

09

A Study of Employee Absenteeism in the Apparel Industry

Upekha Tammita, B. M. D. Seedeve, D. G. T. S. Jayarathne, Aruna Welianga,
L. H. Kasun Madushanka

Abstract

Employee absenteeism is a common problem in the apparel sector in Sri Lanka. There are many research studies done at the organizational level. However, there are no proper studies done to reveal the real problem of the employee absenteeism in this sector. Therefore, the problem of study is: what are the sources of employee absenteeism in the apparel sector. Then, the objective of the study is to find out the sources of employee absenteeism in the apparel sector in Sri Lanka. 150 operational level employees were the sample of the study and sampling method was random sampling. The responses were selected from ten organizations and all organizations were either medium or large scale organizations. There were 36 questions relating to eighteen sources of employee absenteeism asked from the sample and primary data were analyzed by using univariate analysis techniques. According to the research findings, there are six factors do not affect the employee absenteeism while other factors such as job satisfaction, status, working conditions, working hours, ability to present different skills, illness, private life matters, marriage, leave policy, participation of decision making, and organizational policy factors which affect employee absenteeism.

Key words: Employee Absenteeism, Sources of absenteeism, Apparel industry

Introduction

It is a renowned fact that employees are the lifeblood of every organization. The better they are - the better qualified, trained, and managed, the more effective and profitable the organization will be. In that light, Human Resource Management can be defined as the efficient and effective utilization of human resource to achieve goals of an organization. (Opatha, 2009; Arachchige and Kottawatta, online) Therefore, HRM activities such as job design, job analysis, human resource planning, recruiting, selection, performance evaluation, compensation management all contribute to organizational success and long term survival and growth. The primary concern of HRM is to generate and retain an appropriate and contented workforce, which gives the maximum individual contribution to organizational success (Opatha, 2009). In order to achieve this, Opatha (2009) has introduced several objectives of HRM which include, getting and improving the employee commitment as one of these objectives. Hence, employee commitment is one of the primary dimensions of successful HRM.

Fink (1992) states that commitment develops through the process of identification in which a person experiences something or some idea as an extension of self. Therefore commitment to work is a crucial determinant of organizational success. One way of showing commitment to work by an employee is being present at the workplace to carry out scheduled work. Restated attendance is a manifestation of employees'

commitment. On the contrary, Absenteeism has been defined as non-attendance when an employee is scheduled to work (Price and Mueller, 1986). If not at least once, we all have been absent from work for one reason or another. Some are absent more than others, but when it takes place on a regular basis then absenteeism becomes a noticeable problem for that company. Hence, lack of faithfulness in coming to work or in other words absenteeism, shows lack of organizational commitment.

Furthermore, Wooden (1995) listed organizational commitment as one of the most important factors that impact on absence. Hence, we can come to a rational conclusion that absenteeism can be used as a yard stick to measure employees' commitment to the organization. Directing our focus on the relationship between employee commitment and absenteeism in the apparel industry, it is evident that the primary input in apparel industry is labour. Therefore, quality and quantity of labour directly influence the organizations' efficiency, effectiveness and productivity. Hence, special attention should be given to quality and quantity of labour when formulating and implementing HRM policies and procedures.

Narrowing down to Sri Lankan garment industry, Kalegama and Wijayasiri (2004) state, the garment industry in Sri Lanka had its origins in the mid-1960s on a very modest scale, run primarily by the private sector with almost all of the garments produced for the domestic market. There were hardly any exports during this period with a large share of the industry in the hands of few companies. Since the importation of fabrics was either banned or restricted, the garment industry was mainly fed by locally produced textiles. Manufacturing for export began in the mid-1970s with about 5-6 factories in operation; by 1977, export earnings recorded stood at only about US\$ 10 million. Available data suggest that there are currently about 860-890 firms in operation in the garment industry.

Moreover, it was found that one of the most significant factors affecting the competitiveness of the Sri Lankan garment industry is low productivity. The reasons for low productivity according to Kelagama and Epaarachchi (2003) are as follows:

- Poor Working Conditions
- Poor Incentives for Workers
- High Labour Turnover and Absenteeism
- Inadequate Human Resource Development
- Strained Employer-Employee Dialogue
- Restrictive Labour Regulations
- Low Investment in Technology
- Slow Turn-Around Time
- No Garment Factory Standardization
- Lack of Professionalism in the Industry

According to this study, it is clear that high labour turnover and absenteeism is one of the major factors for low productivity in the Sri Lankan apparel industry. Furthermore, the average rate of monthly absenteeism amongst labour in the garment industry is approximately 7.4 per cent (Garment Gazette, June 1999). In addition, Weerakoon and

Thennakoon (2006) states, young female workers have a tendency to leave the apparel industry after a short period of time largely due to long working hours, harsh working conditions and schedules, uncomfortable and low quality living arrangements.

In conclusion, the garment industry today has become the single largest industrial employer in Sri Lanka and a significant contributor to foreign exchange earnings (Weerakoon and Thennakoon, 2006). The pressing problem faced by the apparel industry today, is to improve its productivity in order to face the global competition successfully. Although, employee absenteeism is identified as a crucial factor that hinders labour productivity in the Sri Lankan apparel industry, no formal research has been carried out so far to address this critical issue. Hence, this research is primarily focused on analyzing the employee absenteeism in the Sri Lankan apparel industry.

Problem of the Study

Employee absenteeism is common in all companies in all industries. However, in some companies or in some industries there can be huge absenteeism. There may be different factors or backgrounds causing this huge absenteeism rate. Joo & Garman (1998a; 1998b), Leigh (1991), Rogers & Herting (1993), Monday, Porter & Steers (1982), Bycio, 1992), Kinnear (2006), Crous (2005), Mathis (1983) indicate different sources for employee absenteeism. However, there are few studies done by different researchers relating to the employee absenteeism. In addition to that, there are many studies that were done at the company levels. As a whole, there is a sound theoretical and empirical knowledge gap about the sources of employee absenteeism. Therefore, the problem of the study is: what are the significant factors which affect the employee absenteeism in the Sri Lankan apparel industry. Then, the objective of the study is to find out the significant factors of employee absenteeism in apparel industry in Sri Lanka.

Literature Review

Defining Absenteeism

Absenteeism is a widely discussed term which has been broadly and specifically defined by many academics. According to Kinnear (2006), the term “absenteeism” refers to unscheduled and unapproved absences from the workplace. Absenteeism falls into two distinct categories: “innocent” and “culpable”. Innocent absenteeism also known as non-culpable absenteeism refers to bona fide health issues in which the employee has a genuine illness/injury or medical condition, which is seen to be beyond his/her control and subsequently prevents him/her from attending work. Culpable absenteeism refers to absenteeism in which the employee is absent from work for no acceptable reason. These kinds of absences are characterized by absences without authorized leave and include frequent lateness and/or early leaving.

Crous, 2005 states, according to Griffin et al. (1998) Absenteeism is any failure to report for, or remain at, work as scheduled, regardless of the reason. Involuntary absence is caused by factors beyond the control of the employee. Voluntary absence is the employee’s deliberate choice which can be measured by the frequency index - the number of absences in a specific period (Porteous, 1997). Thus one must differentiate between two types of absence, i.e. involuntary and voluntary absence.

Absenteeism is the failure to report to scheduled work (Schappi, 1988). According to Sikorki (2001) absenteeism is defined as not being present or attending, missing, existing, lacking, inattentive and/or being pre-occupied. Absenteeism does not include annual leave, maternity leave, and authorized absences such as public duty, compassionate leave, and in some cases long term illness. It also refers to uncertified sick leave as well as any other unauthorized period of absences. According to Johns (1994) an absence refers to the time an employee is not on the job during scheduled working hours or is granted a leave of absence or holiday or vacation time. Hence, absenteeism is costly to employers and can be demoralizing for those employees who attend work faithfully (Kinnear, 2006)

Determinants of Absenteeism

Some of the identified determinants of absenteeism are employee satisfaction, employee participation in management systems (e.g., profit sharing ownership schemes), health status, family factors (e.g., being a mother with small children), job performance, age, organizational tenure, perceptions of interactional justice, and worker perception of the absence norm. Studies also show one of the most significant reasons for absenteeism is stress (Joo & Garman, 1998a; 1998b). Joo and Garman (1998a; 1998b) further state, identifying the relationship between financial wellness and absenteeism can help employers better understand the determinants of employee absenteeism.

Leigh (1991) found statistically significant predictors of absenteeism using a national sample. In the model, Leigh (1991) included four categories of independent variables: demographic variables, health variables, aspects of the job, and economic incentives. The significant determinants included health variables (e.g., being overweight, complaining of insomnia, and hazardous working conditions), job characteristics (e.g., inflexible hours), and personal variables (e.g., being a mother with small children). Among the significant variables, dangerous working conditions had the strongest relationship with absenteeism.

In another study, Rogers and Herting (1993) found a negative relationship between education and absenteeism, demonstrating that those who had less education had more absences than those with a higher level of education. They also found a significant relationship between employee tenure and absenteeism.

Absenteeism is also affected by employee satisfaction. Mowday, Porter, & Steers (1982) found a negative relationship between satisfaction with pay and absenteeism, suggesting that those workers earning lower incomes had more absences than people making higher incomes. Job performance is related to absenteeism, too (Bycio, 1992), as workers with low performance ratings from their supervisors tend to have more absences than other workers. Bycio () also found that absenteeism is more likely to follow poor job performance than the reverse situation.

One school of thought identifies the following five primary factors affecting employees' motivation to come to work - work-related attitudes (including job satisfaction), economic and labour market factors (absenteeism is typically lower in

poorer economic times), organizational policies and rules regarding absenteeism, personal and idiosyncratic factors (Kinnear, 2006).

According Crous (2005) causes or determinants of absenteeism are; job satisfaction, unmet expectations, job – person match, organizational culture, personality, ill health, depression, substance abuse, stress, social influence.

Methods

The objective of the study is to find out the significant factors of employee absenteeism in apparel sector in Sri Lanka. Therefore, the survey method was used to collect the primary data. The sample of the study was drawn from the apparel industry and it was limited to 150 operational level workers. The study sample was consisted of ten apparel companies which are medium and large scales. Eighteen factors were asked from the sample and all questions were asked with five point scales. The scales were labeled as strongly agree to strongly disagree with the values of 5 to 1 respectively. Descriptive statistics such as mean, standard deviations, skewness and kurtosis were used to analysis the data. The decision rules are given below.

Decision rules for positive statements

- Mean value > 3.67 – 5.00: Significant factor for employee absenteeism
- Mean value = 2.34 – 3.66: Averagely significant factor for employee absenteeism
- Mean value < 1.00 – 2.33: Less significant factor for employee absenteeism

Decision rules for negative statements

- Mean value < 1.00 – 2.33: Significant factor for employee absenteeism
- Mean value = 2.34 – 3.66: Averagely significant factor for employee absenteeism
- Mean value > 3.67 – 5.00: Less significant factor for employee absenteeism

Empirical Data

Eighteen factors of employee absenteeism were asked from the selected sample and the responses were analyzed using univariate analysis. Table No 01 indicates the sample responses of the effect of job satisfaction of employee absenteeism.

Table 01: The effect of job satisfaction on employee absenteeism

N	Valid	150
	Missing	0
Mean		3.147
Median		4.000
Mode		4.0
Standard deviation		.4576
Skewness		-.284
Std. Error of Skewness		.277
Kurtosis		-1.123
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.548

The negative questions were asked to measure the effect of job satisfaction on employee absenteeism. According to the table No 01, the mean value is 3.147 and standard deviation of the mean value is 0.4576. Then it concludes that the job satisfaction is averagely a significant factor to employee absenteeism.

Table No 02 illustrates the effect of recognized status of employee in the organization on employee absenteeism.

Table 02: The effect of recognized status of employee in the organization on employee absenteeism

N	Valid	150
	Missing	0
Mean		2.6933
Median		2.0000
Mode		2.00
Standard deviation		.4329
Skewness		.678
Std. Error of Skewness		.277
Kurtosis		-.596
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.548

The negative questions of effect of recognized status of employee in the organization on employee absenteeism were asked. According to the table No 02, the mean value is 2.6933 and standard deviation is 0.4329. The, it concludes that the effect of recognized status of employee in the organization on employee absenteeism is averagely significant.

Table No 03 presents the effect of working condition on employee absenteeism.

Table 03: The effect of working condition on employee absenteeism

N	Valid	150
	Missing	0
Mean		2.2800
Median		2.0000
Mode		2.00
Standard deviation		.3729
Skewness		.369
Std. Error of Skewness		.277
Kurtosis		-.717
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.548

The positive questions of the effect of working condition on employee absenteeism were asked and the mean value for the answers is 2.2800 (table No 03). The standard deviation for the mean value is 0.3729. Then, the conclusion of the statistical data is

that the effect of working condition on employee absenteeism is averagely a significant factor.

The effect of target of the given time on employee absenteeism is presented in the table No 04.

Table 04: The effect of targets of the given time on employee absenteeism

N	Valid	150
	Missing	0
Mean		2.3467
Median		2.0000
Standard deviation		.4529
Mode		2.00
Skewness		.362
Std. Error of Skewness		.277
Kurtosis		.122
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.548

The positive questions were asked to measure the effect of targets of given time on employee absenteeism. There is averagely significant or less significant of targets of the given time on employee absenteeism. The mean value is 2.3467 and standard deviation is 0.4529 (table No 04).

Table No 05 illustrates the effect of working hours on employee absenteeism

Table 05: The effect of working hours on employee absenteeism

N	Valid	150
	Missing	0
Mean		2.5867
Median		2.0000
Mode		2.00
Standard deviation		.3984
Skewness		.591
Std. Error of Skewness		.277
Kurtosis		-.509
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.548

The questions asked from the sample responses were negative in nature. According to the table No 05, the mean value and standard deviation of the responses are 2.5867 and 0.3984 respectively. Then, statistical data reveal that the factor of working hours is averagely significant.

Table No 06 illustrates the effect of supervisor support on employee absenteeism.

Table 06: The effect of supervisor support on employee absenteeism

N	Valid	150
	Missing	0
Mean		2.2400
Median		2.0000
Mode		2.00
Standard deviation		.7943
Skewness		.954
Std. Error of Skewness		.277
Kurtosis		1.063
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.548

The positive questions for the effect of supervisor on employee absenteeism were asked. The mean value, according to the table No 06, is 2.2400 and standard deviation is 0.7943. Then, it reveals that it is a less significant factor or moderately significant factor.

The effect of work overload on employee absenteeism is illustrated in the table No 07.

Table 07: The effect of work overload on employee absenteeism

N	Valid	150
	Missing	0
Mean		2.7067
Median		2.0000
Mode		2.00
Standard deviation		.3243
Skewness		.413
Std. Error of Skewness		.277
Kurtosis		-1.018
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.548

There were negative questions asked to measure the effect of work overload on employee absenteeism. According to the responses of the sample given in table No 07 (mean value – 2.7067 and standard deviation – 0.3243), effect of work overload on absenteeism is a less significant factor.

Table No 08 presents the effect of different skills presented on employee absenteeism.

Table 08: The effect of different skills presented on employee absenteeism

N	Valid	150
	Missing	0
Mean		2.7733
Median		3.0000
Mode		3.00
Standard deviation		.3573
Skewness		.089
Std. Error of Skewness		.277
Kurtosis		-.436
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.548

The positive questions were asked to measure the effect of different skills presented on the employee absenteeism. The mean value is 2.7733 and standard deviation is 0.3573 (table No 08). Then this factor becomes an averagely significant factor for the employee absenteeism.

Table No 09 presents the effect of illnesses on repeated work of employees on employee absenteeism.

Table 09: The effect of illnesses on repeated work of employees on employee absenteeism

N	Valid	150
	Missing	0
Mean		3.1067
Median		3.0000
Mode		3.00
Standard deviation		.6453
Skewness		-.282
Std. Error of Skewness		.277
Kurtosis		-.493
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.548

The negative questions were asked to measure the effect of illnesses on employee absenteeism. Table No 09 indicates the mean value of sample responses as 3.1067 and standard deviation as 0.6453. Then, it concludes that effect of illness on repeated works of employees on absenteeism is averagely significant.

The effect of private life matters on employee absenteeism is presented in the table No 10.

Table 10: The effect of private life matters on employee absenteeism

N	Valid	150
	Missing	0
Mean		2.4800
Median		2.0000
Mode		2.00
Standard deviation		.1753
Skewness		.442
Std. Error of Skewness		.277
Kurtosis		-.607
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.548

The positive questions were asked to measure the effect of private life matters on employee absenteeism. According to the table No 10, mean value for the sample responses is 2.4800 and standard deviation of the mean value is 0.1753. Then, it reveals that the effect of private life matters on employee absenteeism is averagely significant.

Table No 11 illustrates the effect of age of the workers on employee absenteeism.

Table 11: The effect of age of workers on employee absenteeism

N	Valid	150
	Missing	0
Mean		2.0933
Median		2.0000
Mode		2.00
Standard deviation		.8123
Skewness		.714
Std. Error of Skewness		.277
Kurtosis		1.104
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.548

The positive questions were asked to measure the effect of age of workers on employee absenteeism. The age of workers on employee absenteeism is less significant. The mean value is 2.0933 (table No 11) and standard deviation is 0.8123.

Table No 12 depicts the effect of marriage of employee on employee absenteeism.

Table 12: The effect of employee marriage on employee absenteeism

N	Valid	150
	Missing	0
Mean		2.8533
Median		3.0000
Mode		4.00
Standard deviation		.6423
Skewness		-.188
Std. Error of Skewness		.277
Kurtosis		-1.297
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.548

The negative questions were asked to measure the effect of employee marriage on employee absenteeism. The table No 12 indicates that employee marriage is an averagely significant factor to determine the absenteeism of employee.

Table No 13 illustrates the effect of salary on employee absenteeism.

Table 13: The effect of salary on employee absenteeism

N	Valid	150
	Missing	0
Mean		2.0000
Median		2.0000
Mode		2.00
Standard deviation		.1428
Skewness		1.180
Std. Error of Skewness		.277
Kurtosis		.738
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.548

The positive questions were asked to measure the effect of salary on employee absenteeism. The mean value for the sample is 2.000 and standard deviation is 0.1428. Then the conclusion of statistical data is that effect of salary is a less significant factor to determine employee absenteeism.

The effect of organizational leave policy on employee absenteeism is given in table No 14.

Table 14: The effect of organizational leave policy on employee absenteeism

N	Valid	150
	Missing	0
Mean		3.1333
Median		3.0000
Mode		4.00
Standard deviation		.5128
Skewness		-.477
Std. Error of Skewness		.277
Kurtosis		-.804
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.548

The negative questions were asked to measure the effect of organizational leave policy on employee absenteeism. According to the table No 14, the mean value of the data is 3.1333 and standard deviation is 0.5128. Then the conclusion is that organizational leave policy is an averagely significant factor to the employee absenteeism.

Table No 15 presents the effect of opportunity of participation in decision making on employee absenteeism.

Table 15: The effect of opportunity of participation in decision making on employee absenteeism

N	Valid	150
	Missing	0
Mean		2.5867
Median		3.0000
Mode		3.00
Standard deviation		.5838
Skewness		.004
Std. Error of Skewness		.277
Kurtosis		-.716
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.548

The positive questions were asked to measure the effect of opportunity of participation to decision making on employee absenteeism. According to the table no 15, mean value and standard deviation indicate that opportunity of participation in decision making on employee absenteeism is averagely significant.

The table No 16 illustrates the effect of incentives on employee absenteeism

Table 16: The effect of incentives on employee absenteeism

N	Valid	150
	Missing	0
Mean		2.2533
Median		2.0000
Mode		2.00
Standard deviation		.9658
Skewness		1.161
Std. Error of Skewness		.277
Kurtosis		1.353
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.548

There were positive questions asked to measure the effect of employee incentives on employee absenteeism. According to the mean value (2.2533) and standard deviation (0.9658) on the table No 16, the incentive is a less significant factor to determine employee absenteeism.

Table No 17 illustrates the effect of organizational policies, rules and regulations on employee absenteeism.

Table 17: The effect of organizational policies, rules and procedures of employee absenteeism

N	Valid	150
	Missing	0
Mean		3.2267
Median		4.0000
Mode		4.00
Standard deviation		.4358
Skewness		-.404
Std. Error of Skewness		.277
Kurtosis		-.781
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.548

The negative questions were asked to measure the effect of organizational policies, rules and procedures on employee absenteeism. According to the table No 17, the conclusion can be drawn on the mean value (3.2267) and standard deviation as organizational policy, rules and procedures become an averagely significant factor to determine employee absenteeism.

The effect of employee job fit on employee absenteeism is depicted on table No 18.

Table 18: The effect of employee job fit on employee absenteeism

N	Valid	150
	Missing	0
Mean		2.2267
Median		2.0000
Mode		2.00
Standard deviation		.4128
Skewness		.479
Std. Error of Skewness		.277
Kurtosis		-.012
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.548

The positive questions were asked to measure the effect of employee job fit on employee absenteeism. According to the mean value and standard deviation of the data on table No 18, job fit is a less significant factor to employee absenteeism.

Research Findings

Major research findings can be summarized as below.

1. The job satisfaction of employee is an averagely significant factor on employee absenteeism.
2. The recognized status of employee in the organization is an averagely significant factor on employee absenteeism.
3. The working condition is an averagely significant factor on employee absenteeism.
4. The target of the given time is either an average or less significant factor on employee absenteeism.
5. The working hours are an averagely significant factor on employee absenteeism.
6. The supervisor support is a less significant factor on employee absenteeism.
7. The work overload is a less significant factor on employee absenteeism.
8. The different skill presented is an averagely significant factor on employee absenteeism.
9. The illness on repeated work is averagely significant factor on employee absenteeism.
10. The private life matter is an averagely significant factor on employee absenteeism.
11. The age of workers is a less significant factor on employee absenteeism.
12. The employee marriage is averagely significant factor on employee absenteeism.
13. The salary of employee is a less significant factor on employee absenteeism.
14. The organizational leave policy is an averagely significant factor on employee absenteeism.
15. The opportunity of participation in decision making is an averagely significant factor on employee absenteeism.
16. The incentive of employees is a less significant factor on employee absenteeism.

17. The organizational policy, rules and procedures of organization are an averagely significant factors on employee absenteeism.
18. The employee job fit is a less significant factor on employee absenteeism.

Conclusion and Recommendation

There are six factors which do not affect to the employee absenteeism. Those factors are supervisor support, work overload, age of worker, salary, incentives and employee job fit. Among these factors, salary and incentives are two special factors. Usually these two factors are most recognized factors to motivate employees in Sri Lanka. In addition to above six factors targets of the given time period becomes a less significant factor on employee absenteeism. All other variables are averagely affecting factors on employee absenteeism. There is no any significant factor among these eighteen factors considered by the researchers.

However, according to the research findings, there are many factors which are averagely significant factors on employee absenteeism. Therefore organizations in the apparel industry should consider to minimize the effect of those factors on employee absenteeism. Clear policy of disciplinary actions and addressing to absenteeism are two factors which should be considered by any organization to minimize the employee absenteeism (Contributor, 2005). Hildebrand pointed out few guidelines to minimize the excessive employee absenteeism, which are 1) develop an appropriate attendance policy, 2) communicate clear expectations, 3) apply company policy consistently, 4) handle attendance issues properly (Hildebrand, online). Thirty three strategies were introduced to minimize the employee absenteeism by Kumar (online), which are;

- a. High collaborative culture
- b. Be aware of problems that may affect employee attendance or performance
- c. Develop open communication between managers, supervisors and employees.
- d. Employees are encouraged to voice their concerns so their perceptions of the work place are clear and can be dealt with.
- e. Cooperation with union representatives can be very helpful in attendance management and should be encouraged
- f. Regularly scheduled department meetings are an excellent way not only to hear employee perceptions and concerns but also to communicate organizational goals
- g. An employee's relationship with their supervisor can greatly influence their feelings about their work, their coworkers and thus their attendance at work
- h. More openness and transparency on the part of management.
- i. Encourage risk taking and experimentation among members.
- j. Make each employee aware that they are a valued member of the "team", that they play an important role in your organization and that their attendance is critical
- k. Hold regular meetings, keep your staff informed and involved
- l. Know your employees; without prying show an interest in their personal lives
- m. Familiarize with community programs which you can recommend to an employee if he/she has a need for assistance (i.e. marital or financial counseling)
- n. Awareness, commitment and involvement by all levels of staff

- o. Match the attendance records during a period of "high" workload to a period of "normal" workload
- p. Bonus for unused sick leave.
- q. Official warnings.
- r. Develop a comprehensive and collaborative continuous improvement program throughout the department.
- s. Counsel individual employees. Discuss with all employees problems of unjustifiable time off.
- t. Bonus work (e.g. Saturday) should not be available to any worker who has been absent during the week.
- u. Introduce an incentive scheme to reward those who don't have an absent day. This is measured quarterly and annually.
- v. Greater attention by supervisors and more accountability of operations management and other management has improved sick leave.
- w. Front line management will be held accountable for attendance management performance.
- x. A management structure be engineered to identify and execute objectives relating to absence prevention, disability management and attendance control.
- y. Effective training and development program.
- z. Effective career planning And development program.
- aa. Each worksite should develop and maintain an attendance management policy.
- bb. Employers should track attendance and assign costs based on reliable data.
- cc. The Attendance Management Team should be given the ability to develop complex case management strategies and aggressively intervene where appropriate.
- dd. Employees should be encouraged to give as much notice as possible for anticipated absences. Absent employees should be requested to keep contact with their employer.
- ee. The employer should be informed of any changes in the employee's health status.
- ff. Employees should be called if they are not keeping contact with the employer. The purpose is to show concern and desire for the employee to regain a healthy status and return to work.
- gg. In addition to individual counseling make use of family counseling methods.

To minimize employee absenteeism in this sector, management of the organization should implement the above strategies individually or/and as an industry.

References

1. Arachchige, B. J. H. and Kottawatta, K. H. H. (online). Human Resource Management. e-Student Sri Lanka, Department of Business Administration, University of Sri Jayewardenepura. Online <http://estudentsrilanka.org/business_studies/hehrm/hrm_01_05/hehrm0101.htm> [10/02/2010].
2. Bycio, P. (1992). Job performance and absenteeism: A review and meta-analysis. *Human Relations*, 45, 193-228.

3. Contributor, G. (2005). Managing excessive absenteeism. http://articles.techrepublic.com.com/5100-22_11-5744256.html. [10/02/2010].
4. Crous, F. (2005). Utilising employee assistance programme to reduce absenteeism in the workplace. University of Johannesburg.
5. Fink, S.L. (1992). High Commitment Workplaces, Quorum Books, New York, NY.
6. Hildebrand, D. S. Managing poor attendance: dealing with excessive absenteeism and tardiness. (online). <http://www.officearrow.com/hr-and-benefits/managing-poor-attendance-dealing-with-excessive-absenteeism-and-tardiness-oaiur-845/view.html> [02/10/2010].
7. Johns, G. (2003). How Methodological Diversity has Improved our Understanding of Absenteeism from Work. *Human Resource Management Review*, 13, 157-184.
8. Joo, S. & Garman, E. T. (1998a). The potential effects of workplace financial education based on the relationship between personal financial wellness and worker job productivity. In E. T. Garman, S. Joo, I. E. Leech, & D. C. Bagwell (Eds.), *Personal Finances and Worker Productivity, Proceedings of the Personal Finance Employee Education Best Practices and Collaborations Conference*, Roanoke, VA, 2(1), 163-174.
9. Joo, S. & Garman, E. T. (1998b). Personal financial wellness may be the missing factor in understanding and reducing worker absenteeism. In E. T. Garman, P. L. Camp, D. C. Bagwell, & J. Kim (Eds.), *Personal Finances and Worker Productivity, Proceedings of the Personal Finance Employee Education Best Practices and Collaborations Conference*, Roanoke, VA, 2(2), 172-182.
10. Kelegama, S & Wijayasiri, J (2004). "Overview of the garment Industry in Sri Lanka", Chapter 2 in Kelegama. S (ed), *Ready-Made Garment Industry in Sri Lanka: Facing the Global Challenge*, Institute of Policy Study, Sri Lanka.
11. Kumar, D. M. (online). Managing strategies to curb absenteeism. http://www.indianmba.com/Faculty_Column/FC239/fc239.html [02/10/2010].
12. Leigh, J. Paul. (1991). Employee and job attributes as predictors of absenteeism in a national sample of workers: The importance of health and dangerous working conditions
13. Mowday, R. T., Porter, L. W., & Steers, R. M. (1982). *Employee-Organization Linkages: The Psychology of Commitment, Absenteeism, and Turnover*. New York: Academic Press.
14. Opatha, H H D N P (2009). *Human Resource Management*. Author: Publish.
15. Price, J.L., Mueller, C.W. (1981). *Professional Turnover: The Case of Nurses*, SP Medical and Scientific, New York, NY.,
16. Rogers, R. E. & Herting, S. R. (1993). Patterns of absenteeism among government employees. *Public Personnel Management*, 22, 215-229.
17. Saman Kelegama and Roshen Epaarachchi UNRISD Project on Poverty Reduction and Policy Regimes. Country Paper: Development Strategies, Welfare Regime and Poverty Reduction in Sri Lanka 2008 United Nations Research Institute for Social Development (UNRISD).
18. Schappi, J. V. (1998). *Improving job attendance: Washington D. C.*. The Bureau of National Affairs, Inc.

19. Social Science & Medicine
Volume 33, Issue 2, 1991, Pages 127-137.
20. Weerakoon, Dushni and Thennakoon, Jayanthi (2006). The South Asian Free Trade Agreement journal of south Asian development
<http://sad.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/3/1/135>.