and Kohler (1990) reported that organisational commitment and job involvement interact in relation to personal absences.

However, these results are not supported by the results of Siegel and Ruh (1973) who found no relationship between work
involvement and absences. Recently Singh and Kumari (1988) also reported that workers in high and low job involvement groups do not show a significant difference in their level of absenteeism.

The second component of quality of working life is intrinsic job motivation and r-values between scores of intrinsic job motivation and absenteeism rate are -.70 for White-collar-workers and -.77 for Blue-collar-workers (shown in Table-4). These values report a statistically significant relationship between both the variables.

These results are also in congruence with the results of Hackman and Oldham (1976) who explained in their job characteristic model that a relationship exists between intrinsic job motivation and absenteeism.

Ilgen and Hollenback (1977) also reported that intrinsically motivated individuals have positive internal feelings about their job and they avail less absences, both excused and unexcused.

Steers and Rhodes (1978) also in their attendance model refer to influence of internal motivation on actual attendance. They explained that if an employee firmly believes in what the organisation is trying to achieve, he or she is internally motivated to attend and contribute toward those objectives.
But again Singh and Kumari (1988) reported an insignificant relationship between intrinsic job motivation and absenteeism.

However, from the present results which indicate a negative relationship between work involvement, intrinsic job motivation and absenteeism, it can be inferred that an employee’s work involvement and intrinsic motivation to come to work represents the primary influence on the actual attendance. The assumption lies here that one has the ability to come to work and this extends the support to second hypothesis.

Employees with high work involvement have fewer absences and the major reason is that they believe that work activity is an important aspect of life. They feel morally obligated to work. Because of such a strong work ethic, they are highly involved in their work and consider it a duty to come to work regularly. They are absent from work only when they have a solid reason to be absent. Work involvement, on the other hand, is also related to employee’s values and expectation. People come to work with differing values and expectations, that is, they value certain features in a job and expect these features to be present to a certain degree. If these features are present in the job, they become involved in it, but if the work they are doing lacks those
features, they loose their involvement in work. Lack of involvement also leads to lack of attachment to work which is also a cause of casual absences.

Intrinsic job motivation also occurs when an employee has strong feelings for his job. It creates conditions where people show high zeal, initiative, interest, enthusiasm, sense of responsibility, loyalty, discipline, pride and confidence to effectively achieve the goals of his organisation. They perform the tasks and activities not because of some apparent reward but just for a subjective feeling of satisfaction. These subjective feelings exert an internal pressure on them to commit themselves to the organisation and contribute in fulfilling the objectives of the organisation. Intrinsic job motivation in an employee is determined by many factors. When an employee is satisfied with working conditions, when his expectations are being met by the job, when his relationship with superiors and co-workers is good, when he gets opportunities for advancement, when he gets ample financial and non-financial incentives, all these conditions lead to high intrinsic job motivation. But if these conditions are not present, the employee feels that his motives are not being satisfied in that particular setting, then he tries to switch away from the job activities. Less internal pressure is exerted by his feelings to attend the work regularly and the outcome is
high absenteeism.

Hence, the second hypothesis of the present study stating that work involvement and intrinsic job motivation would be inversely related to absenteeism, has been verified.

The Table-4 showed that the third component of quality of working life i.e. perceived intrinsic job characteristics is also significantly related to absenteeism (r-values -0.68 for White-collar-workers and -0.57 for Blue-collar-workers). The negative signs before these r-values infer that perceived intrinsic job characteristics are inversely related to absenteeism. Similar results were earlier reported by Locke et al. (1976), Spiegel (1975) and Wanous (1974).

These results are also supportive of Hackman and Oldham's job characteristics model (1976) that suggests that the presence of these job characteristics inversely affects the absenteeism of workers.

Several studies have related absenteeism with one of these job characteristics as Hackman and Lawler (1971), and Rousseau (1978) reported inverse relationship between perceived measures of task identity and absenteeism. Further Brass (1985), Fried
et. al. (1972), Hackman and Lawler (1971). Hackman and Oldham (1976) found that autonomy/skill variety is inversely related to absenteeism.

Though, the present results are being supported by these above explained studies but many other researchers do not find any relationship between enriched jobs (including job characteristics) and absenteeism in their experimental studies (Frank & Hackman, 1975; King, 1974; Malone, 1975).

The fourth component of quality of working life is higher order need strength. It is also correlated with absenteeism rate of White-collar-workers and Blue-collar-workers. The r-values (again shown in Table - 4) are -.71 for WCWs and -.81 for BCWs. Both the values are significant and thus refer to a negative relationship between higher order need strength and absenteeism.

These results are in line with Hackman and Lawler’s (1971) observation that nature of relationship between job characteristics and absenteeism would depend upon the need states of the employees. Hackman and Oldham (1976) have also shown in their job characteristic model that growth needs strength moderates the relationship between job characteristics and outcomes such as higher job satisfaction and lower absenteeism.
Kleinback et al. (1983) found absenteeism to be significantly correlated to achievement oriented motivation which in turn refers to existence of higher order need strength (Porter et al. 1977).

But these results were not supported by Singh and Kumari (1988) who reported that no significant difference exists between absenteeism rate of workers with low need strength and workers with high need strength.

However, the present results assure the existence of an inverse relationship between higher order need strength and absenteeism.

In the light of the present findings which have been reported in above paragraphs, the third hypothesis is supported.

The presence of perceived intrinsic job characteristics makes the job enriched and more rewarding. These intrinsic job characteristics generally named as skill variety, task identity, task significance, autonomy and feedback make the job more humane and productive. They reduce the monotony on the job situation, make the job more challenging, motivating and satisfying and help in improving employee performance. They develop feelings of meaningfulness, feelings of responsibility in the employees and
also intrinsic motivation is increased. The general result of all this is reduction in absenteeism, grievance and ideal times. Although, there are large individual differences in how employees perceive and react to these core intrinsic job characteristics but the typical employee finds them to be basic for internal motivation and they provide certain positive results in the organisation. Even if one of these characteristics is missing, the workers are psychologically deprived and motivational level tend to be reduced and the common reaction is increase in absenteeism in case of both managerial or White-collar-workers and Blue-collar-workers.

Higher order need strength also have negative relationship with absenteeism. Higher order needs include need for personal growth, need for challenge and achievement, need for self actualization. Lower order needs (physical well being, security etc.) are primarily satisfied through economic rewards. The higher order needs, on the other hand, are satisfied through psychological and social rewards. An employee with dominating higher order need strength expects certain characteristics and dimensions in his job. If those expected characteristics and dimensions are not present in the job, he does not get any satisfaction in accomplishing his tasks on job situation and the result is his abstaining away from the situation. Individuals with strong higher
order need strength place a valance on the attainment of their performance objectives. Superior performance often represents a form of intrinsic rewards and often leads to the receipt of positively valent extrinsic rewards from the organisation. All these intrinsic and extrinsic rewards increase their motivation, involvement and satisfaction with the job and lead to regular attendance on the job situation.

Previous studies have established higher order need strength as moderating variable in the relationship of intrinsic job characteristics and absenteeism. Employees with more higher order need strength respond more positively to jobs that have high levels of intrinsic job characteristics than those with low higher order need strength. Its main function may be as a moderator but still the effect of higher order need strength on absenteeism can not be denied.

Hence, the third hypothesis stating that perceived intrinsic job characteristics and higher order need strength would be responsible for reduction in absenteeism is, hereby, verified.

Job satisfaction is the fifth component of quality of working life. Its correlation value with absenteeism in case of:
White-collar-workers is -0.73 and is -0.77 in case of Blue-collar-workers (shown in Table 4), thus showing a negative relationship between both the variables.

Similar type of results were reported by Muchinsky (1977), Porter and Steers (1973), and Water and Roach (1971).

Steers and Rhodes (1978) in their 'attendance model' suggest that attendance is influenced by attendance motivation. Job satisfaction, in turn, is an important determinant of attendance motivation.

The present results are also in accordance with the results of Blau (1985), Cheloha and Farr (1980), Fitzgibbons and Moch (1980), Hackett and Guion (1984), and Yucett (1982).

Some studies have reported a weak relationship between these two variables (Locke, 1976; Nicholson et. al. 1976), where as contradictory results have also been reported by Ilgen and Hollenback (1977); John (1978); and Watson (1981).

But, over all, the present findings that a significant relationship exists between job satisfaction and absenteeism are in congruence with most of the studies already conducted.
Life satisfaction, the sixth component of quality of working life is also inversely related to absenteeism as has been shown by r-values -.61 for White-collar-workers and -.75 for Blue-collar-workers in Table 4 and both these r-values are statistically significant.

Some earlier studies have also reported relationship between features of life satisfaction and absenteeism.

Bhatia in his both studies in 1979 and 1981 observed that habitual absenteeees experience difficulties in adjusting themselves to their domestic and social environment and analysed that ninety percent of the causes of habitual absenteeism were due to personal factors such as family, personality, emotional, marital and social issues. The employees may be absent because of poor healths, inadequate housing, transportation difficulties and lack of recreational facilities. Feelings and activities off the job may affect life at work (Champboux, 1981; Kabanoff, 1980; Near et. al. 1980; Staines, 1980).

Chadwick et. al. (1982) discussed absenteeism as a social exchange between individual and organisation. Part of this exchange involves understanding that absenteeism is influenced by outside factor such as individual’s responsibility to his or her family.
Nicholson and Payne (1987) also reported that absences are caused by domestic problems and maladjustment in life leads to high rate of absenteeism.

The seventh component of quality of working life is happiness. The correlation between happiness and absenteeism in present study is \(-.49\) for White-collar-workers and \(-.52\) for Blue-collar-workers. These significant \(r\)-values are shown in Table - 4 and indicate an inverse relationship between happiness and absenteeism.

These results are supportive of the results of George (1989) who found that positive mood (happiness) at work was significantly and negatively associated with absenteeism.

However, these results are not getting support from the earlier findings of Bhatia (1979) who reported that habit of absenteeism is independent of happiness.

The significant \(r\)-values in Table - 4 for job satisfaction \((-0.73 \& -0.77\) for Group-1 \& 2 respectively\) and for life satisfaction \((-0.61 \& -0.75\) for Group-1 \& 2 respectively\) and for happiness \((-0.49 \& -0.52\) for Group-1 \& 2 respectively\) lend support to the fourth hypothesis of the present study.
So, those employees who have less job satisfaction tend to be absent more often. They do not necessarily plan to be absent, but when some reason for absence arises, a dissatisfied employee finds it easier to respond to that reason and the result is high absenteeism. Job satisfaction refers to the amount of agreement between one's expectations of the job and the rewards that the job provides him. It refers to sheer joy in working. But a dissatisfied worker finds more to dislike in a job situation than a satisfied worker. Job satisfaction depends upon a variety of factors such as job scope, job level, role stress, relationship with employers and co-workers, pay, promotion and other advancement opportunities, working environment etc. and if all these factors help in fulfilling his expectations from job, his satisfaction with the job is high but if these factors don't contribute in fulfilling his expectations, the result is low job satisfaction. Job satisfaction is usually reflected in the level of absenteeism. This is the most common reaction that a worker gives for expressing his dissatisfaction with job. So the atmosphere pertaining in job situation affects his attitude toward his work and either persuades him to attend regularly or keeps him away. Although, illness may be the reason given by employees for an absence, dissatisfaction with job may be the real cause even though employee himself may not realise it.
Just like job satisfaction, life satisfaction is also an important determinant of absenteeism. The present findings also reveal that social, marital and emotional maladjustment leads to high absenteeism. The reason is that working life is an important domain of overall life and generally so much part of the day is spend in this domain of life. So, the feelings and thoughts of other domains of life are bound to affect the working life of an individual. The difficulties faced by the worker in his adjustment in life are often projected on some aspects of the work because of the 'spill over effect' between the two. The dissatisfaction in life may lead to dissatisfaction in job. An employee's performance on the job situation is bound to be affected if he has some problems in other spheres of life and generally he adjusts to these life tensions by withdrawing and staying away from work situation. Frequent discretionary absences become a part of his life style. When he is dissatisfied with some aspect of his life, he carries the same feelings to the work situation and these negative feelings affect adversely his perception of the job environment. He just finds one or the other reason to be dissatisfied also with the job situation and the usual reaction is shirking away from the job.

Happiness is positive mood and also a reflection of overall psychological well being. If an employee is happy with his life,
if his day to day feelings are positive they are bound to be carried over to the work place. His positive feelings and happy mood would change his perception at the work place. He would feel enthusiastic to work and would tackle problems on the job situation in a positive manner. This would lead to increase in satisfaction and would significantly determine the attendance pattern of the employee. But if the employee is unhappy in his life, his feelings would adversely affect his working behaviour. His upset and unpleasant mood would make it difficult for him to continuously work with full enthusiasm and meet the challenges. He would prefer to withdraw and stay away and this would result in high absenteeism. Happiness, on the other hand, depends upon satisfaction with job and life. If an individual is fully satisfied with his job and life, he is bound to feel good and happy.

Hence, the fourth hypothesis stating that higher levels of job satisfaction, life satisfaction and happiness would lead to lower level of absenteeism is hereby, verified.

Now, we may pass on to the last component of quality of working life, that is self rated anxiety. The correlation calculated between the scores of self rated anxiety and absenteeism for both White-collar-workers and Blue-collar-workers are also shown in Table-4. The r-values for Group 1 and Group 2 are .65 and .81 respectively. Since both the values are positive so
inference of direct relationship between self rated anxiety and absenteeism can be drawn. It means that if self rated anxiety of an individual is more, his total absences would be more.

The present results tally with the results of some earlier studies. Pocakacke et al. (1972) and Sinha (1963) had reported that workers with high manifest anxiety tended to be absent more often from their work situation.

Raitsalo and Najman (1979) revealed that 2-3% of absences were due to mental illness (anxiety). Dubey (1979) found anxiety to be positively related to absenteeism. Similar results were reported by Bhatia and Valecha (1981), and Trivedi et al. (1981).

Tucker and Larry (1987) found that situations of perceived stress (that is closely associated with anxiety) are related to absenteeism. Spector and Jex (1991) also found that job satisfaction, frustration and anxiety are moderately correlated. They are also related to absenteeism and this relationship lends support to the fifth hypothesis of the present research.

At this stage, it can be inferred that high anxiety is directly related to absenteeism. Anxiety is usually produced by stress and stress is elicited by an actual or perceived disparity between environmental demands and the organism’s capacity to cope
with these demands. This disparity leads to depression and frustration and has also adverse effect on mental health. This leads to reduction in total life satisfaction. There are individual variations on the level of anxiety. Some people experience higher anxiety because of stressful events but others experience very low level of anxiety on those events. Higher level of anxiety has negative affect on job satisfaction and life satisfaction and this leads to negative effect on working behaviour. High anxious group usually find it difficult to cope with the demands of job, they feel depressed and try to remain away from the job situation. The outcome is high absenteeism.

Hence, the fifth hypothesis stating that high self rated anxiety would lead to high absenteeism is also, hereby, verified.

While studying the effect of these eight components of quality of working life on absenteeism, the present investigator came across with an interesting feature that there may exist the interrelations between these components. For further probing, intercorrelations of scores of all these eight components in case of both White-collar-workers and Blue-collar-workers were computed.
### Table - 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Work Involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Intrinsic Job Motivation</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Perceived Intrinsic job characteristics</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Higher Order Need Strength</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Job satisfaction</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Life Satisfaction</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Happiness</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Self rated anxiety</td>
<td>-.73</td>
<td>-.61</td>
<td>-.68</td>
<td>-.66</td>
<td>-.74</td>
<td>-.81</td>
<td>-.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table - 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Work Involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Intrinsic Job Motivation</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Perceived Intrinsic job characteristics</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Higher Order Need Strength</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Job satisfaction</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Life Satisfaction</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Happiness</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Self rated anxiety</td>
<td>-.87</td>
<td>-.85</td>
<td>-.51</td>
<td>-.80</td>
<td>-.83</td>
<td>-.90</td>
<td>-.63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These intercorrelations shown in Table 5 & 6 reveal that all the eight components of quality of working life are highly correlated with each other in case of White-collar-workers as well as Blue-collar-workers.

We may now discuss these highly significant interrelations one by one. Highly work involved individuals are highly satisfied with their jobs or vice versa. Involvement may be considered as a feedback variable. Involvement may be high because a person is satisfied with or motivated by his job or a person may experience job satisfaction and job motivation because involvement is high. Job (work) involvement works as a moderator for job satisfaction and absenteeism relationship (Cheloha & Farr, 1980). It is also a moderator for establishing the relationship between motivation and absenteeism (Saleh, 1981).

A relationship also exists between involvement and intrinsic motivation (Knoop, 1986). Singh and Kumari (1988) also showed that job involvement was positively related to intrinsic motivation and job satisfaction. There is also proof of relationship which exists between job involvement and job characteristics which in turn is related to intrinsic motivation and job satisfaction (Head & Sorenson, 1985).
Higher order needs strength or growth need strength works as a moderator for relationship between intrinsic job characteristics and job satisfaction (Loher et. al. 1985). Some studies have also shown an approach in which job satisfaction is related to higher order need strength (Singh & Kumari, 1988; Efraty & Sirgy, 1990).

Job satisfaction is also related to life satisfaction (Hunt et. al. 1977; Near et. al. 1978). Just as feelings of job carry over to life, feelings and activities off the job may affect life at work. Keon and McDonald (1982) reported a relationship between life satisfaction and job satisfaction.

Romzek (1989) suggested that higher level of involvement in organisational work resulted in higher non-work satisfaction. Life satisfaction is also related to happiness which is further positively related to job satisfaction (Schell & Loeb, 1986). Anxiety, on the other hand, is negatively related to job satisfaction (Saha & Ojha, 1989).

Significant intercorrelations among the eight components of quality of working life for both Group 1 and 2 showed that these variables (components) were not affecting the absenteeism level (dependent variable) independently but they were also interdependent in nature. The high intercorrelations between the
eight components had facilitatory effect on the dependent variable in the sense that the relation of one component with the dependent variable was determined by the interrelations of that component with other components and also the relationships of the other components with the dependent variable.

For further investigation we may now examine the difference between the means of all the eight factors of the quality of working life of White-collar-workers and Blue-collar-workers. The obtained results are shown in Table 7.
FIG. 9 SHOWING THE MEAN SCORES ON EIGHT COMPONENTS OF QUALITY OF WORKING LIFE OF WCSs & BCWs.
Table 7

Showing the significance of the difference on t-test between mean scores of eight components of OWL of Group-1 (WCWs) and Group-2 (BCWs)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component of OWL</th>
<th>Mean Scores of Group 1 (WCWs)</th>
<th>Mean Scores of Group 2 (BCWs)</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Work involvement</td>
<td>36.92</td>
<td>25.51</td>
<td>17.59**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Intrinsic Job Motivation</td>
<td>37.31</td>
<td>29.29</td>
<td>21.35**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Perceived Intrinsic Job Characteristics</td>
<td>37.83</td>
<td>27.55</td>
<td>24.53**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Higher Order Need Strength</td>
<td>36.19</td>
<td>28.98</td>
<td>19.03**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>90.88</td>
<td>73.27</td>
<td>26.01**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Life Satisfaction</td>
<td>88.28</td>
<td>71.20</td>
<td>25.03**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Happiness</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>14.63**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** p < .01.

These mean scores of eight components of OWL of Group 1 & 2 are also depicted in Fig.9.

All the t-values in Table 7 are statistically significant. This shows that White-collar-workers and Blue-collar-workers differ significantly from each other on these eight components.

Although, the present investigator did not come across any study comparing the White-collar-workers and Blue-collar-workers on any of these eight factors but the present results do refer to a significant difference.
When the data for the present investigation was being collected, the present investigator also observed a difference in the working life of White-collar-workers and Blue-collar-workers. In both the industries, White-collar-workers work under better condition. Although, clerical staff had some dissatisfaction, but generally their overall quality of working life is moderate. However, in case of Blue-collar-workers, condition is more bad. Most of the Blue-collar-workers are generally dissatisfied with their jobs, they also have low involvement in work, intrinsic job characteristics are lacking in their jobs but because of lack of any other job opportunities they have to continue with it. In general life also, most of them have large families to support and pay is never sufficient and they have to face lot of domestic chores. While filling the questionnaires the investigator interviewed the Blue-collar-workers for general interest. Some peculiar responses were like this-

- 'अगर मैनेजमेंट बाते कुंडा उठायेंगे तो उठाना होगा। क्योंकि वे मैंकरी छूट गई तो दोबारा नहीं मिलेगी।'

- 'अपना काम पसंद तो नहीं है पर क्या करे, बाबू जी को देखना है और कोई मैंकरी मिलती भी तो नहीं।'

- 'नौकरी हम खुशहाल से नहीं, मजबूत से करते हैं।'

- 'इतने कम दैनन्दन से क्या कोई संतुष्ट हो सकता है, महागौरी भी तो दिन पर दिन बढ़ती आ। रही है।'
"हम कोई सुभाव देिे वाले कोने होते हैं, वैलेमेंट निकाल कर बाहर कर देते।"

"में इसरों तैरे तैरे कुछ कर सकती है, हमारे हाथ में तो कुछ भी नहीं है।"

"पूरे महीने घर का सख्त बालने का चिंता लो लगी ही रहती है।"

"रक्तों समय तो घर के घर - यह चुनने में निम्न भाला है।"

"गरीबों सबसे बड़ी चिंता है।"

"कौई भी सम्मान गरीबी कम नहीं कर सकती।"

The subjective data substantiate the objective data of Blue-collar-workers. From these verbal responses, the exact picture of low quality of working life of Blue-collar-workers emerges. Inspite of such level of working life, still they have to continue with the same job. These workers generally live under conditions of abject poverty and for them 'to have work at all - any kind of working life - is the overriding aim.' To get some extrinsic especially financial rewards from the job is their only objective. Very few workers give priority to the jobs which are also high in intrinsic qualities. Moreover, the Indian society which is marked by high degree of inequality; wealth, income and power are considered real indicator of one's success in life. This strong desire for extrinsic rewards like money and promotion in a scarcity situation is not conducive to the development and maintenance of the value of inter-personal dependence: it tends
to generate inter-personal conflicts.

Another thing is that most of these workers are uneducated, there is lack of awareness regarding the factors that can contribute in improving their quality of working life, they live under continuous threat of losing the job and all this makes them passive. Moreover, the social set up of India is such that these workers from poorer class are brought up from beginning with the idea that nothing can change their fate and they don't have a right to demand anything. Their adversaries in society are all too powerful who have everything at their command to repel any move that tends to challenge their domination in society. Even the state machinery often also comes to their aid in their disputes with the poor in the name of maintaining law and order in society.

At this stage of discussion, it can be concluded that the low quality of working life is reflected by workers in their low work involvement, low intrinsic job motivation, lack of perceived intrinsic job characteristics, low higher order need strength, low job satisfaction, low life satisfaction, unhappiness and high self rated anxiety. All these, in turn, adversely affect the working behaviour and they try to avoid the working situation on every possible excuse which leads to high absenteeism.
Before closing down the discussion on the obtained results we may sum up the main aim and findings of the study. The present study was designed to study the effect of quality of working life (by taking it components separately) on absenteeism. The results indicated that all eight components of quality of working life are significantly related with the absenteeism. In this light, all the five hypotheses formulated in Chapter III were verified. It could be concluded that quality of working life affects absenteeism rate of both White-collar-workers and Blue-collar-workers.

These findings have immense applied value. The present study gives an idea about the poor quality of working life of the employees especially Blue-collar-workers, how it affects the working behaviour of workers and how it leads to another major problem i.e. high absenteeism in industries. The present findings might be used to guide applied efforts to improve quality of working life through work place innovations. There is a need to start some programs to improve quality of working life. Policy makers in government, labour and work organisations who are responsible for bringing about innovations in work place should try to develop programs in the light of these findings. Workers should not be taken as just means of production but they should be treated as human resources which are to be fully developed
and utilised. It is a whole and integrated person who comes to work each day and he should be treated as a human being. The authoritarian management style can retard the development of productivity, increase comparative economic disadvantages and can create alienated workers likely to cause more problems. Work should be redesigned on socio-economic principle so that work becomes the central life interest of workers. That would satisfy workers social needs as well as higher order needs. In new situations they would be more concerned with work than with extrinsic job satisfaction.

Efforts should be made to utilise organisational resources to increase involvement, motivation, satisfaction etc. of the employees. Not only his working life but his overall life should be taken into account. Even though changes in work place are important and worthwhile, it is crucial for policy makers to recognize that the non-work lives of the workers are also very important and they should also be made more or less fulfilling because the non-work life has strong influence on working life. This would make the workers integrated not only into the work groups but also into the organisations and the larger society. Further more, these highly productive, co-operative and democratic work organisations would reinforce the values of co-operation, democracy etc. So, the redesigned work would help to create and
sustain a healthy, democratic and co-operative society.

But before starting any program in this context, components of quality of working life which are pertinent in India, should be taken into account. The programmes should be developed with full attention on grim realities of India's economic and social situation.

Absenteeism, on the other hand, is also a serious problem but it should not be thought of as an unavoidable evil to live with. The reasons are present with in the individual and they should be digged out. Generally, absence is a form of behaviour that occurs when forces encouraging people to come to work are overcome by forces propelling people not to work. Management should try to find out methods to restore the balance of pressure in favour of those forces impelling attendance. A major focus should be placed on differential expectation levels of employees at the time of entry into the organisation and the extent to which these expectations are met or altered over the course of employment or, in other words, care should be taken to ensure congruence between person and job. The solution of the problem also depends upon joint acceptance of objectives by both the parties i.e. the employees and the management. Participation of the employees in all important matters should be increased to
increase their motivation in work. Behaviour modification techniques should be applied to control absenteeism. Chronic absentees should be given some sort of counselling.

Controlling absenteeism will positively help in progress of organisation.

Some suggestions for the future research are as follows:

1. For confirmation of the present results, the present work should be replicated in different organisational climates.

2. The quality of working life should be further researched in relation to employee behavioural responses other than absenteeism.

3. The components of quality of working life should be studied more in depth, the individual, psychological and additional work related factors that might influence these components should also be taken into account.

4. The studies should be further conducted by including some other components of QWL such as safe and healthy working conditions, educational and health benefits, social integration in the work organisation, social relevance of work life etc.
5. Though, the introduction of QWL movement in Indian industries is not so common but in those industries where this programme is going on, a pre-test and post-test study should be conducted.

6. Most of the studies in the field of work attitudes and absenteeism behaviour have been conducted on Blue-collar-workers. White-collar-workers should also be made focus of research and a comparison between the working behaviour of white-collar-workers and Blue-collar-workers should be made. The factors that affect the difference in their working behaviour should be highlighted.

7. Pink-collar-workers should also be taken as sample of the research work and their quality of working life should also be studied.

8. The studies should be conducted with controlled experimental designs by clearly identifying and isolating the treatment of variables. Non self-report measures should be used to ensure accuracy.