5.1. Introduction

In the previous chapter the causes pertaining to absenteeism of workers in the leather industry has been explored and the self-reported absences have been measured with the help of questionnaire instrument. In this chapter the factors which are responsible for Absence Patterns with respect to demography namely age, gender, marital status, level of education and years of experience; and organizational factors such as, job involvement, job satisfaction, organizational commitment and burnout are discussed. Apart from demographic variables and organizational factors the researcher also underwent the significant change due to various personality traits which includes extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, neuroticism and openness to experience. Each construct has been discussed separately with reference to the theoretical framework, the definition, antecedences, correlates and consequences of the construct. The constructs integrated into a conceptual framework and the relationship with the construct absenteeism is also explained.

5.2. Demographic Variables

The importance of demographic characteristics in explaining absenteeism was acknowledged with the appearance of Price's\(^1\) model. According to Price demographic characteristics directly affect absenteeism. If any demographic variable is found to be causally related to absence behaviour, research may proceed to examine the possible role of specific mediating variables for e.g., job satisfaction, motivation, in the direct effect thus covered.\(^2\)

Most of researchers have been advanced demographic characteristics as predictors of absenteeism in several models. Dozens of studies have accumulated in which gender, age, tenure, education level, and family characteristics were measured, and because there was a growing recognition that some of these characteristics consistently predicted absence-taking.\(^3\) Jensen and McIntosh\(^4\) found that day absent for both men and women are correlated with variables which describe their individual characteristics. These are gender, age, educational attainment, occupation, sector, the number of children living at home, health status, and job duration with organization for which they work and the duration within their occupation.

Rosenblatt and Shirom⁵ have studied to predict absenteeism by personal background factors. Prior absenteeism, age, education and supervisory position were found to be significant predictors of absenteeism frequency, accounting for about 50% of the variance in absence frequency. Cohen and Golan⁶ have also examined the impact of prior absenteeism on demographic variables.

Employee absence behavior is expected to vary with socio-demographic characteristics. Before proceeding further it is necessary to describe the sample in terms of demography. The profile of which is given in the following tables. Also, this section discuss the influence of age, gender, marital status, level of education and year of experience on workers absenteeism.

5.2.1. Age

Age is one of the most studied demographic factors for absenteeism. Many researchers have posited and empirically demonstrated a relationship between age and absenteeism, but the results have been mixed and remain unclear.⁷ Most studies report a negative relationship between age and absenteeism among employees in general.⁸ Despite much previous research, much contradictory evidence is found regarding the relationship between age and absenteeism. Some of the previous studies have found that absence increases with age. It is often argued that older employees are absent more since older people are expected to be sick more, this fact may be explained by older individuals being more susceptible than younger ones to long-term disorders.⁹ Schermerhorn et al.,¹⁰ pointed out that older employees experience higher rates of involuntary absenteeism than younger employees, whose voluntary absences are less frequent. Tylczak¹¹ indicated that age has an effect on absenteeism. Bennett¹² also indicated that age contributes to high rates of absenteeism. A study by Das Pratima et al¹³ from Bihar, India had reported higher proportions of sickness absenteeism.

---

¹² R. Bennett, ‘The kogan page guide to Effective Management’, London: Clays Ltd, St Ives plc, 1994, p.120.
among older workers. Studies by A K Dutta and Sharma\(^{14}\) had also shown that as the age increases the duration of sickness absence increases. Another explanation may be that health tends to deteriorate with age\(^{15}\), besides older employees may be more vulnerable during stressful changes in their work and private lives.\(^{16}\) They further indicated that absence due to illness amongst males is age-related. After the age of 40, absenteeism rates increase and even more so after the age of 50. With aging, workplace perceptions, attitude towards work and sense of age discrimination at workplace affects the efficiency of workers and it influences sickness absenteeism among workers.\(^{17}\)

Other earlier research shows the opposite result; that is, an inverse relationship between absenteeism and age. The analyses indicate that frequency of absence and the number of days absent decrease with age.\(^{18}\) An explanation for the inverse relationship between absenteeism and age may be grounded in interactional psychology. It maintains that situations are as much a function of a person’s behaviour and a person’s behaviour is a function of the situation. Therefore, to the extent that absence is conceptualized in terms of a form of withdrawal from an unsatisfactory work situation, one would expect less absence from older employees because a better person-situation/organization fit is developed over time. Conversely young employees’ absence may be higher due to role conflict or uncertainty of what they believe is the most suitable work role for them resulting in a lower degree of job commitment and sense of responsibility.\(^{19}\) Furthermore, young employees tend to be highly job mobile and consequently are less committed to the job and organization in which they work. Young employees’ opportunity cost of forgone leisure is furthermore likely to be higher compared to that of older employees.\(^{20}\) Another explanation of younger employees’ higher level of absence could, apart from a cultural dimension, be grounded in children.\(^{21}\) This might be an explanation especially for women because the number of young children in the family has a

---


\(^{15}\) J.J. Martocchio ibid, 1989.


\(^{19}\) J.J. Martocchio OpCt, 1989.


strong effect.\textsuperscript{22} as mentioned earlier. It also seems that younger women workers have a pronounced tendency to have higher levels of absence spells-absences not backed by medical certificates - and a slight tendency to have more voluntary absence. This was the result of a count of the total number of absences of less than three weeks' duration occurring before, over, or immediately following a holiday.\textsuperscript{23} Evans and Palmer\textsuperscript{24} also stated that absenteeism episodes among younger people tend to present more frequently and to be of shorter duration, while such episodes among older people present less frequently, but are of longer duration, especially after the age of 50. As outlined above the arguments of direct relationship between absenteeism and age is much more authenticated than for the opposite connection.

Table 5.1: Classification based on Age of the respondents in the Sample Units under study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Agra</th>
<th></th>
<th>Kanpur</th>
<th></th>
<th>Noida</th>
<th></th>
<th>Unnao</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below 20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>19.02%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-30 Years</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>26.40%</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>21.46%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>29.16%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-40 Years</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>32.19%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-50 Years</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>23.20%</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>14.14%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 50</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.40%</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13.17%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.33%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey

Age is an important factor which decides the physical and mental ability of a worker. Table 5.1 shows that 125 workers are taken from Agra region out of which 15 workers are below 20 years, 33 are between 20-30 years, 40 are between 30-40 years, 29 are between 40-50 years and 8 are above 50 years.


Graph 5.1: Age of the respondents in the Clusters under Study

While from Kanpur Cluster 205 workers are taken out of which 39 workers are below 20 years, 44 are between 20-30 years, 66 are between 30-40 years, 29 are between 40-50 years and 27 are above 50 years. Further, from Noida region 46 workers are taken out of which 5 workers are below 20 years, 13 are between 20-30 years, 17 are between 30-40 years, 5 are between 40-50 years and 6 are above 50 years. Whereas, from Unnao 24 workers are taken out of which 3 workers are below 20 years, 7 are between 20-30 years, 6 are between 30-40 years, 6 are between 40-50 years and 2 are above 50 years. Bar Graph 5.1 shows the age of respondents taken from all the four clusters under study for the present research work.

5.2.2. Gender

Gender is one of the important considerations of the social life. It is very common in Indian society, where women are subject to different types of social and economic discrimination at work place. Research shows that absenteeism is higher among women than among men, even when the two genders are holding the same job.\textsuperscript{25} For women short period absence is 20 percent higher compared to men even when controlled for variables such as industry, functional specialty, size of organization, geographical area, age, and children.\textsuperscript{26} Previous research on absence spells has revealed a remarkably consistent pattern with higher absence


rates among women than men. This pattern does not seem to be caused by gender differences in working conditions, by women’s ‘double burden’ of combining the greater share of the responsibility for household and children with paid work, or by health dynamics alone.

A large body of research indicates that absenteeism is higher among women than men. Explanations for this finding are that working women have multiple roles as female homemakers, cares of children and sometimes caring for the elderly. Hardy et al. support this theory as their research also reports that women are generally more absent than men due to domestic problems as well as general health issues. Patton and Johns claim that a plausible explanation for the female excess in sickness absence is the existence of a particular absence culture for women, which is based on general stereotypes and beliefs about women’s lower commitment to work, their ‘double burden’ of combining responsibility for household and children with paid work, higher level of stress, and more fragile health. Empirical findings of a positive, but weak relationship between the female proportion of workplaces and absence rates, have been taken as support for the idea of more lenient norms toward absence and a more tolerant absence culture at female-dominated workplaces.

However, Robbins et al. postulate that the historical role of women in caring for children has changed in the last generation and that men are nowadays taking responsibility for problems associated with child care. Differences in absenteeism, based on traditional female roles, therefore disappear as more women join organizations and follow long term careers.

---

Table 5.2: Classification based on Gender of the respondents in the Sample Units under study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Agra</th>
<th>Kanpur</th>
<th>Noida</th>
<th>Unnao</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Field Survey*

Graph 5.2: Gender of the respondents in the Clusters under Study

Table 5.2 summaries profile of respondents generated based on gender, it was observed that the respondents were predominantly male in all groups. In the present research study 125 workers of the sample units in Agra Cluster are taken, out of which 95 are males and 30 are females. In Kanpur Cluster out of 205 respondents 182 are males and 23 are females. In Noida, out of 46 responses 44 are males and 2 are females. Whereas, in Unnao 24 respondents are taken, 22 are males and 2 are females.

Bar Graph 5.2, above shows the gender of respondents taken from all the four clusters under study for the present research work.
5.2.3. Marital Status

Marital status is the variable that represents kinship responsibilities and is considered as a major contributor to absence. Marital status also influences absences and appears to do so differentially by sex. Married men, perhaps because of their commitment and obligations to home and family life, are absent less frequently than their single counterparts. Probably because of the same commitment, married female employees are absent more frequently than their never married counterparts. Barnby, et al. in their study found out that single men have the lowest absence rates whereas married women have the highest absence rates which they attributed to the difference social responsibilities for gender groups outside the workplace.

Table 5.3: Classification based on Marital Status of the respondents in the Sample Units under study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Agra</th>
<th>Kanpur</th>
<th>Noida</th>
<th>Unnao</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20.80%</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>25.36%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>75.20%</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>68.78%</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced/Separated</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.40%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.41%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widow/Widower</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.43%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey

The social status of a worker depends upon the marital status which also influences his/her absence behavior. Table 5.3 summaries the respondent’s marital status. In the present research study 125 workers of the sample units in Agra Cluster are taken, out of which 26 are single, 94 are married, 3 are divorcee and 2 are widowed. In Kanpur Cluster 282 responses are undertaken out of which 52 are single, 141 are married, 7 are divorcee and 5 are widowed. In Noida, 46 workers are taken out of which 16 are single, 29 are married and 1 is divorcee. While in Unnao 3 are single, 18 are married, two are divorcee and one is widowed. Also, Bar Graph 5.3, below shows the marital status of respondents taken from all the four clusters under study for the present research work.

37 T. Barnby et al., OpCit, 2002.
Graph 5.3: Marital Status of the respondents in the Clusters under Study

Source: Author constructed based on survey Data

5.2.4. Level of Education

Langenhoff\textsuperscript{38} examines that employees with post-school qualifications or secondary level of education have less chance of being absent than employees with a lower level of education. Cristofoli et al.\textsuperscript{39} agree that educated employees, who are more involved in their jobs, are less absent. On the other hand, Lam et al.\textsuperscript{40} state that employees with higher education are more likely to experience less absenteeism frequency, as they have higher expectations of salaries, incentives and recognition. Granlund\textsuperscript{41} research results show no association between education and absenteeism.

\textsuperscript{38} W. Langenhoff, ‘Employee absenteeism: construction of a model for international comparison of influential determinants’, M Econ, Erasmus University, Rotterdam, 2011, p.15.
### Table 5.4: Classification based on Level of Education of the respondents in the Sample Units under study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Education</th>
<th>Agra</th>
<th>Kanpur</th>
<th>Noida</th>
<th>Unnao</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illiterate</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>51.20%</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>44.88%</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>29.75%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior/Secondary</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20.80%</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>17.56%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma/Senior</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7.81%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Field Survey*

Table 5.4 summarizes the respondents level of education. 125 workers are taken from Agra region out of which 64 workers are illiterate, 25 are primary educated, 26 are having an education of junior and secondary education and 10 are having diploma and senior secondary education. While from Kanpur Cluster 205 workers are taken out of which 92 workers are illiterate, 61 are having primary education, 36 are junior and secondary educated and 16 are having a diploma and senior secondary certificate. Further, from Noida region 46 workers are taken out of which 22 workers are illiterate, 14 are primary educated, 8 are having a junior and secondary level education and 2 are diploma and senior secondary educated. Whereas, from Unnao 24 responses are taken out of which 10 are illiterate workers, 6 each are primary and junior/secondary educated and 2 are having a diploma and senior secondary certificate.

### 5.2.5. Years of Experience

Year of Experience is generally defined as the length of employment for which an employee has worked for an organization. According to Robbins *et al.*\(^2\), studies consistently demonstrate an inverse relationship between experience and absenteeism, which means that employees with higher work experience are less absent than those with lower work experience or length of employment. Employees, who have been in employment for long periods, tend to express higher levels of job satisfaction and organizational commitment, resulting in lower rates of absenteeism.\(^3\) On the other hand, studies by Hoque and Islam\(^4\) found that workers with higher work experience report higher levels of absenteeism than

---


workers with lower work experience. A lot of contradiction in the tenure-absenteeism relationship has been reported by Lau et al.\textsuperscript{45}, who found there is no association between tenure and absenteeism. Research in this regard is thus contradictory.

**Graph 5.4: Level of Education of the respondents in the Clusters under Study**

**Table 5.5: Classification based on Years of Experience of the respondents in the Sample**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Experience</th>
<th>Agra</th>
<th>Kanpur</th>
<th>Noida</th>
<th>Unnao</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 5 years</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 years – 10 years</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 years – 15 years</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 15 Years</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Field Survey*

\textsuperscript{45} V.C. Lau \textit{et al.}, 'A qualitative and quantitative review of antecedents of counterproductive behaviour in organisations', \textit{Journal of Business and Psychology}, vol.18, no.1, 2003, pp.73-93.
Table 5.5 summarizes the respondent years of experience. 125 workers are taken from Agra region out of which 33 workers have an experience of less than 5 years, 62 workers have an experience between 5 years to 10 years, 18 respondents have an experience between 10 years to 15 years and 12 workers have an experience of more than 15 years. While from Kanpur Cluster 205 workers are taken out of which 67 workers have an experience of less than 5 years, 87 workers have an experience between 5 years to 10 years, 31 respondents have an experience between 10 years to 15 years and 20 workers have an experience of more than 15 years. Further, from Noida region 46 workers are taken out of which 8 workers have an experience of less than 5 years, 26 workers have an experience between 5 years to 10 years, 10 respondents have an experience between 10 years to 15 years and 2 workers have an experience of more than 15 years. Lastly, from Unnao 24 responses are taken out of which 8 have an experience of less than 5 years, 10 workers have an experience between 5 years to 10 years, 4 respondents have an experience between 10 years to 15 years and 2 workers have an experience of more than 15 years.

Graph 5.5: Years of Experience of the respondents in the Clusters under Study

Source: Author constructed based on survey Data
5.3. Organizational Factors

The organizational factors have been discussed in more detail in the following sections, starting with job involvement.

5.3.1. Job Involvement

Job involvement is defined as the degree to which a person psychologically identifies with.46 Job involvement is with the person who is involved in job, highly motivated and feels a sense of pride in his work. In recent years, the concept of job involvement has steadily gained importance because of its pivotal role in providing a link between productivity on the one hand and employee needs and the quality of working life on the other.47 48 49 Lodahl and Kejner50 define job involvement as the degree of daily absorption a worker experiences in his or her work activity. Work involvement refers to the extent to which an individual is generally interested in, identifies with, and is preoccupied with one’s work in comparison to other aspects of one’s life.51 It reflects the significance individuals attach to having and performing work.52 Since the job involvement construct was introduced by Lodahl and Kejner53, hundreds of empirical studies relating to a variety of personal and situational characteristics in a diversity of work settings have been conducted. From an organisational perspective, job involvement has been considered the key to activating employee motivation54 and a fundamental basis for establishing competitive advantage in business markets.55 56 From an individual perspective, it has also been considered to be essential to personal growth and satisfaction within the workplace, as well as to motivation

and goal-directed behavior. Increasing job involvement can enhance organizational effectiveness and productivity by engaging employees more completely in their work and making work a more meaningful experience.

Job involvement is an important factor in the lives of most people. Work activities consume a large proportion of time and constitute a fundamentally important aspect of life for most people. People may be stimulated by and drawn deeply into their work or alienated from it mentally and emotionally. The quality of one's entire life experience can be greatly affected by one's degree of involvement in, or alienation from, work. A state of involvement implies a positive and relatively complete state of engagement of core aspects of the self in the job, whereas alienation implies a loss of individuality and separation of the self from the work environment considered involvement and alienation to be polar opposites.

Brown also stated that a number of significant conceptual and methodological questions regarding job involvement have been raised and debated but not resolved. These issues include specifying the conceptual domain of job involvement, evaluating commonly used scales, and building a conceptual framework for identifying related constructs as antecedents, correlates or consequences.

5.3.1.1. Theoretical Models of Job Involvement

5.3.1.1(a). Integrated Theory Model

Rabinowitz and Hall have related three classes of working variables with job involvement which include the approach held by individual-dispositional, situational decided approach held and interaction influence between these approaches. In this model, there is

---

64 S.P. Brown *OpCIt*, 1965
67 Gan Chia Seng et al., 'Factors Affecting Employees' Job Involvement in Fast Food Industry', *Universiti Tunku Abdul Rahman*, Malaysia, Research Project, BBA, March 2012, p.31.
none of the approach has a strong relationship with job involvement as all these of the approaches are equally essential in defining job involvement. Figure below shows the model of job involvement’s dimensions that created by Rabinowitz, and Hall.\textsuperscript{68}

**Figure 5.1: Model of Job Involvement's Dimensions**

![Model of Job Involvement's Dimensions](image)

*Source: Rabinowitz and Hall, (1977)*

**5.3.1.1.(b). Theoretical Model from Lodahl and Kejner**

According to Lodahl and Kejner\textsuperscript{69 70 71} he held that job involvement encompasses four sub-dimensions

- **Response to work** In this dimension, Lodahl and Kejner used the expectancy theory to elaborate it. Under this theory, it has been defined that employees respond to their work base on different expectations about their work they possess and the extent of these expectations are achieved to determine the level of job involvement they experience. Riipinen\textsuperscript{72} and Govender\textsuperscript{73} criticised that employees’ needs fulfillment due to the congruence between job expectations and the job itself produce higher level of job involvement.

- **Expressions of being job involved** It has been explained that the expression of employees on job involvement is different from one and another with the level of job involvement experienced. For instance, some employees may state that they have high

\textsuperscript{68} Gan Chia Seng et al. *Ibid*, 2012.

\textsuperscript{69} T. Lodahl, and M. Kejner *OpCit*, 1965.


\textsuperscript{71} Gan Chia Seng *et al.*, *OpCit*, 2012.


\textsuperscript{73} S. Govender and S.B. Paramasur *OpCit*, 2010.
job involvement by thinking of the job even when they are not at work. Conversely, others may feel depressed if they fail at something related to the job.\(^\text{74}\)

- **Sense of duty towards work** A highly involved individual would have a great sense of duty towards work. It is because they feel great with their work. For instance, in order to complete an assigned task, an employee is willing to work overtime without pay.

- **Feelings about unfinished work and absenteeism** A highly involved employee try to prevent being absent from work and feel guilty about unfinished work.\(^\text{75}\) It is because they feel excite and comfortable with their job in the workplace.

### 5.3.1.1.(c). Relationship between Job Involvement and Absenteeism

Employees with high levels of job involvement identify and care for their jobs and want to continue their employment as the job is important to their self image. If employees feel their self image have connected to their job, they seek to be highly involved in the job and not resort to withdrawal behaviours such as absenteeism, with job involvement shown to have a modest relationship with absenteeism, \(r = -0.23\)\(^\text{76}\) On the other hand when job involvement is low, employees have been less motivated to attend work and absenteeism might therefore rise. Low job involvement has been clearly negatively linked to absenteeism.\(^\text{77} \text{78} \text{79}\)

This leads to proposed hypothesis

**There is no significant relationship between Job Involvement and Frequency of Absenteeism of Workers.**

---

\(^{74}\) T. Lodahl and M. Kejner *OpCit*, 1965.


Table 5.6: Responses on Job Involvement Construct in Sample Units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Number</th>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree Nor Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Mean (Std. Deviation)</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Job is satisfactory part of life. (J11)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>4.53 (0.50)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Work is very important. (J12)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>3.97 (0.56)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Work should be done in a perfect manner. (J13)</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.20 (1.01)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>It is very difficult to discontinue (current) job in between. (J14)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.38 (0.83)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Personal involvement is required more in work. (J15)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.79 (1.03)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>There are other important things in life rather than work. (J16)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>3.46 (1.23)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey

Table 5.6, shows the central tendencies measurement of construct job involvement. The researcher used the Likert's Scale using the degrees Strongly Disagree (1), Disagree (2), Neither Agree Nor Disagree (3), Agree (4) and Strongly Agree (5) as the scale of measurement. Among the six statements one of the statement 'Job is satisfactory part of life' is score the highest rank whereby the mean (std. deviation) is 4.53(0.50). Among 400 of respondents, 0.25% 'neither agree nor disagree' towards their job, whereas only 46.25% of respondents 'agree' and 53.50% of respondents 'strongly agree' from the statement.
‘Work is very important’ had scored the second ranking whereby the mean score (std. deviation) is 3.97 (0.56). Amongst the 400 respondents 1.25% ‘disagree’, 13.5% are ‘neutral’, 72.25% ‘agree’ and 13% ‘strongly agree’ towards the statement. The third statement ‘There are other important things in life rather than work’ stands third place whereby the mean (std. deviation) is 3.46 (1.23). From the total 400 responses 47.25% ‘agree’ with the statement followed by the degree of ‘strongly agree’ i.e., 19%. 27% of the responses ‘disagree’ with the statement followed by 6% responses which goes with ‘strongly disagree’.

In the Job Involvement item inventory ‘Personal involvement is required more in work’ ranked fourth place followed by ‘It is very difficult to discontinue (current) job in between’ is in fifth place whereby the mean score (std. deviation) 2.79 (1.03) and 2.38 (0.83) respectively. 28% of the respondents remain ‘neutral’ with the statement of ‘Personal involvement is required more in work’ while 36.5% ‘disagree’ and 8.25% ‘strongly disagree’. On the contrarily, 22.25% ‘agree’ and 5% ‘strongly agree’ with the statement. However, in the statement ‘It is very difficult to discontinue (current) job in between’ 67.75% ‘disagree’ followed by 5.5% respondents ‘strongly disagree’, 10% of them are ‘neutral’ while 0.5% ‘strongly agree’ follows 16.25% ‘agree’. The last rank is given to number third statement in the job involvement inventory i.e., ‘work should be done in a perfect manner’, whereby the mean (std. deviation) is 2.20 (1.01). 59.75% of the respondents ‘disagree’ followed by 20.25% ‘strongly disagree’, 0.75% are neutral, whereas 1.75% ‘strongly agree’ follows 17.5% who rate ‘agree’.

5.3.2. Job Satisfaction

People join organizations with certain motives like security of income and job, better prospects in future, and satisfaction of social and psychological needs. Every person has different sets of needs at different times. It is the responsibility of management to recognize this basic fact and provide appropriate opportunities and environments to people at work to satisfy their needs. Job satisfaction is one of the most widely discussed issues in organizational behavior, personnel and human resource management and organizational management.

---

5.3.2.1. Meaning of Job Satisfaction

People bring mental and physical abilities and time to their jobs. Many try to make a difference in their lives and in the lives of others through working. The reason for wanting a job is often considerably more than just a paycheck. Jobs can be looked at as the means used to achieve personal goals. When a job meets or exceeds an individual’s expectation, the individual often experiences positive emotions. These positive emotions represent job satisfaction. To grasp the meaning of a construct like job satisfaction, it seems logical to look at how it is defined in the literature. The search for a universal definition of job satisfaction is not a difficult one; it is an impossible one. Even though many researchers define job satisfaction, the definitions vary.

5.3.2.2. Definition of Job Satisfaction

Hoppock’s in the thirties response to the question ‘What is job satisfaction?’ was: “...any combination of psychological, physiological, and environmental circumstances that causes a person truthfully to say, ‘I am satisfied with my job’.”

In the seventies Locke views on job satisfaction was: “...a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one’s job or job experiences”.

Vroom, who used the terms ‘job satisfaction’ and ‘job attitudes’ interchangeably, defined job satisfaction as “...affective orientations on the part of individuals toward work roles which they are presently occupying”.

Even though the definitions vary, a commonality among them seems to be that job satisfaction is a job-related emotional reaction.

Job satisfaction has been defined as a general attitude toward one’s job. Job satisfaction source is not only job position but also other factors such as the physical and social work environment, relationships with supervisors and colleagues, group culture and management style of the managers. These factors can have different influences on individuals and their job satisfaction. Around the globe it is an established fact that a person with a high level of job satisfaction tends to be more productive, less absent, and more likely to stay with an organization.

---

82 Jutta Green, ‘Job Satisfaction of Community College Chairpersons’, Dissertation, Faculty of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, 2000, p.6.
satisfaction has a positive attitude towards the job, while a person who is dissatisfied with the job has a negative attitude.\(^9\)

Job satisfaction has many dimensions. Commonly noted facets are satisfaction with the work itself, wages, recognition, rapport with supervisors and coworkers, and chance for advancement. Each dimension contributes to an individual’s overall feeling of satisfaction with the job itself, but the ‘job’ is defined differently by different people.

1) Job satisfaction refers to one’s feeling towards one’s job. It can only be inferred but not seen.

2) Job satisfaction is often determined by how well outcomes meet or exceed expectations. Satisfaction in one’s job means increased commitment in the fulfillment of formal requirements. There is greater willingness to invest personal energy and time in job performance.

3) The terms job-satisfaction and job attitudes are typically used interchangeably. Both refer to effective orientations on the part of individuals towards their work roles, which they are presently occupying.

Though the terms job satisfaction and attitudes are used interchangeably, there are differences between the two. Attitude refers to predisposition to respond. Job satisfaction, on the other hand, relates to performance factors. Attitudes reflect one’s feelings towards individuals, organizations, and objects. But satisfaction refers to one’s attitude to a job. Job satisfaction is, therefore, a specific subset of attitudes.\(^10\)

5.3.2.3. Theories of Job Satisfaction

5.3.2.3.(a). Affect Theory

Edwin A. Locke’s Range of Affect Theory\(^91\) is arguably the most famous job satisfaction model. The main premise of this theory is that satisfaction is determined by a discrepancy between what one wants in a job and what one has in a job. Further, the theory states that how much one values a given facet of work (e.g. the degree of autonomy in a position) moderates how satisfied/dissatisfied one becomes when expectations are/aren’t met. When a person values a particular facet of a job, his satisfaction is more greatly impacted both positively (when expectations are met) and negatively (when expectations are not met), compared to one who doesn’t value that facet. This theory also states that too much of a

particular facet produce stronger feelings of dissatisfaction the more a worker values that facet.

5.3.2.3.(b). Dispositional Theory

Another well-known job satisfaction theory is the Dispositional Theory. It is a very general theory that suggests that people have innate dispositions that cause them to have tendencies toward a certain level of satisfaction, regardless of one’s job. This approach became a notable explanation of job satisfaction in light of evidence that job satisfaction tends to be stable over time and across careers and jobs. Research also indicates that identical twins have similar levels of job satisfaction. A significant model that narrowed the scope of the Dispositional Theory was the Core Self-evaluations Model, proposed by Timothy A. Judge et al. Judge argued that there are four Core Self-evaluations that determine one’s disposition towards job satisfaction: self-esteem, general self-efficacy, locus of control, and neuroticism. This model states that higher levels of self-esteem (the value one places on his/her self) and general self-efficacy (the belief in one’s own competence) lead to higher work satisfaction. Having an internal locus of control (believing one has control over her/his own life, as opposed to outside forces having control) leads to higher job satisfaction. Finally, lower levels of neuroticism lead to higher job satisfaction.

5.3.2.3.(c). Two-Factor Theory (Motivator-Hygiene Theory)

Frederick Herzberg’s Two factor theory (also known as Motivator Hygiene Theory) attempts to explain satisfaction and motivation in the workplace. This theory states that satisfaction and dissatisfaction are driven by different factors i.e., motivation and hygiene factors, respectively. An employee’s motivation to work is continually related to job satisfaction of a subordinate. Motivation can be seen as an inner force that drives individuals to attain personal and organization goals. Motivating factors are those aspects of the job that make people want to perform, and provide people with satisfaction, for example achievement in work, recognition, promotion opportunities. These motivating factors are considered to be intrinsic to the job, or the work carried out. Hygiene factors include aspects of the working environment such as pay, company policies, supervisory practices, and other working conditions. While Hertzberg’s model has stimulated much research, researchers have been unable to reliably empirically prove the model, with Hackman and Oldham suggesting that

---

Hertzberg’s original formulation of the model may have been a methodological artifact. Furthermore, the theory does not consider individual differences, conversely predicting all employees react in an identical manner to changes in motivating/hygiene factors. Finally, the model has been criticized in that it does not specify how motivating/hygiene factors are to be measured.\textsuperscript{94}

5.3.2.3.(d). McClelland’s needs theory

This theory focuses on three needs: achievement, power and affiliation.\textsuperscript{95} Employees who have a strong need for achievement would be satisfied with jobs that are challenging and over which they can exert some control.\textsuperscript{96} In contrast, employees with low achievement needs are satisfied with jobs involving little challenge. Individuals with a high need for affiliation would be satisfied with jobs that involve working with people and establishing close interpersonal relationships.\textsuperscript{97} Finally, employees who have a need for power, have a desire to impact, influence and to control others.\textsuperscript{98} Employees with strong power needs are most likely satisfied with jobs where they can direct and manage others.

5.3.2.3.(e). Job Characteristics Model

Hackman and Oldham proposed the Job Characteristics Model, which is widely used as a framework to study how particular job characteristics impact on job outcomes, including job satisfaction. The model states that there are five core job characteristics (skill variety, task identity, task significance, autonomy, and feedback) which impact three critical psychological states (experienced meaningfulness, experienced responsibility for outcomes, and knowledge of the actual results), in turn influencing work outcomes (job satisfaction, absenteeism, work motivation, etc.) The five core job characteristics can be combined to form a motivating potential score (MPS) for a job, which can be used as an index of how likely a job is to affect an employee's attitudes and behaviors. A meta-analysis of studies that assess the framework of the model provides some support for the validity of the JCM.\textsuperscript{99}

5.3.2.4. Relationship between Job Satisfaction and Absenteeism

One of the more widely researched topics in industrial psychology has been the relationship between job satisfaction and absenteeism. Absence is a phenomenon that can reduce an organization’s effectiveness. Theories of absence hypothesize that job satisfaction plays a critical role in an employee’s decision to be absent. The relationship between job satisfaction and absenteeism is extensively and widely researched. Contradictory to the model of Steers and Rhodes, other researchers have found very weak correlations between job satisfaction and absenteeism. According to Steers and Rhodes, the relationship is not direct, but biographical and situational factors like job involvement moderate it. Vroom found a weak negative and consistent relationship between job satisfaction and absenteeism. He stated that an employee’s decision to be present for, or absent from, work is likely to be strongly related to the perceived rewards or outcomes that he receives from the job. However, he further noted that workers with lower satisfaction levels do not always or frequently respond by skipping work altogether. Other factors, such as personal circumstances must be taken into consideration. Locke also concluded that the relationship between satisfaction and absenteeism is fairly weak. He accounted for this by observing that employees do not react solely on the basis of their feelings. Need values must be balanced with preference values. If jobs are not readily available, most workers presumably not be inclined to risk their employment by frequent absences even if they are not particularly satisfied with aspects of their work. Steers and Rhodes, by contrast, suggested a model of attendance in which job satisfaction plays a vital role. They stated that several major categories of factor have an impact on attendance behavior, but observed that satisfied workers tend to have a strong desire to attend work, whereas dissatisfied workers do not want to attend. Carron and Kuzmits also suggested a fairly strong relationship between low levels of job satisfaction and voluntary absenteeism. They concluded that an employee’s decision on whether or not to attend work is affected by several factors such as the job being too boring.

103 R.M. Steers and S.R. Rhodes, 'Knowledge and speculation about absenteeism', In P. S. Goodman & R. S. Atkin (Eds.), *Absenteeism: New approaches to understanding, measuring*, 1984
104 V.H. Vroom *Op Cit*, 1964
or stressful, whether he or she dislikes co-workers or the supervisor, or whether he or she receives sufficient rewards for attendance.

Many researchers acknowledged that job dissatisfaction may be significant with respect to absenteeism, have concluded that it is not the only factor to blame. Huczynski and Fitzpatrick\(^{108}\) believed that lack of satisfaction only contributes to absenteeism, rather than being the primary cause of it. They point out that although job satisfaction is an important factor, it is a general concept. It embraces sub factors, which may influence absenteeism such as supervision, working environment, and work group relations. Miner\(^{109}\) believed that satisfied workers are less likely to be absent or to quit their jobs.

No less than five reviews spanning the past decades have concluded that absenteeism is negatively related to overall job satisfaction.\(^{110\ 111\ 112\ 113}\) However, this relationship has been questioned. Working with a sample of over 1200 blue-collar workers in a variety of organisations, Nicholson\(^{114}\) found relatively few significant satisfaction absence relationships and concluded that an uncertain relationship existed between the two constructs. Ilgen\(^{115}\) reported similar results with a sample of clerical workers. One of the problems in this research area has been the lack of a guiding theoretical model. There is little systematic knowledge of why satisfaction influences absenteeism at any level other than common-sense. Patchen’s\(^{116}\) study was one of the first to employ a measure of job satisfaction as a predictor of absenteeism. He reports that satisfaction with pay and promotions is negatively correlated with absenteeism. One of the studies that found no relationship between job satisfaction and absenteeism was reported by Vroom\(^{117}\) Mertzner and Mann\(^{118}\) on the other hand found a relationship between job satisfaction and absence for blue-collar, but not for white-collar


\(^{113}\) V.H. Vroom, OpCit. 1964.


workers. Their findings received further support from Ilgen\textsuperscript{119} who found no relationship between satisfaction and absence in a group of university workers. This triggered interest and has resulted in growing interest questioning the posited link between absence and job satisfaction. Locke\textsuperscript{120} said that the magnitude of the correlation between job satisfaction and absenteeism seldom surpasses 0.40, and is typically much lower. However, the relationship between job satisfaction and absenteeism could be moderated by factors such as the importance of work to the employee and the existence of good relationship with superior and peers.\textsuperscript{121} Several other researchers have also concluded that there is a correlation between absenteeism and overall job satisfaction as can be seen in table below.

**Table 5.7: Studies of relationship between Job Satisfaction and Absenteeism**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Researchers</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Relationship with Absenteeism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kerr. et al\textsuperscript{22}</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>Overall job satisfaction</td>
<td>Manufacturing depts.</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metzner &amp; Mann\textsuperscript{123}</td>
<td>1953</td>
<td>Overall job satisfaction</td>
<td>Blue &amp; white collar workers</td>
<td>Negative for blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.H. Zelst &amp; Kerr.\textsuperscript{124}</td>
<td>1953</td>
<td>Overall job satisfaction</td>
<td>Manufacturing workers</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fleishman. et al\textsuperscript{125}</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>Overall job satisfaction</td>
<td>Production workers</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talacchi.\textsuperscript{126}</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>Overall job satisfaction</td>
<td>Office workers</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patchen.\textsuperscript{127}</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>Satisfaction with pay</td>
<td>Oil refinery workers</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harding &amp; Bottenberg.\textsuperscript{128}</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>Overall job satisfaction</td>
<td>Airmen</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vroom.\textsuperscript{129}</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>Overall job satisfaction</td>
<td>Oil refinery workers</td>
<td>Zero</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Author Self Constructed based on Literature Review*

Despite the various perspectives of the foregoing authors regarding the relationship between job satisfaction and absenteeism, there is a point which seems to play a vital role in this

\textsuperscript{119} D.R. Ilgen *OpCit*, 1977.
\textsuperscript{120} E.A. Locke *OpCit*, 1976.
\textsuperscript{122} A. W. Kerr et al., ‘Absenteeism, turnover and morale in a metals fabrication factory’, *Occupational Psychology*, 1951.
\textsuperscript{123} H. Metzner and F. Mann *OpCit*, 1953.
\textsuperscript{124} R.H. Zelst and A.W.Kerr, ‘Workers’ attitudes toward merit rating’, *Personnel Psychology*, vol.6, no.2, 1953, pp. 159-172.
\textsuperscript{127} M.Patchen *OpCit*, 1960.
\textsuperscript{128} F.D. Harding and A.B.Robert, ‘Effect of personal characteristics on relationships between attitudes and job performance’, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, vol. 45, no.6, 1961, p. 428.
\textsuperscript{129} V.H. Vroom *OpCit*, 1962.
matter, which is the degree of flexibility of the organization in terms of the regulations that deal with work attendance. Lastly, it might be logical to say that dissatisfied employees would report more absence than satisfied ones in a flexible organization where there were no serious consequences for absence from work. This leads to proposed hypothesis.

There is no significant relationship between Job Satisfaction and Frequency of Absenteeism of Workers

Table 5.8: Responses on Job Satisfaction in Sample Units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Number</th>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree Nor Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Mean (Std. Deviation)</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fair amount should be paid according to the work done. (JS1)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.58 (0.86)</td>
<td>6th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>People at work are good enough. (JS2)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>3.65 (0.91)</td>
<td>5th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Supervisor is good enough. (JS3)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>3.68 (0.95)</td>
<td>4th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Satisfactory chances for promotion in the job. (JS4)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.75 (0.55)</td>
<td>3rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>All the things coming under work are agreeable. (JS5)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>3.76 (0.89)</td>
<td>2nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Sometimes job feels meaningless. (JS6)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>4.21 (0.69)</td>
<td>1st</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey

Table 5.8, shows the central tendencies measurement of constructs Job Satisfaction. The researcher used the Likert Scale using the degrees Strongly Disagree (1), Disagree (2),
Neither Agree Nor Disagree (3), Agree (4) and Strongly Agree (5) as the scale of measurement. Among the six statements one of the statement ‘sometimes job feels meaningless’ is score the highest rank whereby the mean (std. deviation) is 4.21(0.69). Among 400 of respondents, 3% ‘neither agree nor disagree’ towards their job, whereas only 59.75% of respondents ‘agree’ and 33% of respondents ‘strongly agree’ from the statement, whereas 4.25% responses are of ‘disagree’.

‘all the things coming under work are agreeable’ had scored the second ranking whereby the mean score (std. deviation) is 3.76 (0.89). Amongst the 400 respondents 2.5% ‘strongly disagree’, 15.75% ‘disagree’, 5.5% are ‘neutral’, 62.25% ‘agree’ and 14% ‘strongly agree’ towards the statement. The third statement ‘satisfactory chances for promotion in the job’ stands third place whereby the mean (std. deviation) is 3.75 (0.55). From the total 400 responses 71.25% ‘agree’ with the statement followed by the degree of ‘strongly agree’ i.e., 3.5%. 2.75% of the responses ‘disagree’ while a 22.50% response which goes with ‘neutral’.

In the Job Satisfaction construct ‘supervisor is good enough’ ranked fourth place followed by ‘people at work are good enough’ is in fifth place whereby the mean score (std. deviation) 3.68 (0.95) and 3.65 (0.91) respectively. 0.5% of the respondents remain ‘neutral’ with the statement of ‘supervisor is good enough’ while 22% ‘disagree’. On the contrarily, 64.50% ‘agree’ and 13% ‘strongly agree’ with the statement. However, in the statement ‘people at work are good enough’ 20.50% ‘disagree’ followed by 0.25% respondents ‘strongly disagree’, 2.25% of them are ‘neutral’ while 9.50% ‘strongly agree’ follows 67.50% ‘agree’.

The last rank is given to number first statement in the job satisfaction inventory i.e., ‘fair amount should be paid according to the work done’, whereby the mean (std. deviation) is 3.58 (0.86). 12.50% of the respondents ‘disagree’, 5.75% are neutral, whereas 4.75% ‘strongly agree’ follows 77% who rate ‘agree’.

5.3.3. Organisational Commitment

Organizational commitment is an individual’s psychological attachment to the organization. The individual feel a sense of belonging and identification with the organization. This adds to their desire to achieve the goals of the organization and their motivation to remain with the organization. Organizational commitment has an important place in the study of organizational behavior. This is in part due to the vast number of works that have found relationships between organizational commitment and attitudes and behaviors in the

---

Commitment to an organization leads to an enhanced feeling of responsibility in employees, which in turn leads to less withdrawal behaviors as employees do not want to 'damage' the organization. Steers and Rhodes saw organisational commitment as an influence on the motivation for an employee to attend work, which in turn affects their behaviour. Batemen and Strasser state that the reasons for studying organizational commitment are related to (a) employee behaviors and performance effectiveness, (b) attitudinal, affective, and cognitive constructs such as job satisfaction, (c) characteristics of the employee’s job and role, such as responsibility and (d) personal characteristics of the employee such as age, job tenure.

Organizational commitment has been studied in the public, private, and non-profit sector, and more recently internationally. Early research focused on defining the concept and current research continues to examine organizational commitment through two popular approaches, commitment-related attitudes and commitment-related behaviors. A variety of antecedents and outcomes have been identified in the past thirty years.

5.3.3.1. Definition of Organizational Commitment

Scholl indicated that the way organizational commitment is defined depends on the approach to commitment that one is adhering to.

Accordingly, organizational commitment is defined either as an employee attitude or as a force that binds an employee to an organization. Mowday et al. defines organizational commitment as a relative strength of an individual's identification with and involvement in a particular organization. The authors emphasize that strong organizational commitment is characterized by:

- Belief in and acceptance of the organization's goals and values;
- Willingness to exert considerable effort on behalf of the organization; and
- Desire to maintain membership in the organization.

Aven contend that committed employees are more likely to engage in the following four behaviours more often and more consistently than non-committed employees:

---

(1) Committed employees have higher levels of participation;
(2) Committed employees remain with the organization for longer periods and make more contributions for achieving organizational objectives;
(3) Committed employees are more highly involved in their jobs, and
(4) Committed employees exert considerably more effort on behalf of the organization. There is a general agreement that organizational commitment by employees is a highly desirable psychological state.
Meyer et al.\textsuperscript{138} support this view by defining organizational commitment as a psychological state that is representative of an employee's relationship with the organization. Meyer, Allen and Gellatly\textsuperscript{139} define organizational commitment as the employee's feelings of obligation to stay with the organization: feelings resulting from the internalization of normative pressures exerted on an individual prior to entry or following entry. Furthermore, Meyer and Allen\textsuperscript{140} state that organizational commitment can take three distinct forms, namely, affective commitment, continuance and normative commitment.

5.3.3.2. Affective Commitment

Allen and Meyer\textsuperscript{141} define affective commitment as the employee's emotional attachment to, identification with, and involvement with the organization. Affective commitment involves three aspects: (a) the formation of an emotional attachment to an organization, (b) identification with and (c) the desire to maintain organizational membership. Meyer and Allen\textsuperscript{142} argue that an individual developed their emotional attachment to an organization when he or she identifies with the goals of the organization and is willing to assist the organization in achieving the goals. The researchers go on to say that identification with an organization occurs when the employees own values are congruent with that of the organization and the employee is able to internalize the values and goals of the organization. Heery and Noon\textsuperscript{143} define affective commitment when an employee stays with a particular organization because he or she shares its values and objectives and feels a sense of loyalty.

\textsuperscript{138} J.P. Meyer et al., 'Commitment to organizations and occupations: Extension and test of a three-component conceptualization', \textit{Journal of Applied Psychology}, vol. 78, 1993, pp. 538-551.
According to Jaros et al.\textsuperscript{144} affective commitment is the most widely discussed form of psychological attachment to an organization. Meyer and Herscovitch\textsuperscript{145} state that affective commitment has been found to correlate with a range of outcomes such as turnover, absenteeism, job performance and organizational citizenship behaviour.

**5.3.3.3. Continuance Commitment**

Meyer and Allen\textsuperscript{146} refer to continuance commitment as an employee's awareness that costs are associated with leaving the organization. This then forms the employee's link to the organization as well as his or her choice to remain within the organization in an effort to retain the benefits. The authors summarized these two actions and events in terms of two sets of antecedent variables, namely, investment and alternatives. Meyer et al.\textsuperscript{147} further describe continuance commitment as a psychological attachment to an employing organization that shows the employees perception of the loss he or she would encounter if they were to leave the organization. This dimension of organizational commitment is based on Becker's side bet theory. The theory proposes that organizational commitment is built on the principle of consistent behaviour. According to the theory, commitments come into being when a person, by making a side bet, links extraneous interests with a consistent line of activity. In this regard side bets are defined as anything the employee would view as valuable or that he or she has made as an investment, such as time, effort, money, pension plans, work relationships, and organizational specific skills.\textsuperscript{148} Unlike affective commitment, which involves emotional attachment, continuance commitment affects a calculation of the risks of learning versus the benefit of remaining with the organization.

Similarly, Heery and Noon\textsuperscript{149} defines continuance commitment as when an employee remains with a particular organization either because there are costs to leaving that outweigh the benefits of taking a new job in a different organization, or because there is a lack of alternative employment opportunities.

\textsuperscript{144} S.T. Jaros et al., 'Effects of continuance, affective and moral commitment on the withdrawal process: An evaluation of eight structural equation models', \textit{Academy of Management Journal}, vol. 36, 1993, pp. 951-995.
\textsuperscript{148} H.S. Becker, 'Notes on the concept of commitment', \textit{American Journal of Sociology}, vol.66, 1960, pp. 32-42.
5.3.3.4. Normative Commitment

The third dimension of organizational commitment, normative commitment, refers to an employee's feeling of obligation to remain with the organization; therefore employees with strong normative commitment remains in the organization through their belief that it is the right and moral thing to do.\textsuperscript{150} However, Wiener\textsuperscript{151} postulates that normative commitment to the organization develops through a collection of pressures an individual feel during their early socialization stage from family and culture as well as during their socialization as newcomers to the organization. Normative commitment develops on the basis of a particular investment which the organization makes in the employee-specifically, investments that seem difficult for employees to reciprocate.\textsuperscript{152}

Their three component model of organizational commitment is discussed extensively below.

\textbf{Figure 5.2: Component Model of Organizational Commitment}

\begin{center}
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{image.png}
\end{center}

\textit{Source: Meyer and Allen, (1991)}

5.3.3.5. **Relationship between Organizational Commitment and Absenteeism**

The relationship between organizational commitment and absence has also received much attention in the literature. Hendrix and Spencer in a test of a causal model of absenteeism, found that commitment were major determinants of absence levels. Most of the studies done on organizational commitment and absenteeism have found a negative relationship, i.e., when organizational commitment increases absenteeism decreases.

Employees who are committed are dedicated, loyal, looking for long term relationships with the organization and social responsible. They are less likely to be absent because of the negative consequences it can have on the company.

Theory predicts that highly committed employees should be motivated to attend to facilitate organizational goal attainment. Contrarily another study conducted by Huczynski and Fitzpatrick indicated a positive relationship between organizational commitment and absenteeism. Results of the study reflected that employees with a high commitment showed fewer absences than the other way around. Angle and Lawson corroborates this view by stating that committed employees not only exhibit reduced withdrawal behaviours, but are more likely than others to work towards keeping the organization competitive. However, numerous studies found no significant relationship between employee commitment and absenteeism.

Hence, it can be concluded that the research evidence surrounding the relationship between organizational commitment and absenteeism is inconclusive. This leads to proposed hypothesis:

*There is no significant relationship between Organizational Commitment and Frequency of Absenteeism of Workers.*

---


Table 5.9: Responses on Organizational Commitment in Sample Units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Number</th>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Mean (Std. Deviation)</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Even though one wanted to leave the organization is hard. (OC1)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>59.75%</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>19.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Suddenly leaving the organization would disrupt personal life. (OC2)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>78.50%</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>One should be loyal towards its organization. (OC3)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.50%</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>59.50%</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>One should be ready to accept any type of job in order to keep himself working for the organization. (OC4)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.25%</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>46.25%</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>One should be satisfied while choosing the organization. (OC5)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.25%</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>13.50%</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>72.25%</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey

Table 5.9, shows the central tendencies measurement of constructs Organizational Commitment. The researcher used the Likert Scale using the degrees Strongly Disagree (1), Disagree (2), Neither Agree Nor Disagree (3), Agree (4) and Strongly Agree (5) as the scale of measurement. Amongst the five statements one of the statement ‘one should be ready to accept any type of job in order to keep himself working for the organization’ is score the highest rank whereby the mean (std. deviation) is 4.53(0.50). Amongst 400 of respondents, 0.25% ‘neither agree nor disagree’ towards their job, whereas 46.25% of respondents ‘agree’ and 53.50% of respondents ‘strongly agree’ from the statement, whereas respondents doesn’t show interest on the degree of ‘strongly disagree’ and ‘disagree’.
‘One should be loyal towards its organization’ had scored the second ranking whereby the mean score (std. deviation) is 4.30 (0.58). Amongst the 400 respondents 1% ‘disagree’ with the statement, 3.50% are ‘neutral’ whereas 46.25% ‘agree’ and 53.50% ‘strongly agree’ towards the statement. The second statement ‘suddenly leaving the organization would disrupt personal life’ stands third place whereby the mean (std. deviation) is 4.12 (0.47). From the total 400 responses 78.50% ‘agree’ with the statement followed by the degree of ‘strongly agree’ i.e., 12%. 6.50% of the responses ‘disagree’ while a 3% responses goes with ‘neutral’.

In the Organizational Commitment construct ‘even though one wanted to leave the organization is hard’ ranked fourth place followed by ‘one should be satisfied while choosing the organization’ ranked last whereby the mean score (std. deviation) 3.97 (0.66) and 3.94 (0.56) respectively. 19% of the respondents remain ‘neutral’ with the statement of ‘even though one wanted to leave the organization is hard’ while 1.50% ‘disagree’. On the contrarily, 59.75% ‘agree’ and 19.75% ‘strongly agree’ with the statement. Lastly, in the statement ‘one should be satisfied while choosing the organization’ 1.25% ‘disagree’, 13.50% of them are ‘neutral’ while 13% ‘strongly agree’ follows 72.25% ‘agree’.

5.3.4. Burnout

The concept of burnout started as a ‘grassroots’ description of prolonged occupational stress among human service workers, where former engaged employees gradually get overwhelmed of emotional exhaustion, loss of energy, and withdrawal from work. This description was introduced in the mid 1970’s by two American researchers, Herbert Freudenberger and Christina Maslach, who independently of each other described the phenomenon.\textsuperscript{160,161} The term ‘burnout’ began in early 1970s, at a clinical stage. Clinical professionals used burnout to describe employees’ behavior, including certain characteristics like restlessness, low job motivation, and short-tempered. Thus, the burnout concept was developed from field observations, not from theory. Since the 1970’s, more than 5500 studies and books on burnout have been published. Freudenberger (1974) who started using the term ‘burnout’ to describe employees admitted to psychiatric hospital with symptoms like low work motivation, lack of job commitment, limited emotional associations and fatigue at work. Researchers further understand the need to understand the construct in order to find a solution for the burnout issue. It was during 1980s that more scientific researchers were conducted in order to define burnout and come out with theories to support the construct. It was Maslach

who developed the Multidimensional Theory of Burnout that is most widely used in recent studies on burnout.

The multidimensional theory of burnout divided burnout into three core components, which are emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and reduced personal accomplishment.\textsuperscript{162}

5.3.4.1. Emotional exhaustion

Emotional exhaustion occurs when employees feel that their job has exceeded the limit of their emotions and they could not bear with it. It might be caused by several factors such as excessive workload or dilemma in job. Employees may be lack of energy and feel worn out.\textsuperscript{163} This component is also related to individual factors of burnout, such as a person’s personality, thoughts or attitude. Employees who are more pessimistic are more prone to encounter emotional exhaustion as compared to an optimist.\textsuperscript{164}

5.3.4.2. Depersonalization

Depersonalization is different from emotional exhaustion where this component is related to interpersonal dimension. It refers as interpersonal dimension because it is a condition where individual is detached from others, where they usually have negative thoughts or may react negatively. They became defensive and it is caused by extreme emotional exhaustion.\textsuperscript{165}

5.3.4.3. Personal Accomplishment

Personal accomplishment is characterized by a situation where employees feeling of one’s contribution towards the organization whereas reduced personal accomplishment means employees felt that they are not giving any contribution and they cannot meet the expectations of their job. They feel incompetent and they are unable to help their clients. Individual evaluate their own performance and it may or may not lead to burnout.\textsuperscript{166}

Person who displays all three dimensions mentioned above is highly likely that they are experiencing burnout. However, the key aspect that leads to burnout is the heighten level of emotional exhaustion, and this dimension is the core dimension that explains experienced burnout.\textsuperscript{167}


\textsuperscript{165} C.L. Cooper \textit{Ibid}, 1998.

\textsuperscript{166} C.L. Cooper \textit{OpCIt}, 1998.

\textsuperscript{167} C. Maslach and Susan E. Jackson \textit{Ibid}, 1981.
5.3.4.4. Relationship between Burnout and Absenteeism

Absenteeism is generally considered as an important consequence of burnout at the organizational level. However, emotional exhaustion, depersonalization and reduced efficacy explain on average not more than 2% of the variance in absenteeism.\(^{168}\)\(^{169}\) Several meta-analytic studies on absenteeism show that work-related stress is but one of many variables accounting for employee absence behavior, so we should not expect job stress and absenteeism to be strongly correlated.\(^{170}\) Non-work variables accounting for absenteeism include a wide range of factors, such as personal characteristics, sport injuries, smoking, alcohol consumption, psychological disorders, and physical pain.\(^{171}\) These non-work variables may also interact with work-related variables, and show complex relationships with absenteeism. In the study conducted by Erickson \textit{et al.}\(^{172}\) found that family demands moderated the effect of job burnout on absence frequency. Experiencing a high level of burnout was associated with increased absenteeism if employees had children under 6 living at home, or reported having difficulty with their child care arrangements. Lastly, Schaufeli and Enzmann\(^{173}\) concluded, that: "\textit{... despite the popular assumption that burnout causes absenteeism, the effect is rather small and is most related to emotional exhaustion}"

Hence, it can be concluded that the research evidence surrounding the relationship between burnout and absenteeism is conclusive more to emotional exhaustion rather than depersonalization and personal accomplishment. However, in this research all the three components are taken into consideration. This leads to proposed hypothesis

\textit{There is no significant relationship between Burnout and Frequency of Absenteeism of Worker.}


Table 5.10: Responses on Burnout in Sample Units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Number</th>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree Nor Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Mean (Std. Deviation)</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>One feels emotionally drained out from work. (B1)</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2.63 (1.21)</td>
<td>3rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency Percentage</td>
<td>16.75%</td>
<td>39.25%</td>
<td>17.25%</td>
<td>18.75%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>It feels tiresome to get up in the morning for the job. (B2)</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2.67 (1.31)</td>
<td>2nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency Percentage</td>
<td>23.50%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>16.75%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>10.75%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Working with current job is not interesting as the previous one. (B3)</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.55 (1.05)</td>
<td>4th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency Percentage</td>
<td>15.75%</td>
<td>35.75%</td>
<td>31.25%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>5.25%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Accomplishing the work given feels exhilarated. (B4)</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>3.17 (1.39)</td>
<td>1st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency Percentage</td>
<td>17.25%</td>
<td>19.75%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey

Table 5.10, shows the central tendencies measurement of construct Burnout. The researcher used the Likert Scale using the degrees Strongly Disagree (1), Disagree (2), Neither Agree Nor Disagree (3), Agree (4) and Strongly Agree (5) as the scale of measurement. Amongst the four statements fourth the statement ‘accomplishing the work given feels exhilarated’ is score the highest rank whereby the mean (std. deviation) is 3.17(1.39). Amongst 400 of respondents, 15% ‘neither agree nor disagree’ towards burnout dimension, whereas 26% of respondents ‘agree’ and 22% of respondents ‘strongly agree’ from the statement, contrarily 17.25% of the respondents ‘strongly disagree’ with the statement followed by 19.75% who shows ‘disagreement’.

‘it feels tiresome to get up in the morning for the job’ had scored the second ranking whereby the mean score (std. deviation) is 2.67 (1.31). Amongst the 400 respondents 27% ‘disagree’ with the statement followed by 23.50% responses who shows interest on ‘strongly disagree’, 18.75% are ‘neutral’ whereas 20% ‘agree’ and 10.75% ‘strongly agree’ towards the statement. The first statement ‘one feels emotionally drained out from work’ stands third place whereby the mean (std. deviation) is 2.63 (1.21). From the total 400 responses 18.75%
‘agree’ with the statement followed by the degree of ‘strongly agree’ i.e., 8%. 17.25% are ‘neutral’ 16.75% responses are ‘strongly disagree’ follows 39.25% shows ‘disagreement’.

Lastly, in the Burnout construct the statement ‘working with current job is not interesting as the previous one’ ranked whereby the mean score (std. deviation) is 2.55 (1.05). 31.25% of the respondents remain ‘neutral’ with the statement, whereas 12% ‘agree’ followed by 5.25% ‘strongly agree’ On the contrary, 15.75% ‘strongly disagree’ follows 35.75% ‘disagree’.

The last section of this chapter focuses on the construct ‘Personality Traits’ and the related theories. Information about the determinants of absenteeism is valuable for firms as well as policy makers. However, a recent study concludes after analyzing an extraordinary rich set of explanatory variables for the determinants of absenteeism that “most of the cross-sectional variation in absenteeism is ultimately ‘explained’ by unobserved time invariant individual characteristics”\(^{174}\) In this research personality is measured by a Big Five personality scale as an important individual determinant of attendance decisions. A recent trend in organizational research is dispositional explanations for the attitudes individuals display at work and their subsequent effects on employee behavior. This body of research has led to renewed debate over the relative effects of dispositional versus situational variables on work attitudes, roles, and behaviors. Therefore, whereas some argue that dispositional constructs are relevant to understanding human behavior\(^ {175}\), others suggest that situational variables are more useful predictors of people’s attitudes and behaviors in organizational settings and that the search for dispositional effects likely to prove unproductive\(^ {176}\).

However, in spite of the criticisms issued by the situationists, considerable evidence has accumulated in support of the dispositional approach.\(^ {177}\) Porter and Steers\(^ {178}\) argued that employees with extreme levels of emotional instability, anxiety, low achievement orientation, aggression, independence, self-confidence, and sociability are more likely to be absent than employees with more moderate levels of these personality traits. On the basis of past research, the role of personality in explaining absence is equivocal at best, particularly in the case of inferring personality effects that are based on past absence. Thus, there is only limited

---


research on the dispositional basis of absenteeism and on the relationship between personality and the construct of absence proneness. One of the factors that might explain this lack of research attention is that, until recently, personality research lacked an accepted framework describing the structure and nature of personality. There are literally hundreds of dispositional variables that have been invented in the history of personality research. When specific traits have been selected for inclusion in absence research, it generally has been in a piece-meal fashion. Personality has become an indispensable consideration for employers looking for dedicated employees who have not engaged themselves in much absence prone behaviors. Personality influence becomes less obvious if an employee’s place of work is not a highly socialized environment and if the job is traditional. This leads to more absenteeism because the employees thus seek a highly interactive arena outside their work place.

5.4. Defining Personality

Personality is defined as the combination of stable physical and mental characteristics that give the individual his or her identity. These characteristics or traits includes how one looks, thinks, acts and feels.\(^{179}\)

Personality can be defined as a ‘relatively enduring pattern of recurrent interpersonal situations which characterize a human life’.\(^{180}\) Meyer et al\(^{181}\) gives a general definition of the term ‘personality’. They state that ‘personality’ is the constantly changing but nevertheless relatively stable organization of all physical, psychological and spiritual characteristics of the individual which determines his or her behavior in interaction with the context in which the individual finds himself or herself. Earlier, Gordon Allport,\(^{182}\) defines personality as the dynamic organization within the individual of those psychophysical systems that determine his characteristic behaviour and thought'. Allport’s definition of personality is, on analysis, quite complex and complete. It recognizes that personality is determined by the interaction of biological and psychological process; personality is an organized whole consisting of interdependent physical, cognitive and psychosocial aspects; personality is dynamic, in other words, it develops, grows and changes as the individual matures and learners; changes or variations in how personality is expressed may also from time to time or across situations; personality, through the psychophysical systems, motivates and directs behavior; personality


provides recognizable or characteristic unique attributes, thoughts and behaviors, which enable the individual to adapt in his or her environment.

5.4.1. Defining Traits

Traits refer to observable behaviors in an individual that are often used to describe a person.\(^{183}\) Traits are long-term qualities or attribute that influence individuals to behave consistently across situations. Traits are internal dispositions that color how we see and interpret the world. Traits influence the meanings which give to life events, the choices what an individual make, the goals he/she select, and the actions they take. They represent what Diener\(^{184}\) called ‘top down’ influences on well-being. That is, inner dispositions (top) exert stable and pervasive influences on many aspects of lives (down) that affect health and happiness.

5.4.2. Relationship between Personality Traits and Absenteeism

The psychological literature on absenteeism was prevalently concerned with negative work attitudes, e.g. job involvement, job satisfaction, organizational commitment and burnout. As absenteeism represents a specific behavior whereas work attitude is a more general construct, attitudes are likely to be insufficient as explanatory variables of absenteeism.\(^{185}\) A particular problem in this literature is the fact that it is difficult to come up with a precise definition of the variables and constructs.\(^{186}\) Therefore, relatively stable characteristics like personality traits might be a fruitful way to explain absenteeism as was proposed by several researchers.\(^{187}\)

Personality has become an indispensable consideration for employers looking for dedicated employees who not engaged themselves in much absence prone behaviours. Personality influence becomes less obvious if a workers’ place of work is not a highly socialized environment and if the job is traditional. This leads to more absenteeism because the employees thus seek a highly interactive arena outside their work place. Porter and Steers\(^{188}\) argued that employees with extreme levels of emotional instability, anxiety, low achievement orientation, aggression, independence, self confidence, and sociability are more likely to be
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absent than employees with more moderate levels of these personality traits. Bernardin\textsuperscript{189} tested this hypothesis on the basis of a sample of male sales professionals and found support only for the effects of extreme anxiety levels on absence. Froggatt,\textsuperscript{190} argued that absence reflects inherent and long-standing personality characteristics that account for the stability of absence over time and across situations. Absence proneness emerged as the explanatory concept. However, unlike most other personality characteristics, which are measured through conventional psychological scales, absence proneness typically has been inferred through less conventional methods.

5.4.3. The Five Factor Model (Big Five Model)

The five factor model also called as the Big Five was proposed by Norman\textsuperscript{191}, but has achieved popularity within the last 20 years. Costa and McCrae have attempted to explore the implications of the five factor model for personality theory. From the last decade, however, consensus has emerged that a five-factor model of personality, often termed the Big Five,\textsuperscript{192} can be used to describe the most salient aspects of personality. The 'Big-Five' theory recognizes the frequent reoccurrence of five personality traits across other factors from some analytic studies. The Big Five personality framework is originated from the lexical hypothesis-the assumption that the major dimensions of behavior could be mapped onto (or derived from) the words that exist in our language to describe a person. Almost 70 years ago, Allport and Odbert reported 18,000 descriptors of an individual in the English language. This group of words was later reduced to approximately 8,000 and then 4,500\textsuperscript{193} based on the elimination of evaluative, ambiguous, and unfamiliar words, as well as terms that referred to physical (rather than psychological) aspects. As explained, the lexical hypothesis refers to the idea that these words (derived from lay rather than scientific knowledge) would provide a comprehensive frame of reference to establish taxonomy for the underlying personality dimensions of human beings. Despite the lack of theoretical rationale for the etiology of traits identified by the Five Factor model, there has been enough consensus and empirical evidence.

\textsuperscript{191} W. Norman, 'Towards an adequate taxonomy of personality attributes', \textit{Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology}, vol.66, 1963, pp. 574-583.
\textsuperscript{193} T. Norman, '2,800 personality trait descriptors: Normative operating characteristics for a university population', \textit{University of Michigan, Department of Psychology}, 1967.
in support of the identification of the Big Five as the universal dimensions of personality.\textsuperscript{194} The Big Five model proposed by Costa and McCrae derived from cluster analysis of Cattell’s 16PF\textsuperscript{195}. The central idea of Big Five Model is that traits must be distinguished from most of the attributes studied by psychologists—attitudes, beliefs, values, habits, skills, roles, relationships, and so forth. McCrae and Costa\textsuperscript{196} concluded that personality can be defined in terms of five similar traits: Extraversion, Neuroticism, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness and Openness to experience. Bergh and Theron\textsuperscript{197} also believe that the five-factor model of personality has developed into an approach that arguably now enjoys the most support as an integrative trait description of personality. The Big five similar traits are discussed as follows.

5.4.3.1. Extraversion

Extraversion, a construct originally advanced by Eysenck,\textsuperscript{198} can broadly termed as sociability. Extroverts are highly social, are more talkative, active, and assertive than their introverted counterparts. Furthermore, extraversion is typically characterized by gregariousness and excitement-seeking behavior. They frequently display a great deal of commitment to social groups and activities. Although extroverts may view the workplace as merely another place to socialize, they may also see work in general as an obstacle to spending time with family and friends and to their involvement in other leisure activities. Highly extroverted people tend to be cheerful, sociable and comfortable in dealing with large groups of people. Berg and Feij\textsuperscript{199} noted that extroverted employees have better utilization of their competencies than those with low extroversion, hence enable them to achieve better work efficacy.

"[t]hose who enjoy being around people, especially large gatherings, and tend to be assertive, active and talkative. They like simulation and excitement, and are generally cheerful and optimistic. Individuals scoring low in Extraversion tend to prefer their own company, are reserved and independent and do things at even pace"

\textsuperscript{197} Z.C. Bergh and A. L. Theron, ‘psychology in the work context (Eds.)’, \textit{Halfway House: International Thompson Publishing}.
5.4.3.2. Relationship between Extraversion and Absenteeism

Usually, the working life might put restrictions on their ability to fully live their extravert lifestyle which could lead to the conclusion that leisure time is more valuable to extraverts. According to Allen, absent increases the leisure time of extraverted people. Judge supported that the big-five personality traits especially extroversion predicts employee absence, and that the relationship is partially mediated by an absence history. Due to the fact that an extroverted employee is outgoing, sociable, and wants to be at work because work exhibits social interactions, the social interactions at the workplace stimulated him, and absenteeism has been avoided. However, a study by Barry and Stewart found that too many extroverts can lead to team performance which makes some members to stay away from work. Previous researches provide some limited support for the existence of a positive relationship between extraversion and absence behavior. Cooper and Payne found a positive relationship between the two constructs. Contrarily, another study found that sociability was negatively associated with an indicator of employee reliability in a study reanalyzing previous data. Erdheim et al. found a negative influence of Extraversion on which leads to the postulation that potential negative consequences of absence are valued less. Thus, although there are limited empirical data, this evidence and the nature of extraversion caused the researcher to develop relationship between Extraversion and absence behavior. This leads to proposed hypothesis.

There is no significant relationship between Extraversion and Frequency of Absenteeism of Workers

---

205 J. Erdheim, 'Linking the Big Five personality constructs to organizational commitment', *Personality and Individual Differences*, vol.41, 2006.
Table 5.11: Responses on Extraversion Personality in Sample Units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree Nor Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am talkative,</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.25%</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>outgoing, and sociable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Field Survey*

Table 5.11, shows the means and percentage of responses of extraversion personality. In the table, the mean of the statement is 4.11 and standard deviation is 0.70.

The researcher used the Likert Scale using the degrees Strongly Disagree (1), Disagree (2), Neither Agree Nor Disagree (3), Agree (4) and Strongly Agree (5) as the scale of measurement. 400 respondents in extraversion personality construct i.e., ‘I am talkative, outgoing, and sociable’ articulate their responses on 5.5% ‘disagreement’, 3.25% ‘neutral’, 65.75% ‘agree’ and 25.50% ‘strongly agree’.

5.4.3.3. Agreeableness

Agreeableness has also referred to the individuals who are sympathetic, warm, like to help other people, cooperative and nice. Individuals with high levels of agreeableness tend to be kindness, unselfishness, tolerant, flexible, cooperative, trusting, courteous, forgiving and soft hearted.\(^{206}\) Agreeableness involves the degree to which individuals are cooperative, warm and agreeable as opposed to cold, disagreeable and antagonistic. Because agreeable workers tend to regard their work as a platform to improve their personal value and earn respect, whenever they interact with others people agreeable workers achieve better results as they are more cooperating and can have good communication, such workers should be more involved in their jobs. Empirical research also reports a negative relationship between agreeableness and absenteeism. For example, workers who often set higher goals to gain a much higher sales volume were given higher supervisory ratings compared to other workers. As a result, they are often considered as an important and talented workers of the organization.\(^{207}\)

---


Taylor and deBruin describes individuals who are high in Agreeableness as:

"sympathetic towards others, straightforward, selfless, are eager to help, and believe that others will be helpful in return. Individuals who score low on Agreeableness tend to be skeptical, manipulative, competitive, and self-centred. In other words, they look after their own interests."

5.4.3.4. Relationship between Agreeableness and Absenteeism

Agreeableness implies a pro-social and collectivistic orientation towards others, causing agreeable people to be altruistic, thankful and modest. Transferred to the work environment this should lead to lower absenteeism rates. Agreeable people might feel a greater obligation towards their employer and here the past studies, concluded that this leads to less offset behaviour such as absenteeism. This is in contrast to theoretical arguments and evidence presented by Seibert and Kraimer showing a negative correlation between Agreeableness and career satisfaction. If low career satisfaction impacts the worker’s loyalty towards the employer negatively, it would be expected to have more agreeable workers to exhibit higher rates of absenteeism. However, in this research work it is hypothesize a correlation between agreeableness and absenteeism caused by the pro-social orientation of agreeable employees.

So, the proposed hypothesis is

*There is no significant relationship between Agreeableness and Frequency of Absenteeism of Workers*

**Table 5.12: Responses on Agreeableness Personality in Sample Units**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree Nor Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequency Percentage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency Percentage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am the one who likes to cooperate with others</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>70.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Field Survey*

---


Table 5.12, indicates the means and percentage of responses of agreeableness personality. In the table, the mean of the statement is 4.15 and standard deviation is 0.61.

The researcher used the Likert Scale using the degrees Strongly Disagree (1), Disagree (2), Neither Agree Nor Disagree (3), Agree (4) and Strongly Agree (5) as the scale of measurement. 400 respondents in agreeableness personality construct i.e., ‘I am the one who likes to cooperate with others’ articulate their responses on 3.50% ‘disagreement’, 2% ‘neutral’, 70.50% ‘agree’ and 24% ‘strongly agree’.

5.4.3.5. Conscientiousness

Conscientiousness is associated with industriousness, determination, self-discipline and responsibility. Individuals who report high scores on conscientiousness should report more involvement in their work due to their sense of duty towards every role they assume. Self-control and the active process of planning, organizing and carrying out tasks is referred to as conscientiousness. Conscientious individuals are best identified for their efficiency, organization, determination, and productivity. No wonder, then, that this personality dimension has been reported to be significantly associated with various types of performance. According to Taylor and de Bruin

“[c]onscientiousness has to do with the self-discipline required in planning, organising, and carrying out of tasks. Individual high in conscientiousness are focussed, strong willed, and determined. They also tend to be dependable, hardworking, achievement oriented, and persevering. Low scores tend to be more relaxed in working towards their goals, and may tend to be more hedonistic, distractible and impulsive than high scores. Individual who score low on the order facet of conscientiousness prefer less organised environments and dislike routine”.

5.4.3.6. Relationship between Conscientiousness and Absenteeism

Past research has not examined the relationship between specific measures of conscientiousness and absenteeism, although some studies are suggestive. Bernardin noted a strong correlation between ‘superego strength’ (closely related to self-discipline) and absence behaviors. Some research has focused on the aspects of conscientiousness linked to employee responsibility and integrity in attempting to predict a variety of counterproductive

---
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employee behaviors (including absence from work). Mowday and Spencer\textsuperscript{214} found that self-reported need for achievement correlated negatively with personal absence, whereas Hogan and Hogan\textsuperscript{215} found a positive relationship between responsibility and employee dependability (absent patterns). The achievement-orientation component of conscientiousness has also received some attention in the absence literature. Thus, no research has directly investigated the relationship between conscientiousness and absence. However, the nature of the construct, and several suggestive studies, the researcher found a significant relationship between conscientiousness and absence. This leads to proposed hypothesis.

There is no significant relationship between Conscientiousness and Frequency of Absenteeism of Workers.

Table 5.13: Responses on Conscientiousness Personality in Sample Units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree Nor Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am the one who makes plans and follows them.</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>68.75%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4.25%</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey

Table 5.13, indicates the means and percentage of responses of conscientiousness personality. In the table, the mean of the statement is 2.31 and standard deviation is 0.88.

The researcher used the Likert Scale using the degrees Strongly Disagree (1), Disagree (2), Neither Agree Nor Disagree (3), Agree (4) and Strongly Agree (5) as the scale of measurement. 400 respondents in conscientiousness personality construct i.e., ‘I am the one who makes plans and follows them’ articulate their responses on 9% ‘strongly disagree’, 68.75% ‘disagree’, 4.25% ‘neutral’, 17.50% ‘agree’ and 0.50% ‘strongly agree’.


5.4.3.7. Neuroticism

A neuroticism personality experience anxiety, depression, anger and worry\textsuperscript{216}, which tend to create negative perception. Neuroticism Personality refers to an individual who are anxious, insecure, angry, embarrassed, nervous and depressed. Because of neurotic employee’s tendency to interpret experiences under negative light, individuals who score high on neuroticism should be less likely to develop positive attitudes towards their work.\textsuperscript{217} Individuals who score less on neuroticism are even-tempered, well adjusted, and tolerant of stress. Taylor and deBruin defined Neuroticism as,

"If the tendency to experience negative affects such as fear, sadness, embarrassment, anger, and fretfulness. Along with these, individuals high in Neuroticism tend to be prone to irrational ideas, are less able to control their negative emotions, and cope poorly with stress. Individuals who score low in Neuroticism are emotionally stable, calm even-tempered and composed".

5.4.3.8. Relationship between Neuroticism and Absenteeism

It seems likely that such tendencies may make employees who are high on neuroticism more likely to engage in withdrawal behaviors, such as failing to come to work on a frequent basis. Furthermore, some definitions of neuroticism advance the idea of an impulsivity component. In an early review of the absenteeism literature, Porter and Steers\textsuperscript{218} suggested that employee absenteeism be viewed as an impulsive, spontaneous form of behavior. Martocchio and Harrison\textsuperscript{219} suggested that neurotic people feel so much pressure in their jobs that absence can be seen as part of a coping strategy. However, the nature of the construct, and suggestive studies, the researcher found a significant relationship between neuroticism and absenteeism. This leads to proposed hypothesis.

There is no significant relationship between Neuroticism and Frequency of Absenteeism of Workers.

\textsuperscript{217} K.Mahajan \textit{OpCit}, 2015, p.56.
Table 5.14: Responses on Neuroticism Personality in Sample Units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree Nor Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am emotionally unstable and gets easily upset.</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.75%</td>
<td>33.25%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>35.50%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey

Table 5.14, indicates the means and percentage of responses of neuroticism personality. In the table, the mean of the statement is 3.06 and standard deviation is 1.24.

The researcher used the Likert Scale using the degrees Strongly Disagree (1), Disagree (2), Neither Agree Nor Disagree (3), Agree (4) and Strongly Agree (5) as the scale of measurement. 400 respondents in neuroticism personality construct i.e., ‘I am emotionally unstable and gets easily upset.’ articulate their responses on 9.75% ‘strongly disagree’, 33.25% ‘disagree’, 9.5% ‘neutral’, 35.50% ‘agree’ and 12% ‘strongly agree’.

5.4.3.9. Openness to Experience

Openness includes curiosity, ability to be imaginative, broadminded, receptivity of new ideas, flexibility of thought and inventiveness. Creative and intelligence have been found to demonstrate a relationship with the Openness to Experience factor, with individuals who score higher on the factor also tending to be more creative. Workers with high scores on the openness to experience factor are absorbed with the beauty of art and nature, are curious about certain areas of knowledge and imagination, are interested in ideas and unconventional people. Besides, they tend to searching for new methods to complete his/her work efficiently and effectively. Workers with low scores on this factor are not impressed by art work, they have no intellectual curiosity, are not creative, avoid activities and are characterized by a high degree of the conventionalism.

---

5.4.3.10. Relationship between Openness to Experience and Absenteeism

Openness is related to the need for novelty, variety and complexity as well as the intrinsic desire for experience. If workers scoring high on the factor Openness end up in a workplace which is characterized by routine, boredom at work and a low degree of autonomy, their absence rates might be higher. Openness to experience and Absence Pattern has no theoretical or empirical basis. As this is the important personality domain in Big Five Model. So, the researcher hypothesized null expectation with respect to this facet of FFM. The proposed hypothesis is

*There is no significant relationship between Openness to Experience and Frequency of Absenteeism of Workers.*

Table 5.15: Responses on Openness to Experience Personality in Sample Units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree Nor Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My imaginations are creative</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.25%</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>22.25%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.50%</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Field Survey*

Table 5.15, indicates the means and percentage of responses of openness to personality. In the table, the mean of the statement is 3.74 and standard deviation is 1.05.

The researcher used the Likert Scale using the degrees Strongly Disagree (1), Disagree (2), Neither Agree Nor Disagree (3), Agree (4) and Strongly Agree (5) as the scale of measurement. 400 respondents in neuroticism personality construct i.e., 'My imaginations are creative' articulate their responses on 0.25% ‘strongly disagree’, 22.25% ‘disagree’, 3.50% ‘neutral’, 50.75% ‘agree’ and 23.25% ‘strongly agree’.

---

5.5. Chapter Summary

This chapter explained the concept of Demographic Variable i.e., Age, Gender, Marital Status, Level of Education and Years of Experience; Organizational variable i.e., Job Involvement, Job Satisfaction, Organizational Commitment and Burnout; and Personality Traits which includes Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, Neuroticism, Openness. Moreover, the relationship of Absenteeism with each construct was also discussed. The responses of each construct was tabulated which is helpful in further analysis.