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Abstract: Evolution keeps complicating the universe by adding new phenomena that have new properties and new forces and that are regulated by new methodical laws. The principle thesis of the Sociology of knowledge is that there are modes of reflection which cannot be adequately understood as long as their social origins are obscured. It is indeed true that only an individual is capable of thinking. There is no such physical entity as a group mind which thinks over and above the heads of individuals, or whose ideas the individual rarely reproduces. Nonetheless, it would be false to deduce that all the ideas and sentiments which stimulate an individual have their origins in him also, and can be passably explained exclusively on the foundation of his understanding. As Albert Einstein and most experts have examined with care the methodological foundations of methodical knowledge clearly recognize, the belief in an objective, public World with methodical objects in it the same for all observers, is a theoretically inferred, not a purely empirically given knowledge (Northrop;1948). Assumption of the common World arises out of human talk. Notion of an objective World is based on the naive and massive everyday assumption that there is a World which, despite the variety of view points and circumstances, we nevertheless think we hold in common. Sociological theory must be psychologically honest is not to provide a paean to methodological individualism, but it does suggest the benefit to Sociology of thinking more carefully about the place of individuals within its theories. Sociologists are known for their emphasis on the 'emergence' and 'irreducibility' of social phenomena, and their skepticism toward the 'reductionist' explanations.
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I. INTRODUCTION

All that can be rationally proposed is to recognize character of positivity in social as in all other Science, and to ascertain chief bases on which it is founded. The scientific character of future Sociology is thus indicated. Further, it is the exclusive property of positive principle to recognize fundamental law of continuous human development, representing existing evolution as necessary result of gradual series of former transformations. It is usual before proceeding to systematic presentation to give sketch of its literature. A bibliographical introduction informs how much effort has been expended, how it has progressed and what stage of development it has reached. If sketch is critical, and it can hardly fail to be so, the introduction gives a comprehensive view. But it involves disadvantages of a technical nature. If each system should be described in detail, introductory sketch would become narration.

The use of formal models to describe, explain, and predict phenomena is as old as is Science, and, indeed, many would consider formal modeling to be an essential ingredient of scientific activity. In contrast, thinking formally about models is a more recent phenomenon, dating back to the late 19th Century. Findings from behavioural inherent research have profound implications for the study of organisational behaviour. The individualistic focus of psychology is in general much more compatible with evolutionary analyses than is anthropology’s emphasis on group-level entities. Behavioural-inherent research seldom finds evidence that more than half of the variance for complex behavioural traits is due to inherent differences among individuals. What can Philosophers of Science gain by shifting their focus from established ‘knowledge’ to prospective analysis of ongoing scientific ‘practice’? Can pragmatic understanding of Science ‘as research’ account for objective status of laws, models and theories? And does notion of conceptual articulation through experimental systems provide a valid alternative to representation list of Science?

Evolutionary and behaviour inherent explanations are commonly lumped together as ‘biological explanations of behaviour.’ With little exception, what we call neurosocionomics now is, on the one hand, an awful extravagance of ideological debates, a forest of words, which go by the name of conjecture and, on the other, a miscellany of findings uninformed by conjecture and exuding such quantity of trivia that even sociologists find the whole mortifying. We are in a deep crisis. If human societies are ultimately comprised of individual humans and their behaviour, and if human behaviours are ultimately controlled by human brains, and if the human brain is ultimately just another human organ, and if complex human organs ultimately acquired their particular configuration and function through natural selection, then shouldn’t we look to natural selection to provide ultimate explanations about the character of human societies? The general failure of sociologists to understand, much less accept, an evolutionary perspective on human behaviour transcends mere ignorance and ideological bias, although it incorporates a good deal of both. It also includes a general
anthropocentric discomfort with evolutionary thinking, a self-interested resistance to self-understanding, and a trained sociological incapacity to accept the fundamental canons of scientific conjecture construction. ‘Anthropocentric’ here is used to mean an exclusive interest in human beings.

We critically examine contemporary biological models of individual organisational behavior. We demonstrate how approaches to biology in organisational Sciences assume that biological systems are simultaneously causal and essentially static; that genotypes exert constant effects. In contrast, we present a sociogenomic approach to organisational research, which could provide a meta-theoretical framework for understanding organisational behavior. Sociogenomics is an interactionist approach that derives power from its ability to explain how genes and environment operate. This leads to a conception of genetic and environmental effects that is fundamentally dynamic, rather than the static view of classical biometric approaches. We review biometric research within organisational behavior, and contrast these interpretations with a sociogenomic view. We provide a review of gene expression mechanisms that help explain the dynamism observed in individual organisational behavior, particularly factors associated with gene expression in the brain.

Theories and models of human (absenteeism) behaviour emanate from all disciplines of social Sciences. What is it isn't the problem? What is distinctive about it? Where is it isn't the problem? Who / what do / doesn't the problem involve? When did or when / didn't or when doesn't it occur? What is the same when the problem occurs? What is different when the problem occurs? What is the extent of the problem? Is the problem getting bigger / getting smaller? What is distinctive about its change in size? Can this objective be divided into several sub-goals? Is this objective the ultimate goal in solving the problem? Is achieving this objective simply a route to achieving another objective? Are there other related objectives? Can this obstacle be sub-divided? Does this obstacle really prevent me reaching this objective? Are there other related obstacles? Does this obstacle prevent me reaching other objectives? Does this definition take account of the needs of others who are involved or who may be affected?

Evidence suggests that discursive, elaborative processes are a vital element in behaviour change. Indeed, in many ways disciplinary boundaries simply serve to demarcate the types and contexts of human (absenteeism) behaviour in which scholars are interested, how (absenteeism) behaviour is defined, and the methods via which it may be studied. Beyond a certain degree of complexity, it becomes virtually impossible to establish meaningful correlations between variables or to identify causal influences on choice. More complex models may aid conceptual understanding but be poorly structured for empirical quantification of attitudes or intentions. Less complex models may aid in empirical quantification but hinder conceptual understanding by omitting key variables or relationships between key variables’. In this sense, attempting a comprehensive review of theories of (absenteeism) behaviour would not be possible. Having said this, attempts have been made to develop theories and models of human (absenteeism) behaviour which transcend specific contexts. These attempts to isolate the key controlling factors, processes or causes of (absenteeism) behaviour, and most originate from within psychology (social psychology) and Sociology.

What happens when we make explicit the mechanisms that are implicit in organisational research? What does the field already know? Social mechanisms are theoretical constructs, but they are often implicit. Sociologists may be able to contribute importantly to explicating the sociality of cognition. Neurosoconomics claim to scientific status can no longer be upheld primarily through a façade of quantitative methodology. It must be anchored in a theoretical paradigm that satisfies scientific canons. Such a theoretical paradigm sociologically signally failed to produce in over a Century of self-conscious existence. The main reason for that failure is that neurosoconomics turned its back on the conjecture that was overwhelmingly successful in explaining change and variation in life forms on this planet: evolution by natural selection. If neurosoconomics fails to join the methodical mainstream, it may survive for another Century as a scholastic discipline, but it will never be taken critically as a Science.

II. NEURO - PERSPECTIVES

The application of neurosocnomics to management is a nascent field but one that promises to enrich our fundamental understanding about our working lives. In that context, it is vital to engage in progressive, and informed, debates about conjecture, method and applications to practice. For almost a decade, a small but growing body of researchers has sought to address a singular research question, with implications for management scholars across the globe; namely, what benefit can an understanding of the human brain have for the Sociology and practice of management? As research in this area has progressed it has become more and more obvious that robust answers to this question need the input of a wide panel of experts from across both organisational Sociology and mainstream cognitive neurosocnomics. To ensure that the management scholar is aware of the distinct approaches available it is important to discuss the differences and similarities in the various theoretical positions. However, it must be understood that a comparative discussion of Becker et al.’s (2011) organisational neurosocnomics (ON), social cognitive neurosocnomics (SCN), and organisational
cognitive neurosociology (OCN) should not be implicit as merely semantic, nor as simply neologistic fetishism. Neither field alone possesses the theoretical, methodological, or practical tools necessary to fully address the scientific problems at hand. Researchers strongly share Becker et al.’s (2011) sense of excitement about the prospective for neuroscientific advances to inform major advances in organisational sociologies, while also recognizing that even well-established cognitive Sociology can offer major insight into contemporary organisational conjecture. In fact, Researchers go further than Becker (2011), to argue that without the appropriate application of cognitive neurosociology, organisational Sociology will find it far more difficult to advance at the same rapid rate that it has over the last Century.

Understanding how the brain responds to specific motivators will allow a fresh look at motivation theories. A neuroscience perspective on motivation can add an important and powerful perspective. By understanding how the human brain works to motivate Soldier, we can start to think about how to enhance motivation. The goal of the organisation is to minimise engagement of the brain’s aversive system and attempt to best engage the motivational system. So how can we take this neuroscientific information and help organisations? Researchers still need to produce the mechanism by which conditions, certain arrangements of micro situations, motivate human actors to behave in certain ways. This mechanism should explain both why they behave as they do in specific situations and why they maintain certain dispersions in micro behaviours among themselves, across time and space, thereby making up the macro patterns of social configuration. Wilson presented sociobiology as an ongoing project to unify both the work of different disciplines and studies of a diverse array of different social species. Wilson proposed that the social behaviour and organisation of different species were a function of various dimensions of their population demographics and evolutionary ecology. Wilson proposed that if such a framework was developed, it also could be used to explain many aspects of Soldier social organisation. He argued that the social Sciences could be placed on a more secure foundation by studying Soldier beings with the same approach that had worked for studying the social behaviour of other animals. By treating humans as simply as special case of the same fundamental dynamics that had already been applied to other species, Wilson claimed that sociobiology held the promise of bringing many estranged branches of scholarship underneath the umbrella of the natural Sciences.

Related contentions are that sociobiology’s supposed ‘biological determinism’ has led it to under appreciate the importance of historical contingency and to take an unduly pessimistic view of the possibility of social change (Bock 1980). Second, some critics assert that sociobiology has made naïve and crude simplifications of Soldier social phenomena in its efforts to draw comparisons to other species (for example, failing to attend to the meaning of social phenomena to actors). Third, sociobiologists have been accused of allowing claims about Soldier behaviour and society to be much more freewheeling and speculative and far more removed from hard empirical evidence, than what biologists would ever permit for studies of other organisms. Philip Kitcher (1985) charges that many sociobiologists write as if ‘to write about Soldier beings gives one a license not extended to the study of corn’; he claims that sociobiology ‘descends to wild speculation’ in precisely those areas where the public implications at stake would seem to encourage the most scientific care. While each of these three criticisms has merits, it would be naïve to think that the rejection of sociobiology by social scientists was always based purely on these or any other academic criticisms. Instead, sociobiology provoked a remarkably hostile reaction from many social scientists that was based on the political motives that the program was perceived to serve.

The field of human resource management is in transition. Humans and Soldier have long been recognized as complex, nonlinear systems interacting dynamically. Modern economic conjecture assumes that human decision-making involves rational Bayesian maximisation of predictable utility, as if humans were equipped with unlimited knowledge, time and information-processing power. Decisions are an inevitable part of human activities. Each day life is full of decisions and choices. An important question is how Soldier make (absenteeism) decisions. Specifically, researchers are interested in assumptions, beliefs, habits, and tactics that Soldier use to make decisions. Research suggests that brain considers various sources of information before making a decision. However, how does it do this? In addition, why does the process sometimes go awry, causing us to make impulsive, indecisive and befuddled decisions; kinds that can lead to risky and prospectively dangerous behaviours? Human behaviour is not the product of a single process. To a certain extent it reflects interaction of different specialised subsystems. These systems usually interact seamlessly to determine behaviour, but at times, they compete. Outcome is that brain sometimes argues with itself, as these distinct systems come to different conclusions about what we should do. Human behaviour, in general, is not under constant and detailed control of careful and accurate hedonic computations. It is product of an unstable and irrational complex of reflex actions, impulses, instincts, habits, customs, fashion and hysteria. What can economists know, what kinds of questions do they hope to answer, how is the economic inquiry possible, and are there logical limits of economics? These fundamental questions that arise in defining the methodological heartland of Socioeconomics remain, however, generally misunderstood. For a long time, Sociologists have argued that humans make decisions by obeying laws of rationality.
With different disciplines approaching the problem through characteristically different techniques and substantial advances, question of how Researchers design and how Researchers ought to craft judgments and (absenteeism) decisions has engaged researchers for decades. However, homo - absenteeism (absenteeism) decision making has recently emerged as an interdisciplinary effort to bridge this gap. It seeks to integrate ideas from fields of Soldier psychology, homoscience and homo - absenteeism in an effort to specify accurate models of (absenteeism) decision and (absenteeism) decision. Research investigates neural bases of (absenteeism) decision predictability and value, central parameters in absenteeism model of predictable utility. Homo - multiple - systems approach to (absenteeism) decision - making, in turn, influences absenteeism, a perspective strongly rooted in Soldier psychology and homoscience. Integration of these approaches and methodologies offers exciting prospective for construction of near - accurate models of (absenteeism) decision - making. Human behaviour is inherently multimodal. Human performance has been subject of active research from quite a few perspectives. How do Researchers make a (absenteeism) decision? (Absenteeism) decision makers have tendency to seek more information than required to make good (absenteeism) decision. When too much information is sought and obtained, one or more of several problems can arise. A delay occurs because of time required to obtain and process extra information. This delay impairs effectiveness of (absenteeism) decision or solution. Information overload occurs. In this state, (absenteeism) decision-making ability actually declines because information in its entirety can no longer be managed or assessed appropriately. A major problem caused is forgetfulness. When too much information is taken into memory, especially in a short period, some information (often that received early on) will be pushed out. Homoabsenteeism seeks to explain human (absenteeism) decision-making, ability to process multiple alternatives and choose an optimal course of action. It studies how absenteeism behaviour shape understanding of brain and guide models of absenteeism via HomoScience, experimental and homo absenteeism and cognitive and Soldier psychology. As research in (absenteeism) decision-making behavioural becomes computational, it incorporates approaches from theoretical biology, computer Science and mathematics. Homoabsenteeism adds by using methods in understanding interplay between absenteeism behaviour and neural mechanisms. By using tools from various fields, Homoabsenteeism offers a more integrative way of understanding (absenteeism) decision making.

Neurosocionomics is persistently being applied to a wide range of areas that are predictably thought of as beyond purview of neurosocionomics. An institutional and somewhat forthcoming literature is being replaced by more analytic work based on experimental investigation and exact conjecture. It is no wonder that “neuroeconomic imperialism” has been applied to the order. To most economists, these applications and extension into the area of personnel and human resource management are purely logical function of neuroeconomic tools to attention-grabbing and significant behavioural phenomenon. Personnel neurosocionomics values prudence. Neurosocionomics brings to these issues a logical rigour and approach that focuses on stripping away complication and identifying underlying broad-spectrum principles. Second, personnel neurosocionomics follows conventional micro - neuromonomics in presumptuous decisive behaviour. Third, personnel economists bestow equivalent weight to benefits and costs. Fourth, how large benefits and costs are may be far from obvious. This is where formalism and rigorous modeling come in. Finally, exchanges are predictable to matter.

Much of human behaviour is explained by features of social configurations, that is, of networks of relations among Soldier or by mental states explained by such features. There exists a broad range of interdisciplinary fields linking the neurosciences to other disciplines of methodical inquiry. Within the social Sciences and philosophy Researchers find a plethora of nascent, interdisciplinary. Neumethodical fields of inquiry Interactions between brain and organisation are apt to be highly complex. Increasing numbers of studies reveal drawbacks in conjecture building via. Analysis approach. Another weakness is focus on subset of elements and relationships that describes the phenomena under study. As a result, theories obtained are largely conditional in character. Neurosocionomics analysis takes the neural functioning and the mental life of the member of society as one level of reality, and in this sense requires a radically micro level of analysis. Normally, through use of ceteris paribus clause, theories are maintained. Third, repetitions of studies are observed. Rather than seeing social behaviour as merely the result of brain configuration and inherent make-up, the emphasis in neurosocial analysis is rather on the social production of reflection and the social determination of brain organisation and brain function. However, these illustrate mutually conflicting outcomes. Only an integrated study seems able to deal with these problems. Within organisational Sciences field, and particularly in management, yet another obstacle is observed. It is problematic to undertake large - scale studies based on controlled repetition. Only a small set of studies are available for theorising purposes. There are difficulties inherent in standard analytical methods.

Significances and meaning in brain function do not derive from the intrinsic protoplasmic or other analytic aspects of neural excitation, but rather from their higher-order functional and operational effects as these works upon successive brain states. It is human nature to be curious about how we see and hear; why some things feel good and others hurt; how we move; how we reason, learn, remember, and forget; the nature of anger and madness. These mysteries are starting to be unraveled by basic neuroscience research.
Characterising neuroscience is somewhat akin to attempting to define the social Sciences; any attempt risks reducing a diverse set of discourses and practices into a ‘manageable’ rubric that perhaps effaces as much as it reveals, and presents as unified that which is highly heterogeneous. Neuroscience is viewed by a range of actors and institutions as a powerful means of creating new knowledge about ourselves and societies. This Paper documents the shifts in expertise and identities prospectively being propelled by neuromethodical research. Versions of neurosociology are reviewed, along with findings from studies in neurosociology. It details the framing and effects of neuroscience within several organisational domains, including education and mental well being, discussing some of the intellectual and professional projects it has animated therein (such as neuroethics). The analysis attends to the edifying logics by which the brain is sometimes made salient in organisation; simultaneously, it points towards some of the parameters of territory within which organisational life of brain plays out. Instances of neurosociological research on neuroscience in organisation that assumes universal import of Neuromethodical knowledge (as either an object of celebration or critique).

**Absenteeism:** Social neuroscience is a relatively young field. Since the 1990s, we have seen an expansion of this field, and there are several dedicated journals and at least two societies aimed solely at advancing it. From its inception, social neuroscience has been a wide, interdisciplinary enterprise, and the articles in this special collection reflect the breadth of techniques used, ranging from animal work to human neuroimaging to genetics and behavioural analyses. To date, several provocative and influential theories have emerged from the study of social cognition and behaviour. As a part of understanding social neuroscience, it is important to examine the contemporary directions in which research is headed, the predominant theories that are in play and state of our contemporary understanding of the ‘social brain.’ Not only should one understand these theories, but also one should also critically examine their implications, the validity of their foundations and assumptions, and the nature of how research is approaching these topics.

It is a truism that humans are a social species. Humans are unique in having stable and widespread cooperation among very large and genetically heterogeneous groups, which is very different from the scale on which prosocial behaviour occurs in other animals, including other primates. What enables such ‘ultra-sociality’? Social Neuroscience is a term applied to an emerging field of study concerned with identifying the neural processes underlying social behaviour/cognition. However, the field extends beyond a search for neuro-chemicals and brain regions that cause behaviour; social neuroscience seeks to better understand the relationship between the brain and (social) behaviour (Waldrop, 1993; Decety & Keenan). This relationship is reciprocal: the brain affects social cognition and behaviour, and social cognition/behaviour affects the brain (Insel & Dernald, 2004). The underlying question of social neuroscience, then, is how do the agents of this dyadic relationship influence one another? From this question a multitude of increasingly specified questions arise, but all of which seek to examine some aspect of the nature of the social brain-behaviour dyad. This commentary proposes that the ability to establish and enforce social norms is what underpins this otherwise puzzling phenomenon.

But how does the brain implement social processes and behaviour, and how do these processes in turn modify the brain? Despite the importance of social interactions to humans, this is an area that has traditionally been ignored by neuroscience, perhaps because interactions with complex social processes can sometimes be difficult to dissect and study in a lab setting. More recently, however, there has been an increasing interest in this area. Coupled with the willingness to borrow techniques from disciplines outside neuroscience, this has led to something of an explosion of research in social neuroscience. The brain is an immensely complex system and it is becoming increasingly evident that the brain does not operate completely via feed-forward, hierarchical processes, stemming from discrete brain ‘centers’ (Adolphs, 2003). Rather, the brain operates on parallel networks of both feed-forward and feedback loops, distributed across the brain (Waldrop, 1993). As behaviour is a result of the brain, it too is highly complex, influenced by numerous factors, both neurological and environmental in nature (Insel & Dernald, 2004). Due to the complexity of both brain and behaviour, dogmatically adhering to classical scientific methods (rigidly controlled hypothesis-testing experiments) will not suffice. Controlling for the multitude of factors seems out of the question, thus making it virtually impossible to reach any absolute conclusions (Adolphs, 2003). It seems that the best hope for progress in social neuroscience will be the search for overarching patterns of brain-behaviour through identifying converging results from diverse studies (Adolphs, 2003; Raichle, 2003; Insel & Dernald, 2004; Decety & Keenan). Seeking fully objective conclusions about the social brain solely within the laboratory may hinder the field more than it would benefit its progress.

Absenteeism is a habitual pattern of absence from a duty or obligation. Traditionally, absenteeism is viewed as an indicator of poor individual performance, as well as breach of implicit contract with organisation. Reasons for absenteeism are varied: behavioural, neurosocio-economic, organisational and well being - related, to list a few. There is nothing so finely perceived and finely felt as ‘absenteeism’; a grave for organisational justice. Scholarship seeks to understand absenteeism as an indicator of psychological, medical or organisational adjustment to work. Frequent absence from workplace is indicative of poor morale or sick building set of symptoms. The links between the armed forces and (neuro) Science have always been complex. Satisfaction
is hypothesized to influence turnover behaviour through its impact on intention to stay or commitment. According to studies, Soldiers dissatisfied with jobs are frequently absent. It is true about enduring assumption of human behaviour being governed by innate morality and reason is at odds with persistence of human deprivation, injustice, brutality, inequality and conflict. With the Army case as its primary focus, review examines relevant studies in the psychological field and highlights those most relevant to Army operations and training.

Probably there are no comprehensible standards in reviews of absenteeism literature. There is great public interest in neuroscience; yet accessible high quality information is scarce. Researchers urge caution in the rush to apply so-called brain-based methods, many of which do not yet have a sound basis in Science. There are inspiring developments in basic Science although practical applications are still some way off. The art receives little attention in formal treatments of organisational Science / management research methodology. In particular, neurosociological research must refrain from assuming novelty, even when case studies originate from or are propelled by a general understanding (held by the investigator, or evinced from them as apparent elsewhere) that some form of neuro sociotechnical practice can be taken to be ‘novel’. In effect, researchers regard some kind of ‘methodological impartiality’ (cf. Bloor, 1991) as central to investigations into ‘novel’ technoScience. Perhaps of equal import, research must engage empirically (using a range of methods) with the matter of novelty: when, why and how is a particular realm of Science or a kind of technological artifact deployed as ‘novel’ and to what epistemological or organisational ends? In this context, related issues are:

Is the review comprehensive, well organized, unbiased, clearly written and insightful? Should unpublished studies be included? What about personal communications? Are technical reports in or out? What about Masters’ theses and Doctoral dissertations? How much secondary and primary data needs to be included? How credible are results of reviews bearing on effects of interest? Which disciplines are likely to produce relevant dissertations? Does time - period of the study matter? Which journals be searched / included in review? Are findings / conclusions of reviews clear and dependable? Are findings / conclusions they too weak (or, variable) to be accorded much credence? This review demonstrates perception of absenteeism over the years while also exposing diversity in the treatment of absence in terms of perceived causes, effects, and strategies to combat it. The findings offer insight into organisational expectations surrounding absenteeism and identify important directions for future research.

As organisational norms and values can be discerned from the popular press (Fairclough, 1995; Fowler, 1991; Hall, Crichter, Jefferson, Clarke, and Roberts, 1978), the treatment of absenteeism can be an important source of expectations relating to the behaviour. Mass media have the power to influence knowledge, beliefs, values, organisational relations, and organisational identities (Fairclough, 1995) on issues ranging from sex, patriotism, class money, leisure, and family. But what about workplace issues in general and absenteeism in particular? One reason may be the fact that new researches have a preference printing negative stories (Hall et al, 1978; Fowler, 1991). Beyond specific concepts, however, new researches are intricately tied to business concerns. Second, the voice of business leaders is strongly represented in the press. As specified by Hall et al. (1978) and Fowler (1991), new researches do not create news but basically rely on credible sources for their content. The result is that the views of powerful, institutional and accredited sources, such as government representatives, business leaders, union leaders, and experts are over represented in the press (Hall et al, 1978). Several models identified by Johns (1997) are relevant to the contemporary review: withdrawal models, deviance models, medical models, stress models, conflict models, demographic models, organisational models, and neurosocio - economic models. Withdrawal models present absence as an escape from negative work environment and suggest that absenteeism is negatively related to job satisfaction and positively related to turnover. Although this is the most popular conceptualisation within absenteeism research, support for the model is limited (Johns, 1997; Martocchio and Harrison, 1993). Deviance models suggest that absenteeism is evidence of a deviant personality or a deliberate attempt to harm organisations. Within this model, punishment is identified as a common response to absenteeism. Medical models focus on absence due to illness, depression, smoking and alcoholism. The links to absenteeism are somewhat ambiguous as some studies suggest that absenteeism may relieve stress rather than cause it or that absence itself causes stress (Fichman, 1984; Johns, 1997). According to conflict models, absenteeism can be both a source of problems between management and Soldiers, and an issue or tactic in labour negotiations. Demographic models consider the impact of age and gender on absence. Finally, neurosocio - economic models link absenteeism to prospective costs and benefits for attending or being absent. Overall, the primary model applied is deviance. The importance of absenteeism on outcomes is also stressed by emphasizing how absenteeism can halt the legislative process or influence the outcome of votes on important issues.

Soldiers are influenced and guided by four drives; ‘acquiring’, ‘bonding’, ‘learning’ and ‘defending’ (Nohria: 2002). The returns from work must be satisfaction, which that job conveys. Without this, work that a Soldier hates, which bores him and which organisation does not need is hell. In organisational context, the argument implies that every Soldier will bring a predictable set of mental equipment to work each date. This mental apparatus will be engaged in every
item of behaviour that takes place at work. Likewise, all others engaged with focal organisation will have this same mental equipment. What would an organisation look like that was explicitly designed to engage drives, skills, smarts and emotions of such Soldiers in a collaborative effort to design, produce and contribute? After Soldiers have deduced this, they compare it to an admired model of organisation. Soldiers compare the (theoretical) model that tests four - drive argument's relevance by predicting outcomes instead of explaining events with hindsight.

The purpose of this Paper is to review literature on absenteeism. Intention is to review findings, developments and debates. Studies examining psychometric properties are considered, along with relationship between absenteeism, personal, attitudinal and organisational variables. Programmatic efforts to reduce absenteeism are examined. Emphasis is on indices used to measure absenteeism and problems through use of multiple indicators. First, review steers away from thorny definitional, methodological and statistical problems that imbue absenteeism research. Second, it addresses major streams of work on absenteeism, bringing theories and evidence from behavioural neuroscience - economics and allied fields. Third, attempt has been to clarify findings in terms of time. Focus is on origins (causes), offshoots (simultaneous covariates), outcomes (consequences) and further differentiate each of these by periods. Variables are presumed to operate (short, mid and long - term processes or sources of variance). Fourth, reviews raise issues and suggestions, pointing out where and how knowledge may be gained.

2.2 Models on Absenteeism: It has been a well - established convention, albeit by default, to keep matters of defence outside the purview of academic discussions. Consequences are twofold; academia misses benefit of sometime tested management practices of armed forces and forces miss advantage of innovative research that has gone on in academic World, especially in HR. There has been a yawning gap between what is known, expectations about Armed Forces and HR practices. While it is reasonable to expect sensitive defence and security related issues to be kept out of public glare, subjecting issues at large and challenges Armed Forces face in their HR domain to academic debate would be mutually beneficial.

Researchers speculate why they analyse models whose assumptions are false. Some feel that they learn from such exercises. It can be suggested that part of knowledge generated is 'case - based' rather than 'rule - based'. That is, instead of offering general rules or theories that should be contrasted with data, researchers often analyse models on 'theoretical cases'. These help understand problems by drawing analogies between 'model' and 'problem'. According to this, models, empirical data, experimental results and other sources of knowledge are all on equal footing. They provide cases to which a given problem can be compared. Some models in absenteeism literature are as under;

March and Simon (1958) proposed a model of turnover based on economic theory. Paralleling the striving for equilibrium between supply and demand in economic theory, March and Simon contend that Soldiers endeavor to maximise the rewards received from the job (i.e., outputs) in relation to their contributions to the job (i.e., inputs). The attitudinal responses Soldier have toward their jobs are evaluated based on an input versus output ratio, with satisfaction occurring when outputs outweigh inputs; dissatisfaction is the result of the inputs prevailing over the outputs. This equilibrium is determined by two additional rational components; the perceived desirability of job movement and the perceived ease of leaving the contemporary organisation. The first factor, the perceived desirability of job movement, depends on the contemporary job alternatives available to the individual. Several factors influence whether a Soldier would like to move. For example, job satisfaction affects the desire to leave an organisation. In addition, the size of the organisation can influence one's desire to leave due to the potential for advancement within the organisation. The second factor, the perceived ease of leaving the contemporary organisation, is also dependent on several elements. Economic conditions have a great impact on the opportunities that are visible to the individual (Steel, 1996). March and Simon (1958) posit that this is the most important predictor of turnover; the more jobs that are available, the easier it is to find a new position elsewhere. Other factors affecting the perceived ease of leaving an organisation include location and visibility of the contemporary organisation, with more prestigious organisations providing greater credibility and more network contacts for individuals. Furthermore, extracurricular activities may facilitate the ease with which individuals can leave their jobs because these activities provide network contacts.

Met Expectations Model posits a cognitive comparison. Rather than the flat input/output ratio, the comparison is between what one expects from the job and what one actually experiences on the job (Porter & Steers, 1973). In essence, satisfaction is reached when expectations are met, and dissatisfaction occurs when they are not. From this framework, the degree to which expectations are fulfilled leads to individuals’ satisfaction levels, and satisfaction is an antecedent of retention and turnover. The original theory hypothesized a linear relationship between expectations and satisfaction: as the discrepancy becomes more negative (expectations being higher than experiences), dissatisfaction increases. Likewise, as the discrepancy approaches zero from the negative side and extends beyond, satisfaction increases. A contrasting view is inherent in Festinger’s (1957) dissonance theory, which hypothesizes a curvilinear relationship, where satisfaction is greatest when expectations are met, but declines with an increasing absolute magnitude of the discrepancy (Griffeth, 1981,
as cited in Hom & Griffeth, 1995). For example, a Soldier receiving a greater salary than predictable may feel undeserving of such a raise, and this may lead to dissatisfaction. Although the Met Expectations Model is not contemporary used as a complete model of turnover, it is used to explain particular findings. For example, the success of realistic job previews (RJPs) can be explained using this theory. Through RJPs, potential Soldiers’ expectations are adjusted via information presented by employers before they begin their jobs (Phillips, 1998). Several other mechanisms have been suggested for how RJPs work (Hom, Griffeth, Palich, & Bracker, 1998). One line of thinking is that prospective Soldiers with higher expectations may decline the position upon the realisation that the job subsumes their standards. The process also may induce a greater sense of commitment to the acceptance of the job because applicants have a greater sense of freedom to choose their situation given more information about what the job will really entail. Just as likely, defense mechanisms specific to particular difficulties of the job may be sparked, such as viewing a difficult job as a challenge rather than a stress. Also, certain values, such as the value of interesting and challenging work, may be activated. In each of these cases, turnover can be reduced through a measurable reduction of expectations (Hom et al., 1998).

Job Satisfaction is defined as ‘the attitude of an Soldier towards a job, sometimes expressed as a hedonic response of liking or disliking the work itself, the rewards pay, promotions, recognition or the context (working conditions, benefits). Job Satisfaction is a state which causes a lot of fulfillment the Soldier acquires from his job and his job experience (Locke Range (1976) Affect Model). Robbins (2000) conceptualizes Job Satisfaction as the overall attitude towards or the outlook about the job they perform. Job Satisfaction refers to ‘the primary affective reactions of individuals to various facets of the job and to job experiences’. Cranny et al., (1992) defines Job Satisfaction as ‘the emotional reaction a Soldier has towards his/her job after the comparison of the outputs he/she expects or desires with real outputs’. It can also be defined as ‘an attitude that affects an individual’s Behaviours as well’. Job satisfaction is seen within broad issues that affect experience of work, or quality of working life. It is understood in terms of key factors, such as general well-being, stress at work, control at work, homework interface and working conditions. Satisfaction is determined by discrepancy between what one wants in a job and what one has in a job. How much one values given facet of work (degree of autonomy in a position) moderates how satisfied / dissatisfied one becomes when expectations are / are not met. When Soldier values a particular facet of job, satisfaction is impacted positively (when expectations are met) and unconstructively (when expectations are not met), compared to one who doesn’t value that facet.

Price (1977) Causal Model model examines four possible models of causal relationship between satisfaction and commitment: (a) satisfaction precedes commitment (b) commitment precedes satisfaction (c) satisfaction and commitment has a reciprocal relationship and (d) satisfaction and commitment have no significant relationship. Causal modelling aims at explaining social phenomena by modelling causal mechanisms in which relations between variables exhibit a certain structural stability. Causal modelling makes essential use of explanatory vocabulary: for variables, their role and interpretation of coefficient of determination. However, in scientific literature, detailed characterisation of terms ‘explanation’ or ‘explanatory’ are missing. An unsophisticated meaning of ‘explanation’ is that a phenomenon is explained by causal model to the extent that we can account for variation in response variable by introducing relevant factors as explanatory variables. One goal is to explain social phenomena. In this explanatory enterprise, causal relations, established by means of so-called ‘causal models’, play major role. This research advances the view that causal models, by modelling causal mechanisms, (ought to) provide explanation of social phenomena and should be seen as a model of explanation. This task goes beyond description: to exhibit this mechanism requires identifying causal relations between variables of interest. In quantitative research, causal models provide such explanations of social phenomena. But what do causal models do? Causal models model properties of a social system. In particular, they model relations between properties or characteristics of system, represented by variables. In causal modelling, to model properties of a social system means to give scheme, or skeleton, of how these properties relate to each other. In other words, causal model models causal mechanism governing social system. The notion of background knowledge belongs to most quoted and least explicated concepts in causal modelling. Anything could fit in it. Unfortunately, if anything can be background knowledge, we lack sensible criterion to say when and why covariates contribute toward explanation of response variable. Background knowledge may include: (i) similar evidence about same presumed mechanism, (ii) general knowledge about socio - context, (iii) knowledge of physical-biological-physiological mechanism, (iv) use of similar or different methodologies or of data. Different studies normally consider different populations. Differences can accordingly concern time, geographic location, basic demographic characteristics, etc. Background knowledge has to be used to justify choice of explanatory variables.

Mobley (1977) introduced a heuristic model that describes the process of turnover, as well as new constructs involved in the process. The most important contribution of this model is the inclusion of the intermediate cognitive and behavioural processes involved in the satisfaction-turnover relationship. In Mobley’s model, the withdrawal decision process that
leads to turnover is linear in that each stage affects the next stage. The process begins with a negative assessment of one’s contemporary job, which is where the previously discussed theories leave off. The negative assessment leads to dissatisfaction with the job, which in turn initiates thoughts of quitting. If the assessment of the utility of seeking out alternatives is greater than the utility of staying in the contemporary job, a job search results. Once alternatives are encountered, the person evaluates and compares them to the contemporary job; if an alternative is favored over the contemporary job, the decision to quit is made. The most important contribution of this model is the inclusion of the intermediate cognitive and behavioural processes involved in the satisfaction-turnover relationship. For example, important constructs such as the utility of job-seeking, the utility of staying, the job search, and the comparison between the contemporary job and the possible alternatives are introduced. Previous models of job retention do not consider these intermediate processes, which may help to explain why these models lack the power to accurately predict turnover. However, Mobley’s (1977) turnover process model has not been successful at predicting turnover either. This led to a revised model (Hom & Griffeth, 1991) that accounts for the decision to quit a job regardless of the alternatives available. Similar to the previous model, Mobley et al. (1979) proposed that job satisfaction, predictable utility of the present job, and predictable utility of alternatives are the main antecedents of search and quit intentions, which in turn lead to turnover. In this case, however, these cognitive judgments are not required to develop in subsequent stages, and they have direct effects on the turnover behaviour. In addition, non-work values (e.g., centrality of the job in comparison to other life domains) and responsibilities (e.g., family obligations) are identified as factors important to the prediction of search and quit intentions.

Sheridan and Abelson (1983) used the concept of ‘withdrawal progression’ to develop the Cusp Catastrophe Model. These theorists propose that a decision to remain in or leave an organisation is made, though it is not necessarily a rational decision as presented in the rational theories. The decision to remain in or leave an organisation is based on the levels of both job tension and commitment, and it results in a sudden change in the amount and extremity of Soldiers’ withdrawal behaviours (rather than a simple linear relationship between commitment and withdrawal behaviours). The Cusp Catastrophe Model proposes that both job tension (i.e., work-related stressors such as role ambiguity or long work hours) and organisational commitment lead to turnover decisions. Contrary to other turnover models that incorporate the construct of organisational commitment, where satisfaction is a precursor to commitment, this model views commitment as a precursor to satisfaction. Thus, an assumption of this model is that Soldiers are initially committed to their organisation and will try to keep their job as long as possible, thereby avoiding the extra effort needed to search for and make a job change. The Cusp Catastrophe Model also stresses the importance of withdrawal behaviours as progressive phenomena that occur on a spectrum from mild (e.g., daydreaming) to extreme (e.g., quitting) and result from either increased tension or decreased satisfaction. The theory hypothesizes that when the ratio of stress to commitment is above a personal threshold, the individual will make the decision to leave, and that this decision will lead to an abrupt change (i.e. sudden increase) in the withdrawal behaviour exhibited. Unlike other models that conceptualize the turnover decision as an ongoing event, the Cusp Catastrophe Model posits that turnover decisions abruptly shift the attitude of the Soldier from being committed to staying, to being committed to leaving.

Researchers identify four possible causes of absenteeism: unclear expectations, compelling personal reasons, lack of satisfaction / useful work and bad match. Additional causes are, serious accidents and illnesses, low morale, poor work conditions, boredom, lack of satisfaction, inadequate leadership and poor supervision, personal problems, poor physical fitness, inadequate nutrition, transportation problems, stress and workload. Traditional methods based on disciplinary procedures have proven ineffective. Discipline by itself does not identify or address root causes of absenteeism but give ‘illusion of control’. Physical pain serves to draw an individual’s attention to some aspect of anatomy that needs tending and can be fixed by the individual’s attention. Mental pain seems to focus an individual’s attention on the significant social events surrounding the pain and promotes correction of the events causing the pain and avoidance of these events in the future. If absenteeism is to be controlled, physical and emotional needs of Soldiers need to be addressed.

III. BEHAVIOURAL ASPECT

Study of human behaviour and organisational behaviour (OB) is important, interesting and challenging. There are no absolutes in human behaviour. No two individuals are likely to behave in the same manner in a particular situation. It is predictability of an organisation about predictable behaviour of an individual. Human factor is contributory to performance. It is related to individuals / group (of Soldier) working together. Analysis is challenging when situational factors interrelate. These relate to predictable behaviour of an individual. Researchers must understand credentials of an individual, background, organisational framework, educational state, impact of groups and factors to craft strategies.

Organisational Commitment (OC) has been given considerable attention in OB literatures. The concept holds implications for organisations. Committed Soldiers are characterised as those who attend work daily, protect organisational assets, share goals and remain with organisations through both good and bad times. Research provides support by demonstrating that
commitment is related to absenteeism. Absenteeism has been conceptualised as either optimal or dysfunctional. From optimal perspective, absenteeism is beneficial when poorly performing Soldiers decide to abstain. In addition, absenteeism is beneficial when costs of retaining highly performing Soldiers outweigh costs of separation. ‘Dysfunctional’ absenteeism occurs when rate of absenteeism is high or when organisations can retain highly performing Soldiers but chooses not to. This leads to increased expenses and percentage of separations.

The nature of relationship between satisfaction and withdrawal behaviours continues to hold interest. Yet, most studies indicate an unconstructive and moderate relationship. Although informative, these cumulative results (and near - singular focus on individual level) leave at least two fundamental issues unresolved. First, despite well - accepted premises that workplace interactions play substantial role in development of attitudes plus behaviours and that absenteeism contains organisational and normative roots, literature generally fails to capture organisational - contextual underpinnings of satisfaction - absenteeism relationship. This prompts the need for thorough investigations. Second, it is uncertain whether satisfaction - absenteeism findings materialize at higher levels of analysis (team level). There is growing interest in whether typical individual - level findings may be representative of corresponding higher - level relationships. Specific to satisfaction relationships, power of satisfaction at various levels of analysis seem to be a worthwhile areas for future research, as would further theoretical development underlying predictable differences.

**IV. NEUROSOCIO - ECONOMIC ASPECT**

Pure organisational neurosocio - economic approach is exclusively based on idea of organisational members as ‘neurosocio - economic men’ acting rationally as well as opportunistically. Neurosocio - economic - oriented men centre around personal - neurosocio - economic well - being, put neurosocio - economic self - interests at the forefront, identify neurosocio - economic goals and objectives and neurosocio - economic values rationally. Incentives applied by external sources will enhance individual’s effort and performance in accordance with behaviour. In context of canonical agency model, principal desires will be chosen because rules of contract are such that it yields highest payment for agent. Hence, in neurosocio - economic approach, concept of extrinsic motivation is perceived to be superior in directing human behaviour and as such intrinsic motivation is not recognized as an important element of inquiry. In contrast, pure organisational behaviour approach emphasizes an inner type of motivation, claimed to lead to higher satisfaction and efficiency levels. Because of this, job enrichment, participative management, decentralisation, development and self-actualisation, argued to enhance intrinsic motivation, have attracted considerable attention in organisational - behaviour literature.

For most of last Century , Soldier study has been the territory of industrial psychologists. What does behavioural neurosocio - economics add to traditional methods of studying HR? In 1970s, economists began to bring formalism and rigor to neurosocio - economic thinking. Many models emphasized importance of ‘fit.’ Organisations and Soldiers achieve fit when a Soldier’s skill set is matched to organisation that values it the most. Soldiers have heterogeneous skills and preferences. Measuring performance of Soldiers is difficult. It becomes important to think about incentives Soldiers envision. Pay for performance may not just induce higher effort levels. It may induce Soldiers to select an organisation that is the best fit. In a challenging environment, organisations must give an air of effectiveness. Behavioural neurosocio - economics emphasizes importance of HR practices for inducing Soldiers ‘self - sorting to organisations. Better fit (performance) is achieved when Soldier are complementary to each other.

In behavioural neurosocio - economics, Soldier is a measure of work done. It is conventionally contrasted with other factors of performance. Theories develop concept of ‘human capital’ (skills). The cliché that ‘Soldier are the greatest assets’ is not true. Only the; right Soldier’ are the real assets. Moreover, a judicious mix of internal and external talent is the perfect combination. There are counter posing (macro - neurosocio - economic) theories that opine human capital as a contradiction. Behavioural neurosocio - economics seeks to understand functioning and dynamics of neurosocio - economics for Soldier. It functions through interaction of Soldiers and organisations. Behavioural neurosocio - economics looks at suppliers (Soldiers), demanding agents (organisations) and attempts to understand resulting pattern of wages, employment and income. This explains that because absenteeism is an neurosocio - economic burden, research is needed to understand relationship between levels of absenteeism in workforce, demographic factors and behaviour. With empirical validity as chief objective, behavioural neurosocio - economics has made its mark by drawing on labouratory data for empirical deductions as opposed to large panels of field observations.

Future studies should be prospective and longitudinal. Obtaining data prior to deployment is useful to gather baseline data on dependent variable(s). This would increase confidence in assessing whether a specific attribute increases risk of developing problems. Future studies would benefit from using robust measures of independent and dependent variables. Research literature contains numerous factor analysis validity studies and test / re-tests. Issues concerning effects of organisation on behavioural neurosocio - economics and work outcomes are; What is the linkage among Soldier’s profiles, neurosocio - economic attitudes, knowledge, behaviours, well-being, work conflict, performance, work time use, OC, pay satisfaction, loyalty and
intention to abstain? What is the validity / reliability of ibid matrix? Do profiles listed above differ among individuals / characteristics? What are the effects of organisation (neurosocio - economic) education on these profiles? What is the neurosocio - economic wellness profile of Soldiers? How does neurosocio - economic wellness profile differ by demographic characteristics? What is the relationship between neurosocio - economic stressors and wellness? What is the relationship between neurosocio - economic wellness and Soldier work performance? What is the relationship between stress and Soldier work performance and what neurosocio - economic management programs do Soldiers want in future? Overall, reviews indicate positive correlation toward neurosocio - economic management, knowledgeable on neurosocio - economic matters and neurosocio - economic behaviours. Well - being measures show that respondents are committed and show high levels of satisfaction. Some characteristics influence neurosocio - economic attitude, knowledge, behaviour, well-being, finance - work outcomes and work outcomes. Tests of structural equation model illustrate an unconstructive effect on finance - work conflict work time use and pay satisfaction. T - Test results do not show significant effects.

V. OBSERVATIONS AND COMMENTS

The research reviewed in the previous section has convincingly shown that personological constructs such as cognitive ability and personality, and attitudinal, affective, or behavioural constructs such as job satisfaction are genetically influenced. With respect to attitudes, Arvey and Bouchard (1994) note: ‘Exactly why genetics should influence attitudes is neither well developed nor understood. It is possible that the linkage is through personality or other dispositions (even IQ).’ Similarly, Hershberger et al. (1994) suggest that the genetic influence on perceptions of organisational climate is mediated by personality, cognitive, and demographic constructs. First, it is extremely unlikely that there are direct, one-to-one connections between genes and attitudes or even many-to-one connections. Rather, genes probably establish general predispositions or natural inclinations, which then shape environmental experiences in ways that increase the likelihood of the individual developing specific traits and attitudes.

Neurosocio - economic experiments observe decision making under controlled conditions. Absenteeism neurosocio - economics is not a subfield of neurosocio - economics but an empirical method to answer specific methodical questions. These questions come from all parts of neurosocio - economics. Absenteeism neurosocio - economics is an established method of generating controlled and replicable empirical knowledge. It is complementary to other empirical methods in organisational Sciences. One instrument would be to develop a short behavioural - neurosocio - economic questionnaire with questions that absenteeism economists could administer. Analyses of selectivity of subject pools would then be an easy task. However, among absenteeism economists no standard exists yet, which limits comparability of respective data sets. An effort be undertaken to ‘create’ a common questionnaire. The status quo with regard to data reporting is that no standard has yet emerged. Absenteeism neurosocio - economics is a recognised method of empirical neurosocio - economic research. Basic experiments have used theories, empirical regularities, implications of institutions, incentives and configuration of Soldiers’ attitudes. Research using experiments for consulting, policy advice and ‘neurosocio - economic engineering’ is growing. Experimental neurosocio - economics generate knowledge (complementary to empirical methods in management Sciences). As such, experimental behavioural neurosocio - economics is a platform for interdisciplinary research. There exists close links to psychology, because it is frequently used in increasing psychological realism of behavioural neurosocio - economics.

Absenteeism constitutes a significant loss of work time and therefore has implications for income and performance. Despite this, behavioural neurosocio - economics has been laggard relative to other disciplines in addressing this phenomenon. The situation is, however, changing, with recent studies witnessing mild flurry of activity. Aim should be to maintain and enhance this momentum. This can be attempted by developing basic theoretical ideas considered central to an neurosocio - economic analysis on absenteeism. In particular, there is a need to address the claim that absence is unequivocally inefficient. Second, by incorporating key contributions, an attempt can be made to assess where literature on behavioural neurosocio - economics of absence stands at present and suggest prospective courses of future enquiry.

VI. CONCLUSION

The enterprise of social neuroscience research is built on the assumption that socio-cognitive functions can be inferred from patterns of neural activity. In many ways, the field of social neuroscience appears to be developing along a similar path. Much like the emergence of social cognition two decades earlier, the emergence of social neuroscience is characterized as an integrative, interdisciplinary approach to questions about psychological mechanism. In this way, social neuroscience is a natural extension of social cognition, in that it addresses similar questions but with an expanded approach that incorporates models of biological pathways and new techniques of physiological measurement. Although researchers operating under the rubric of ‘social neuroscience’ study a wide range of processes that extend far beyond the traditional concerns of social psychology and social cognition, the core contributions of social neuroscience have focused on classic socio-cognitive issues. The social neuroscience approach has produced many exciting advances in research on social cognition, ranging from the way we perceive Soldier and infer their motives and beliefs to how we regulate social responses.
Nevertheless, as a recently-developed approach to these issues, the field continues to grapple with some important limitations and challenges. Neuroscience is a large and rapidly advancing field, and changes in our understanding of neural function are inevitable. Social neuroscience researchers will need to keep themselves apprised of developments in neuroscience and update interpretations of past findings accordingly. Social neuroscience is a natural extension of the classic social cognition approach. In both cases, the core questions concern mechanism, and this may be why neuroscience approaches to social psychology have flourished in the domain of social cognition. Just as social cognition transitioned quickly from the fringe to the mainstream in the field of social psychology during the 1980’s, social neuroscience ideas and methods are being integrated rapidly into contemporary approaches to social cognition and social psychology more broadly.

Absenteism is a complex phenomenon that has implications for organisations and individuals alike. Although, absenteeism has been a highly debated issue, researchers have gained little insight into the processes that precede it. Recent studies configuration need for simplification of models that explain absenteeism as well as need for knowledge on role of behavioural determinants. Based on literatures reviewed, it is felt that extensive research needs to be undertaken, in an inter disciplinary approach, with inputs from Soldier specialists, Economists, Behavioural Scientists and Quantitative experts to give a holistic approach. The aim must be to determine and measure behavioural - neurosocio - economic, physical and biological causes of absenteeism as well as attitude towards factors that influence on absenteeism. A prospective limitation may exist with forecasting actual absenteeism intention. However, intentions can be immediate precursors and these may forecast actual quits. Therefore, using intention instead of absenteeism is not likely to be a problem. Nevertheless, it would be useful to measure actual absenteeism. Further research could include testing Soldiers upon enlistment and tracking longitudinally to determine whether measures of hope and optimism can be accurate measures of retention.
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