ABSTRACT

Leather Industry in Uttar Pradesh has got the unique distinction of having a very large area under leather manufacturing and contributing a great part in the total leather production. The Industry feeds a great number of people who are dependent on it for their livelihood. Being labour intensive industry with unique characteristics and supporting a huge labour force with obligatory responsibilities, problems of this industry are diverse. Punctuality and earnestness of the workforce is sine-qua-non for the development of the organization as well as for the economy. Any unevenness in this regard would upset the industrial activity. One of the basic problems of industrialization, which deficiently affects industrial production and economic growth of the country, has been the problem of ‘Absenteeism’. Absenteeism is one of the major human problems of the present day in industrial arena. It affects the cost of production, and creates problems in achieving production targets and of securing accelerated economic growth. Absenteeism is one such problem from which though the other industries, in varied degrees, too have suffered but the leather industry is perhaps the one which is the worst victim of this menace. Absenteeism is an omnipresent phenomenon and affects almost every type of organisation. It has been recognized as a vital issue that affects the total management discipline, and also quantity and quality of production of a firm.

Extensive research and investigation has been conducted on absenteeism but despite, employee absenteeism is still a poorly understood organizational phenomenon which takes a heavy toll on worker productivity in Indian industries in general and leather industry in particular. This is because of negligence of the policy makers, trade unions, as well as the employers. There has been a substantial increase in the rate of absenteeism over the years in several industries. Perhaps this would have been of much significance in the earlier days of industrial development, but in the current world scenario, with huge investments and necessity of skilled manpower, absenteeism of this magnitude affects the entire industry. Very little research has been conducted to identify the causes, management attitude and to evaluate workers response towards absenteeism in Indian industries. However, no research has been found so far, which describe the absenteeism ailment in Indian Leather industry.

The reason behind the selection of Uttar Pradesh Leather Industry, as it occupies a place of prominence in the Indian economy, in view of its massive potential for employment, growth and exports. Thus absenteeism is a typical type of industrial ailment and is predicament. The Leather Industry of Uttar Pradesh is a victim of this syndrome of absenteeism. The cities in the state where this industry is generally centralized is Agra, Kanpur and Noida, but it is
mostly in the form of an unorganized sector and the figures available about absenteeism are not sufficient as to formulate any general conclusion.

The first chapter ‘An Introductory Background and Framework of the Study’ as the same suggest started with the introductory section which highlights the concept of Absenteeism and its ailment in Leather Industry. Absenteeism is a social malady in an industry which disrupts work schedules, imposes extra burden on co-workers, reduces efficiency in labour productivity and lowers worker’s morale. In this chapter the researcher has overviewed the earlier studies conducted by Western and Indian authors on the menace of Absenteeism. This assessment has been named as ‘Review of Literature’ and it helped in racing out the research gap at the disposal of the researcher to determine the objectives of study which are as follows:

1. To analyze the gravity of the problem of labour absenteeism in the unorganized industrial sector with special reference to private sector leather undertaking of Uttar Pradesh.
2. To uncover the various factors responsible for absenteeism in the workplace and to explore which of these factors are most responsible.
3. To analyze whether the various indicators for the reason behind absenteeism of workers is related to some selected Demographic variables such as Cluster, Age, Gender, Marital Status, Level of Education and Experience.
4. To determine Self Reported Absence of workers that influences Frequency of Absenteeism in the Private Sector Leather Units of Uttar Pradesh.
5. To investigate the impact of some specific Organizational Factors such as Job Involvement, Job Satisfaction, Organizational Commitment and Burnout on Employee Absence in the Private Sector Leather Units.
6. To investigate the impact of Personality Traits including Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, Neuroticism and Openness on Employee Absence in the Private Sector Leather Units.
7. To suggests suitable remedial measures to mitigate the intensity of the problem of Absenteeism, in the light of the findings of the study.

It is imperative to mention that while carrying out a scientific investigation, there is a need to formulate hypotheses in order to draw meaningful inferences regarding the sample under study. Formulation of Hypothesis is a very important step in research investigation. Hypothesis is a presumption which provides the basis of investigation and ensures the proper
direction in which the study should proceed.\textsuperscript{1} The hypotheses framed under the study are divided into two parts followed by sub hypotheses.

\textit{Hypotheses – Part A}

\textbf{Ho 1: There is no significant difference in the perception of workers and managers on Explored Factors that influence absenteeism across Cluster under study.}

Sub Hypotheses of above hypothesis are:

i. There is no significant difference in the perception of workers and managers on attitudinal factors that influence absenteeism across \textit{cluster} under study.

ii. There is no significant difference in the perception of workers and managers on wage issues that influence absenteeism across \textit{cluster} under study.

iii. There is no significant difference in the perception of workers and managers on social obligations that influence absenteeism across \textit{cluster} under study.

iv. There is no significant difference in the perception of workers and managers on personal factors that influence absenteeism across \textit{cluster} under study.

\textbf{Ho 2: There is no significant difference in the perception of workers and managers on Explored factors that influence absenteeism across age under study.}

Sub Hypotheses of above hypothesis are:

i. There is no significant difference in the perception of workers and managers on attitudinal factors that influence absenteeism across \textit{age} under study.

ii. There is no significant difference in the perception of workers and managers on wage issues that influence absenteeism across \textit{age} under study.

iii. There is no significant difference in the perception of workers and managers on social obligations that influence absenteeism across \textit{age} under study.

iv. There is no significant difference in the perception of workers and managers on personal factors that influence absenteeism across \textit{age} under study.

\textbf{Ho 3: There is no significant difference in the perception of workers and managers on Explored factors that influence absenteeism across gender under study.}

Sub Hypotheses of above hypothesis are:

i. There is no significant difference in the perception of workers and managers on attitudinal factors that influence absenteeism across \textit{gender} under study.

ii. There is no significant difference in the perception of workers and managers on wage issues that influence absenteeism across \textit{gender} under study.

\textsuperscript{1} V.P. Michael, ‘Research Methodology in Management’ (IId), \textit{Bombay: Himalaya Publishing}, 1985.
iii. There is no significant difference in the perception of workers and managers on social obligations that influence absenteeism across gender under study.

iv. There is no significant difference in the perception of workers and managers on personal factors that influence absenteeism across gender under study.

**Ho 4:** There is no significant difference in the perception of workers and managers on Explored factors that influence absenteeism across marital status under study.

Sub Hypotheses of above hypothesis are:

i. There is no significant difference in the perception of workers and managers on attitudinal factors that influence absenteeism across marital status under study.

ii. There is no significant difference in the perception of workers and managers on wage issues that influence absenteeism across marital status under study.

iii. There is no significant difference in the perception of workers and managers on social obligations that influence absenteeism across marital status under study.

iv. There is no significant difference in the perception of workers and managers on personal factors that influence absenteeism across marital status under study.

**Ho 5:** There is no significant difference in the perception of workers and managers on Explored factors that influence absenteeism across level of education under study.

Sub Hypotheses of above hypothesis are:

i. There is no significant difference in the perception of workers and managers on attitudinal factors that influence absenteeism across level of education under study.

ii. There is no significant difference in the perception of workers and managers on wage issues that influence absenteeism across level of education under study.

iii. There is no significant difference in the perception of workers and managers on social obligations that influence absenteeism across level of education under study.

iv. There is no significant difference in the perception of workers and managers on personal factors that influence absenteeism across level of education under study.

**Ho 6:** There is no significant difference in the perception of workers and managers on Explored factors that influence absenteeism across years of experience under study.

Sub Hypotheses of above hypothesis are:

i. There is no significant difference in the perception of workers and managers on attitudinal factors that influence absenteeism across years of experience under study.

ii. There is no significant difference in the perception of workers and managers on wage issues that influence absenteeism across years of experience under study.
iii. There is no significant difference in the perception of workers and managers on social obligations that influence absenteeism across years of experience under study.

iv. There is no significant difference in the perception of workers and managers on personal factors that influence absenteeism across years of experience under study.

Hypotheses – Part B

Ho 7: There is no significant impact of Organizational Factors (Job Involvement, Job Satisfaction, Organizational Commitment and Burnout) on Overall Frequency of Absenteeism of Workers.

Ho 8: There is no significant impact of Personality Traits (Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, Neuroticism and Openness) on Overall Frequency of Absenteeism of Workers.

Next is the Research Methodology section which portrays how the research is carried out in terms of the research design, data collection methods, sampling design, research instrument, construct measurement, data processing and data analysis.

The Study is divided into two parts. With the first phase an attempt is made by the researcher to explore factors (from the perception and opinion of managers/supervisors and workers respectively) which are pertaining for workers’ absenteeism (causes of absenteeism) and its relationship with the demographic variables. In the second phase an impact of organizational factors and personality traits on the absence frequency of workers in the leather industry has been made. The two research designs that the researcher has used in this research are exploratory and descriptive. In exploratory research design the evidence are obtained to test the hypotheses of the cause-and-effect relationship between the independent variables and the dependent variable, however the study is descriptive by nature. Through this research design, the researcher able to obtain results to either accepts or rejects the hypothesis.

The population from which the sample was drawn for the study consists of private sector units of leather industry in Uttar Pradesh. The researcher centered the target population situated in Agra, Kanpur, Noida and Unnao. The sampling frame of this study consists of workers working in the leather units. In actual practice, the sample drawn from a list of population elements that is often somewhat different from the target population that has been defined. Based on the formula of the research division of the National Education Association\(^2\), the appropriate sample size for the population of 75 and 3819 should be 63 and 400 respectively, the researcher keeps the sample of managers/supervisors as it was derived

---

by the formula and also shown in the table while the sample size of workers which was derived by the formula i.e., 349.13 is increased to the figure of 400. Primarily, before sampling procedure the researcher has distributed 130 sets (30 for managers/supervisors and 100 for workers) of the survey questionnaire for the purpose of pilot test. After that the reliability and validity of the 130 sets of questionnaires would be ensured so as to run the actual survey by distributing 463 sets of survey questionnaire both to workers and managers engaged in Uttar Pradesh Leather units. The Sampling Elements constitute 400 workers and 63 managers/supervisors. The technique of sampling adopted by the researcher is convenience sampling.

Under the design and development of the research instrument, the questionnaire for this study was constructed through an exhaustive literature review of research work and the scales of previous research authors. Questionnaire has been used as a medium for data collection as it enabled to reach out the element of transparency. Questionnaire was divided into two languages i.e., English and Hindi. The questionnaire consisted of 56 questions divided into 5 sections; Section A, Section B, Section C, Section D and Section E. Section A is designed to gather the demographic and personal information from the respondents in leather industry. This section consists of six questions. The questions asked were based on Cluster, Age, Gender, Marital status, Level of Education and Years of Experience. Question related to Gender and Marital Status were designed in nominal scale whereas questions related to Cluster, Age, Level of Education and Years of Experience were designed in ordinal scale. Section B is designed specifically to identify the reasons of worker's absenteeism.

This attempted to gather the perception regarding the factors leading to worker's absenteeism. The framing of questionnaire was based on an issue that 'why a worker might be absent from work'?

The workers rated each factor for their absence at work on a 5-point Likert’s Scale. Also the management rated each factor for worker's absence. The management and the workers could add other factors if necessary. The questionnaire consisted in the main of self-rated, non-comparative single-item rating scales used to assess respondents’ level of agreement or disagreement with statements relating to the causes of absenteeism in the organization, to their satisfaction with standard features and to the difficulty of choice between many alternative models. Questionnaire was designed on the bases of previous literature and study related to labour absenteeism. With this first part of the study the perception of workers and management for the main determinant of absenteeism becomes clear. Moreover, comparison is made between the perception of management and opinion of workers on workers'
absenteeism with that of demographic variables, the researcher attempted to test whether there exists any significant relationship between demographic variables (categorical independent variable) with the explored factors (dependent variable) that influence absenteeism in the industry.

Further, the researcher attempts to know the various underlying determinants due to which absenteeism frequency (lack of physical presence) exists. Keeping this view, the Section C of questionnaire was based on the frequency of absenteeism which constitutes Absence Frequency, Intensity of Absence, Attitudinal Absences and Medical Absences in the sample units. This section consisted of seven questions, which were based on ordinal scale having nominal properties and they also allow things to be arranged based on how much of some concept they possess. All the question in this section are being measured in ordinal scale. In Section D construction of worker’s opinion with the five organizational dimensions namely, Job Involvement, Job Satisfaction, Organizational Commitment and Burnout, were designed so as to come across any significant difference of these organizational factors with frequency of absenteeism. Total number of items in this section was 21. Lastly, Section E was based on the personality characteristics of the sample unit workers, namely, Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, Neuroticism, Openness. All the questions in section ‘D’ and ‘E’ were designed in interval scale which is categorized under metric scale. Questions designed in interval scale have both nominal and ordinal properties and at the same time they also capture information about the differences in quantities of a concept. Five-point Likert Scale was employed to all the questions in section ‘D’ and section ‘E’ in which higher scores indicate higher agreement with each statement. Respondents were required to choose one response from among several alternatives given in a question, so as to come across any significant difference of organizational factors and personality characteristics respectively with the frequency of absenteeism.

The secondary sources were obtained from several databases provided by Aligarh Muslim University Library such as Wiley, Taylor and Francis, ProQuest, Science Direct, JSTOR, Emerald, Google Scholar and Books of National as well as International repute, Labour Bureau Data Bank, Reports of CFTI, Agra and CLE, Kanpur files and documents.

The collected information from primary data was rearranged in systematic manner and were analysed with the help of SPSS (version 20.0) and E-Views Softwares. The hypotheses has been tested by applying Factor Analysis, one way ANOVA, Independent Sample t-test, Multiple Regression, while using OLS various underlying assumptions were also checked so as to run a multiple regression model.
The second chapter titled ‘Absenteeism: A Conceptual framework’ covers the conceptual framework of Absenteeism. As the Labour Bureau of Shimla and ASI defines, “absenteeism is the total man shifts lost because of absence as percentage of total number of man shifts scheduled to work”. Firstly, the meaning, definition and concept of Absenteeism has been defined in the chapter, after that various types of absenteeism has discussed i.e., Authorized, Unauthorized, Culpable and Innocent. Absenteeism has been measured in many ways, partly because the reasons for absence from work are manifold. The indices used in measuring the incidence of absenteeism are Absenteeism Rate, Absence Rate, Frequency rate, Severity Rate and Combined Rate. Further, in this chapter it has been discussed that how the ailment of absenteeism would be responsible for organization’s cultural problem and managerial problem? Moreover, various causational models of absenteeism has been discussed which includes pain avoidance model, adjustment to work model, decision models and integrated model of attendance. Lastly, magnitude of absenteeism, causes and consequence of absenteeism followed by absenteeism management techniques in general has been discussed.

The third chapter titled ‘An Overview of Leather Industry’, which has been framed to discuss in detail the background of leather industry, sectoral configuration of leather industry and its growth in organized sector in India. Rapid growth of industries in later half of the eighteen century established neo-factory system which undermined the position of labour against the machines, consequently labour lost its identity. But since the Independence, when the goal of socialist democracy was kept in forefront, the industrialists began to feel the importance of labour in the industry. The Government of India while drafting Planning Commission gave much importance to the labour in the industries. Not only this but the Government of India also focuses on the maximum production, working conditions of labour much be improved to a great extent, especially in labour intensive industries. Therefore, Leather Industry was chosen for the present study by the researcher because this industry, being a labour intensive industry provides employment to about 40 Lakhs people in more than 25,000 Units. Various phases of this industry are Tanning, Footwear and Leather goods and manufacturing etc, which are all labour intensive and almost all the workers involved in the industry belongs to poor community. The two World Wars of the last century helped too much in the development and expansion of the Indian Leather Industry especially to a great extent in two towns, viz. Agra and Kanpur in Uttar Pradesh State. Kanpur leading in tanning of leather while Agra leads in Footwear manufacturing. From the last two decades, the tanning industry of Kanpur extends its boundaries to Unnao City while Noida undertakes the development of new footwear cluster together with Agra.
Fourth Chapter titled ‘Causes of Workers Absenteeism in Sample Units’, in which the researcher find out the reason(s) why leather industry workers are absent from workplace. There are a number of reasons as to why there exist absence patterns amongst workers. For this purpose, the dependence was made on the perception study of the sample workers, selected conveniently from the different strata of population (e.g. workers who belong to both the genders and all the four cities namely, Agra, Kanpur, Unnao and Noida) and also of the opinions of Managers/Supervisors of Leather industry of Uttar Pradesh.

With an intention to know the perception/views of the workers and also the managers and supervisors they were served a set of schedule questionnaires. This schedule questionnaire included in it the possible reasons behind the practice of absenteeism in Leather Industry which were listed during the pilot study. The advices of the subject experts (mostly entrepreneurs) have also been taken into consideration. Eighteen questions were framed including Assigned Disagreeable and Monotonous Task, Desire to earn more wages by working with some other employer(s), Reluctance to work on piece rate wage system, Satisfied with the payment policy of the organization, Poor Health Condition, Engagement in marketing activities on days following the payment of the weekly wages to them, Bad weather condition, Reluctance to deal with Leather Products at times as this activity is perceived by many as an Inferior Employment, Inertia for profession which neither helps to earn satisfactory wages nor the social recognition/respect, Callousness and lack of economic consciousness and attitude towards saving for future, Attending Social and Religious Functions, Habit of Consuming Liquor, Insufficient rest period during the working hours in the organization, Family Responsibilities, Absence of requisite leave arrangement in the organization, Fatigueness, Engagement in activities aimed at earning additionally, Lack of team work and coordination. Out of these eighteen questions six factors have been extracted through Factor Analysis methodology. These six factors account for 63.725% of the covariance among the variables. The variable which has got a high loading with one factor it has that loading only with that factor and it should not appear in other factor, because factors within themselves should be consistent but with each other it is as different as possible. Again an attempt has been made by the researcher to condensed the exact possible causes of absenteeism. For this purpose reliability test using Cronbach’s alpha is used. The new factors appeared are Attitudinal Factors, Wage Issues, Social Obligations and Personal Issues.

Further, it was discussed earlier that most commonly absenteeism is defined in terms of physical presence. In the present research work, to measure the dimensions of absenteeism empirically, the indices of absence frequency, absence intensity, attitudinal absences and
medical absences has been taken into account. The source of variance is focused on medium term absence, as this kind refers to absenteeism that can be deemed to have a time span of between three months and one year. This period includes quarters and single years, which are common intervals for absenteeism records and attendance patterning. The next chapter in sequence is chapter fifth titled ‘Absenteeism Correlates’. 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; organizational factors such as, job involvement, job satisfaction, organizational commitment and burnout. 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. Moreover, the responses of each construct was tabulated which was helpful in further analysis. The succeeding chapter titled ‘Data Analysis and Interpretation’ tested different hypotheses of the proposed research work taking various aspects like explored absenteeism causes, demographic factors, frequency of absenteeism, organizational factors and personality factors. This chapter exclusively meant for the testing of the hypotheses and making the interpretations of the result obtained by using different statistical tools. To find out the perception of workers and managers on explored factors that influence absenteeism across demographic factors i.e., cluster, age, gender, marital status, level of education and years of experience; one way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) and Independent Samples t-test, was used. The results of categorical predictor variables (demographic variables) and criterion variable (new explored factors responsible for absenteeism) are as follows,

By analyzing, it has been seen that there was no significant difference in the perception of workers and managers on Attitudinal Factors that influence absenteeism across Cluster because the result of the data analyzed by applying One way ANOVA analysis at 5% level of significance shows that the ‘F’ value was 0.436 and Sig. value(p) was 0.728 which was more than 0.05 (95% confidence level), which indicates that null hypothesis was accepted at the 0.05 significant level and it means that the perception of managers and workers on workers'
absenteeism does not significantly differ from each other on *Attitudinal Factors* across Clusters under study.

Further, it has been seen that there was no significant difference in the perception of workers and managers on *Wage Issues* that influence absenteeism across Cluster because the result of the data analyzed by applying One way ANOVA analysis at 5% level of significance shows that the ‘F’ value was 0.758 and Sig. value(p) was 0.518 which was more than 0.05 (95% confidence level), which indicates that null hypothesis was *accepted* at the 0.05 significant level and it means that the perception of managers and workers on workers’ absenteeism does not significantly differ from each other on *Wage Issues* across Clusters under study.

Afterwards, it has been seen that there was no significant difference in the perception of workers and managers on *Social Obligations* that influence absenteeism across Cluster because the result of the data analyzed by applying One way ANOVA analysis at 5% level of significance shows that the ‘F’ value was 0.929 and Sig. value(p) was 0.427 which was more than 0.05 (95% confidence level), which indicates that null hypothesis was *accepted* at the 0.05 significant level and it means that the perception of managers and workers on workers’ absenteeism does not significantly differ from each other on *Social Obligations* across Clusters under study.

Lastly, it has been seen that there was a significant difference in the perception of workers and managers on *Personal Issues* that influence absenteeism across Cluster because the result of the data analyzed by applying One way ANOVA analysis at 5% level of significance shows that the ‘F’ value was 2.745 and Sig. value (p) was 0.043 which was less than 0.05 (95% confidence level) which indicates that null hypothesis is *rejected* at the 0.05 significance level and it means that there was a significant difference in the workers and managers on *Personal Issues* that influence absenteeism of workers across clusters under study.

It has been seen by analyzing that there was no significant difference in the perception of workers and managers on *Attitudinal Factors* that influence absenteeism across age because the result of the data analyzed by applying One way ANOVA analysis at 5% level of significance shows that the ‘F’ value was 0.830 and Sig. value (p) is 0.002 which is less than 0.05 (95% confidence level) which indicates that null hypothesis was *rejected* at the 0.05 significance level and it means that there was a significant difference in the workers and managers on *Attitudinal Factors* that influence absenteeism of workers across age under study.
Thereafter, it has been seen that there was no significant difference in the perception of workers and managers on *Wage Issues* that influence absenteeism across age because the result of the data analyzed by applying One way ANOVA analysis at 5% level of significance shows that the ‘F’ value was 1.064 and Sig. value (p) was .026 which was less than 0.05 (95% confidence level) which indicates that null hypothesis was rejected at the 0.05 significance level and it means that there was a significant difference in the workers and managers on *Wage Issues* that influence absenteeism of workers across age under study.

Further, it has been seen that there was no significant difference in the perception of workers and managers on *Social Obligations* that influence absenteeism across age because the result of the data analyzed by applying One way ANOVA analysis at 5% level of significance shows that the ‘F’ value was 0.557 and Sig. value (p) was .019 which was less than 0.05 (95% confidence level) which indicates that null hypothesis was rejected at the 0.05 significance level and it means that there was a significant difference in the workers and managers on *Social Obligations* that influence absenteeism of workers across age under study.

Lastly, it has been seen that there was no significant difference in the perception of workers and managers on *Personal Issues* that influence absenteeism across age because the result of the data analyzed by applying One way ANOVA analysis at 5% level of significance shows that the ‘F’ value was 2.627 and Sig. value (p) was 0.014 which is less than 0.05 (95% confidence level) which indicates that null hypothesis is rejected at the 0.05 significance level and it means that there is a significant difference in the workers and managers on *Personal Issues* that influence absenteeism of workers across age under study.

By analyzing, it has been seen that there was no significant difference in the perception of workers and managers on *Attitudinal Factors* that influence absenteeism across gender because the result of the data analyzed by applying Independent Sample t-test at 5% level of significance shows that the ‘t’ value was -0.732 and Sig. value (p) was 0.465 which was more than 0.05 (95% confidence level) which indicates that null hypothesis was accepted at the 0.05 significance level and it means that there was no significant difference in the workers and managers on *Attitudinal Factors* that influence absenteeism of workers across gender under study.

Thereafter, it has been seen that there was no significant difference in the perception of workers and managers on *Wage Issues* that influence absenteeism across gender because the result of the data analyzed by applying Independent Sample t-test at 5% level of significance shows that the ‘t’ value was -0.644 and Sig. value (p) was 0.520 which was more than 0.05
(95% confidence level) which indicates that null hypothesis was accepted at the 0.05 significance level and it means that there was no significant difference in the workers and managers on Wage Issues that influence absenteeism of workers across gender under study. Further, it has been seen that there was no significant difference in the perception of workers and managers on Social Obligations that influence absenteeism across gender because the result of the data analyzed by applying Independent Sample t-test at 5% level of significance shows that the ‘t’ value was 0.007 and Sig. value (p) was 0.995 which was more than 0.05 (95% confidence level) which indicates that null hypothesis was accepted at the 0.05 significance level and it means that there was no significant difference in the workers and managers on Social Obligations that influence absenteeism of workers across gender under study. Lastly, it has been seen that there was no significant difference in the perception of workers and managers on Personal Issues that influence absenteeism across gender because the result of the data analyzed by applying Independent Sample t-test at 5% level of significance shows that the ‘t’ value was -0.160 and Sig. value (p) was 0.873 which was more than 0.05 (95% confidence level) which indicates that null hypothesis was accepted at the 0.05 significance level and it means that there was no significant difference in the workers and managers on Personal Issues that influence absenteeism of workers across gender under study. By analyzing, it has been seen that there was no significant difference in the perception of workers and managers on Attitudinal Factors that influence absenteeism across marital status because the result of the data analyzed by applying One way ANOVA analysis at 5% level of significance shows that the ‘F’ value was 0.515 and Sig. value (p) was 0.672 which was more than 0.05 (95% confidence level) which indicates that null hypothesis was accepted at the 0.05 significance level and it means that there was no significant difference in the workers and managers on Attitudinal Factors that influence absenteeism of workers across marital status under study. Thereafter, it has been seen that there was no significant difference in the perception of workers and managers on Wage Issues that influence absenteeism across marital status because the result of the data analyzed by applying One way ANOVA analysis at 5% level of significance shows that the ‘F’ value was 0.350 and Sig. value (p) was 0.045 which was less than 0.05 (95% confidence level) which indicates that null hypothesis was rejected at the 0.05 significance level and it means that there was a significant difference in the workers and managers on Wage Issues that influence absenteeism of workers across marital status under study.
Further, it has been seen that there was no significant difference in the perception of workers and managers on **Social Obligations** that influence absenteeism across marital status because the result of the data analyzed by applying One way ANOVA analysis at 5% level of significance shows that the ‘F’ value was 1.543 and Sig. value (p) was 0.023 which was less than 0.05 (95% confidence level) which indicates that null hypothesis was rejected at the 0.05 significance level and it means that there was a significant difference in the workers and managers on **Social Obligations** that influence absenteeism of workers across marital status under study.

Lastly, it has been seen that there was no significant difference in the perception of workers and managers on **Personal Issues** that influence absenteeism across marital status because the result of the data analyzed by applying One way ANOVA analysis at 5% level of significance shows that the ‘F’ value was 0.726 which was more than 0.05 (95% confidence level) which indicates that null hypothesis was accepted at the 0.05 significance level and it means that there was no significant difference in the workers and managers on personal issues that influence absenteeism of workers across marital status under study.

By analyzing, it has been seen that there was no significant difference in the perception of workers and managers on **Attitudinal Factors** that influence absenteeism across level of education because the result of the data analyzed by applying One way ANOVA analysis at 5% level of significance shows that the ‘F’ value was 0.988 and Sig. value (p) was 0.398 which was more than 0.05 (95% confidence level) which indicates that null hypothesis was accepted at the 0.05 significance level and it means that there was no significant difference in the workers and managers on **Attitudinal Factors** that influence absenteeism of workers across level of education under study.

Thereafter, it has been seen that there was no significant difference in the perception of workers and managers on **Wage Issues** that influence absenteeism of workers across level of education because the result of the data analyzed by applying One way ANOVA analysis at 5% level of significance shows that the ‘F’ value was 0.350 and Sig. value (p) was 0.033 which was less than 0.05 (95% confidence level) which indicates that null hypothesis was rejected at the 0.05 significance level and it means that there was a significant difference in the workers and managers on **Wage Issues** that influence absenteeism of workers across level of education under study.

Further, it has been seen that there was no significant difference in the perception of workers and managers on **Social Obligations** that influence absenteeism across level of education because the result of the data analyzed by applying One way ANOVA analysis at 5% level of
significance shows that the ‘F’ value was 1.877 and Sig. value (p) was 0.035 which was less than 0.05 (95% confidence level) which indicates that null hypothesis was rejected at the 0.05 significance level and it means that there was a significant difference in the workers and managers on Social Obligations that influence absenteeism of workers across level of education under study.

Lastly, it has been seen that there was no significant difference in the perception of workers and managers on Personal Issues that influence absenteeism across level of education because the result of the data analyzed by applying One way ANOVA analysis at 5% level of significance shows that ‘F’ value was 1.052 and Sig. value (p) was 0.370 which was more than 0.05 (95% confidence level) which indicates that null hypothesis was accepted at the 0.05 significance level and it means that there was no significant difference in the workers and managers on Personal Issues that influence absenteeism of workers across level of education under study.

By analyzing, it has been seen that there was no significant difference in the perception of workers and managers on Attitudinal Factors that influence absenteeism across years of experience because the result of the data analyzed by applying One way ANOVA analysis at 5% level of significance shows that the ‘F’ value was 3.642 and Sig. value (p) was 0.041 which was less than 0.05 (95% confidence level) which indicates that null hypothesis was rejected at the 0.05 significance level and it means that there was a significant difference in the workers and managers on attitudinal factors that influence absenteeism of workers across years of experience under study.

Thereafter, it has been seen that there was no significant difference in the perception of workers and managers on Wage Issues that influence absenteeism across years of experience because the result of the data analyzed by applying One way ANOVA analysis at 5% level of significance shows that the ‘F’ value was 1.460 and Sig. value (p) was 0.025 which was less than 0.05 (95% confidence level) which indicates that null hypothesis was rejected at the 0.05 significance level and it means that there was a significant difference in the workers and managers on Wage Issues that influence absenteeism of workers across years of experience under study.

Further, it has been seen that there was no significant difference in the perception of workers and managers on Social Obligations that influence absenteeism across years of experience because the result of the data analyzed by applying One way ANOVA analysis at 5% level of significance shows that the ‘F’ value was 0.524 and Sig. value (p) was 0.666 which was less than 0.05 (95% confidence level) which indicates that null hypothesis was accepted at the
0.05 significance level and it means that there was no significant difference in the workers and managers on *Social Obligations* that influence absenteeism of workers across years of experience under study.

Lastly, it has been seen that there was no significant difference in the perception of workers and managers on *Personal Issues* that influence absenteeism across years of experience because the result of the data analyzed by applying One way ANOVA analysis at 5% level of significance shows that the ‘F’ value was 0.180 and Sig. value (p) was 0.910 which was more than 0.05 (95% confidence level) which indicates that null hypothesis was accepted at the 0.05 significance level and it means that there was no significant difference in the workers and managers on *Personal Issues* that influence absenteeism of workers across years of experience under study.

In the last two hypotheses it has been found that the correlation between the independent variables and dependent variable in this study is both negative as well as positive. Moreover, the multiple regression analysis showed that the independent variables (Job Involvement, Job Satisfaction, Organizational Commitment, Burnout, Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, Neuroticism and Openness) were able to define 31.2% of the variation in dependent variable (Frequency of Absenteeism). However, predictor variables explain only 31.2% of the variations in dependent variable leaving out 68.8% (100% - 31.2%) unexplained in this study which is undesirable. While applying ANOVA, the ‘F’ statistics is 19.632 and its significant value is 0.000 which is less than significant value i.e., 0.05, so the value of ‘F’ is significant which means that all the predictor variables jointly can influence dependent variable in the ‘Population’. $R^2$ and ‘F’ statistics both talk about joint significance level. Although, the $R^2$ is low but the ‘F’ statistics is significant, as the former indicate ‘Sample’ while the latter indicated ‘Population’, which is more important, Hence, $R^2$ does not affect the result. Apart from this, six out of nine predictor variables were statistically significant, as per the guideline most of the variable should be significant to have a good estimated model. On the other hand, the ANOVA table revealed that the F-statistic is significant and hence the model for this study is a good descriptor in explaining the relationship between the dependent variable and predictor variables.

Looking at unstandardized coefficients, it showed that with every additional one unit of job involvement, the frequency of absenteeism decreased with -0.043 units, holding other variables constant. For job satisfaction, with every additional one unit of satisfaction

---

possessed by the workers in the leather industry their frequency of absences is decreased with -0.193 units, controlling the other independent variables in the equation. Also with every additional one unit of organizational commitment, the frequency of absenteeism decreased with -0.443 units.

An increase of 0.572 units the frequency of absenteeism can be explained with every additional unit of the burnout for the workers, holding other independent variables constant. Besides that, as far as personality traits of the workers are concerned it is seen that, with every additional unit of extraversion, the frequency of Absenteeism is increased by 0.115 units, controlling other variables constant. Next, for every additional unit increase in agreeableness, the frequency of absenteeism is decreased by -0.069 units, holding other variables constant. Lastly, holding other variable constant with the additional unit of the three remaining variable namely, conscientiousness, neuroticism and openness the frequency of absenteeism is increased by 0.088, 0.020 and 0.010 respectively.

Apart from that, in the standardized coefficient column, the largest beta coefficient is 0.480 which is for burnout. This indicates that the burnout variable makes up the strongest unique contribution to explain the frequency of absenteeism when the variable explained by other variables is controlled in the model. Adversely, the beta of the job involvement is the lowest with -0.017. This means that it makes up the weakest unique contribution to explain the dependent variables.

The values in the Sign. Column in the coefficients table indicates whether this variable is able to make a statistically significant unique contribution to the model. It is dependent on the variables which are included in the model and the amount of overlapping among the independent variables. The variable is made up of significant unique contribution to the prediction of dependent variables if the significant value is less than 0.5 and vice versa. Inversely, problem of overlapping with other independent variables in the model causes the significant value to be greater than 0.5.

Lastly, the variables of job involvement, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, burnout, extraversion and conscientiousness above are made in unique and are statistically significant with significant value of 0.042, 0.005, 0.007, 0.000, 0.026 and 0.033 respectively, which contributes to the prediction of dependent variable, namely frequency of absenteeism.

The econometric model was used for diagnostic checking. The researcher has undergone the existence of multicollinearity problem by checking the correlation matrix of independent variables. Based on the result of correlation analysis for each pair of variables, there is no correlation for each pair of variables found to be higher than benchmark of 0.70. Therefore, it
can be concluded that there is no serious multicollinearity problem in the model. In addition to it, VIF (Variance Inflation Factor) has also taken into account, all of the calculated VIF are less than 10, which means that there is no serious multicollinearity problem in the model. As the correlation matrix between dependent variable and independent variables and the VIF for auxiliary models also provided the same results, so the researchers have sufficient evidence to conclude that there is no serious multicollinearity problem in the model. To check Normality Assumption, the standardized residual is checked. In order to make sure each of the error term is normally distributed, it is assumed that the estimated error term must be zero. Two methods, Mathematical and Graphical has been considered. Under Mathematical approach, the standardized residual through test of Normality is checked by Shapiro Wilks test. Under Graphical method, the histogram below is reasonable to be considered as normally distributed whereby the skewness of the distributed is asymmetric. Further, it is important to detect the heteroscedasticity because one of the assumptions in Classical Linear Regression Model (CLRM) states that the disturbances should have an equal variance which is homoscedasticity. If there is heteroscedasticity in the model, the variance of errors would not achieved at optimal level, t and F statistics values would be biased or wrong, p-value for independent variable would be biased or wrong, and become inefficient estimator. Fortunately, the residual points do not create systematic pattern, so it is indicated that the regression model contains homoscedasticity, hence regression model fulfills the requirements necessary that doesn’t violate absence of heteroscedasticity problem. Lastly, test of autocorrelation was conducted, the researcher calculate the Durbin Watson test statistic value, through SPSS which is 1.975. Further, by examining the Savin and White table, the tabulated value of a row for sample size 400 and the column labeled k=9, it is indicated that the printed bounds are $d_L = 1.795$ and $d_U = 1.876$. If the observed value of the test statistic is more than the tabulated lower bound, then the decision rule is cannot reject the null hypothesis of non-auto correlated errors in favor of the hypothesis of positive first-order autocorrelation. Since d (1.975) is more than $d_U$ (1.876), the null hypothesis is accepted. Thus, value of ‘2’ for the Durbin-Watson test indicates no autocorrelation.

In the Last Chapter titled ‘Summary of Findings, Conclusion and Suggestions’, the researcher has made every effort to present the conclusion of the study in a lucid manner. The researcher after making a detailed study of Causes of Absenteeism in Sample Units (Chapter 4) and Absenteeism Correlates (Chapter 5), and thereafter make an analysis of it, has proposed various recommendations and suggestions at the end of this chapter. The researcher gives leather industry specific suggestions and general suggestions. They are
Leather Industry Specific Suggestions

1. Systematic analysis to identify the problem of absenteeism should be started at the plant level, which apart from others, would involve the study of pattern and quantum of absence, the location and number of employees involved in absenteeism and the factors associated with absenteeism at plant/shop-floor level.

2. For effective control of absenteeism, the employees must necessarily be involved, as the real solution of the problem depends upon the joint acceptance of objectives by parties, viz., the employees and the management.

3. The attitude of the management towards absenteeism is of utmost importance. All too often one senses an atmosphere of resigned despair which does nothing to improve matters. Such an attitude can contribute little towards dealing effectively with the problem of absenteeism.

4. The efforts should be directed towards departments with high absence rates. Whenever absence is predominant, management action should be aimed towards alleviating the causes of it rather than towards suggestive correction of the problem. This may involve training of workers in multi-skills to make their work more varied and interesting and leading to lessening of desire to stay away from work.

5. There should be compulsory formal attendance policy. Establishing clearly worded policy statement and making it known to the concerned and also periodically reminding about it. It can give a long way in reducing the number of absences due to ignorance or misunderstanding of standards.

6. Proper maintenance and supply of information on absenteeism to appropriate levels in the organization is necessary as a control mechanism. A periodic statement, department-wise, of those who enjoy leave frequently, resulting into loss of wages, may be carefully scrutinized by the managers/supervisors.

7. Health Care programmes can definitely reduce time lost from work by preventing serious illness. These preventive health programmes are invaluable as an aid to morale of the workers and to their personal well-being; they can be regarded as indicative of management’s concern for the employees.

8. The Attendance Bonus scheme is one of the very common devices being introduced by several organizations for decreasing absenteeism. However, this scheme does not involve any competition for getting the bonus. It involves mere physical presence of an individual. Under Indian conditions it may be able to ensure the presence of the employees but not commensurate productivity. Therefore, in order to introduce a healthy element of competition
the individual bonus system has been modified by some firms in the form of introduction of group bonus plan.

9. Another point worthy of mentioning is that any form of action taken by management involves some cost. Therefore, it must be ensured that the benefits gained from the reduction of absence exceed this cost. In particular, care must be taken to prevent the suppression of absenteeism merely resulting in the emergence of some other form of non-productive behavior.

General Suggestion

1. The selection of employees on the basis of communal, linguistic and family considerations should be discouraged or avoided. The management should look for aptitude and ability in the prospective employees and should not easily yield to pressure or personal likes and dislikes.

2. The facilities of drinking water, canteens, lavatories, rest room, lighting and ventilation, need to be improved. Where any one of these facilities is not available, it should be provided. All these help in keeping the employees cheerful and increase productivity and the efficiency of operations throughout the plant.

3. The management should, pay reasonable wages and allowances, taking into account the capacity of the industry to pay, the level of wages prevailing in different firms in the same industry in the same area and in neighboring areas, the productivity of labour and the general effect of rising wages in neighboring industries. The allowances that may be paid to workers should include old age allowance, length-of-service allowance, position allowance, special job allowance, good attendance allowance, transportation allowance and housing allowance, so that the worker may have and know security of employment.

4. The management should recognize the needs of workers and offer them adequate and cheap housing facilities, free or subsidized food, free medical aid and transportation facilities to and from their residence, free educational facilities for their children, and other monetary and non-monetary benefits.

5. Since a majority of the workers are illiterate, bulletins and written notices, journals and booklets are not understood by them. Therefore timely illustrations and instructions, meeting and counseling, are called for. As for grievance settlement, the management should recognize that a delayed grievance may become a complicated case. A procedure for fair and prompt redressal of grievances is, therefore essential.

6. The management's strict attitude in granting leave and holidays, even when the need for them is genuine, tempts workers to go on E.S.I. leave, for under this scheme, they can have
56 days in a year on half pay. An effective way of dealing with absenteeism is to liberalize leave rules.

7. Safety at work can be maintained and accidents can be prevented if the management tries to eliminate such personal factors as negligence, overconfidence, carelessness, vanity, etc., and such material factors as unguarded machinery and explosives, defective equipment and hand tools. Job satisfaction and cordial relations between the workers and employers would help to eliminate most of the personal factors.

8. The supervisor should recognize that industrial work is a group task and cannot be properly done unless discipline is enforced and maintained. The problem of industrial discipline becomes serious when “the end is not accepted as necessary or desirable, when there is no common aim between the discipliners and the disciplined; and discipline then becomes a mere frustration of the human purpose, stunts and development of the human personality and embitters human relations, for it is then a denial of freedom to the individual.” Cordial relations between the supervisor and the workers are therefore essential for, without them, discipline cannot be maintained and productivity cannot be increased.

**Directions for Future Research**

Future studies could also adopt a more qualitative approach and different methodological stances in order to investigate the consequences of absenteeism from a more holistic perspective. The Study has certainly succeeded in bringing to light certain important factor, but it is hoped that further work may be focused on uncovered dimensions of this area. The present study is limited to the blue collar workers, it can be extended to other categories of staff so as to have a more comprehensive view of absentees in general.

Based on the results of the first part of this study, there can be further investigation to explore various other factors which causes absenteeism, by increasing the sample size. This gives more strength in the result’s validity. The role of the immediate manager/supervisor is carefully undertaken so as to determine their significant impact on absenteeism. Participation, Intervention and Influence of the manager/supervisor decreases the frequency of absenteeism in the industry.

Surprisingly, lot of available literature, to organisations by consultancies and survey organisations is not based on rigorous, academically credible research. Due to the excess of definitions of absenteeism, there is currently no real shared understanding of the connotation of absenteeism, just as there is equally little systematic knowledge about what really works in terms of raising levels of absences in organisations. There is therefore a real need for more in-depth investigation into the managing absenteeism at plant level in a widening range of
organizational settings, in order to advance both understanding and management practice. Further, research exploring the similarities and differences between absenteeism patterns should first seek to expand upon this study by examining more variables for both criterion-related and predictor-related validity evidence.

Finally, the results of the second phase of this study focused in explaining significant difference of frequency of absenteeism and constructs of organization and personality, hint towards other variables that should be explored as key factors for both organizational and personality. On the basis of Organizational Factors they are Job Scope, Group Size, Leadership, Team Work, Group Cohesiveness, Need Satisfaction, Job Enrichment and Job Enlargement etc. while on the basis of Personality they are Reserved/Outgoing, Less Intelligent/More Intelligent, Submissive/Self assertive, Sober/Carefree, Tough Minded/Tender Minded, Trusting/Suspicious, Placid/Apprehensive, Group Dependent/Self Sufficient etc.

It is hoped that conclusions of this research pave the way for several research areas and have the prospective of becoming a base for further research.