

An Assessment of Soldiering Level Among The Technical Personnel of UAS, Bangalore

K. T. PRIYANKA AND N. R. GANGADHARAPPA

Dept. of Agril. Marketing, Co-operation and Business Management,
College of Agriculture, UAS, GKVK, Bengaluru - 560 065

ABSTRACT

This study was taken up with the objective to analyse the level of soldiering among the technical personnel of UAS, Bengaluru. Medium level of soldiering was observed among the technical personnel of UAS, Bengaluru. 60 per cent of Assistant Professors and Associate Professors and 53.33 per cent of Professors were under medium level of soldiering.

In management literature today, the greatest use of the concept of Taylorism is as a contrast to a new, improved way of doing business. In political and sociological terms, Taylorism can be seen as the division of labour pushed to its logical extreme, with a consequent de-skilling of the worker and dehumanisation of the workplace. Taylor observed that some workers were more talented than others and that even smart ones were often unmotivated. He observed that most workers who are forced to perform repetitive tasks tend to work at the slowest rate that goes unpunished. This slow rate of work has been observed in many industries in many countries and has been called by various terms (some being slang confined to certain regions and eras), including "soldiering" (reflecting the way conscripts may approach following orders), "dogging it", "goldbricking", "hanging it out", and "ca canae". Managers may call it by those names or "loafing" or "malingering"; workers may call it "getting through the day" or "preventing management from abusing us". Taylor used the term "soldiering" and observed that, when paid the same amount, workers will tend to do the amount of work that the slowest among them does.

Taylor's concept of soldiering is used to study the level of soldiering among the technical personnel of UAS Bangalore. The soldiering was analysed in three levels like *viz.* high level soldiering, medium level soldiering and low level soldiering. Certain soldiering dimensions like self-awareness, defining quality and productivity, enabling protocols like organization climate, management style, working hours and situation, competency in task, financial incentives, leadership and factors influencing for counterproductive work

behaviour were used to analyse the level of soldiering existing among the technical personnel.

METHODOLOGY

The soldiering was analysed in three levels *viz.* high level, medium level and low level soldiering. Self-awareness, defining quality and productivity, organizational climate, management style, working hours and situation, competency in task, financial incentives, leadership and factor influencing counterproductive work behaviour were considered as soldiering dimensions to analyse the soldiering level.

A structured schedule was prepared with the help of experts in the field of Agricultural Extension and Agri-business Management, which includes all the items under each of the variables selected for the study. The data collection was done during the month of February-March, 2015 by personal interview method with the help of the constructed schedule.

The list of sample is divided into 3 categories based on cadre wise like : Assistant Professors, Associate Professors and Professors. From this list, 30 Assistant Professors, 30 Associate Professors and 30 Professors were selected randomly from technical personnel of UAS Bengaluru. Thus, total sample size of this study constitutes 90 technical personnel. Simple random sampling technique adopted to select the sample respondents. Information elicited from the respondents using personal interview method with the help of constructed schedule.

The statistical tools and tests such as frequency, percentage, mean and standard deviation were used

to analyse the data systematically to draw valid inferences.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The dimensions used to measure the soldiering level among the technical personnel of UAS, Bengaluru is presented in Table I. The mean score of Assistant Professor for self-awareness was 18.23 defining quantity and productivity was 17.40, organizational climate was 166.96, management style was 43.80, working hours and situation was 65.80, competency in task was 34.00, financial incentives was 18.30, leadership was 70.66 and counter productive work behaviour was 32.33.

The mean score by Associate Professors for self-awareness was 18.53, defining quality and productivity was 17.20, organizational climate was 150.76, management style was 39.53, working hours and

situation was 63.30, competency in task was 28.76, financial incentives was 17.56, leadership was 59.66 and counterproductive work behaviour was 34.50.

Similarly, the mean score by Professors for self-awareness was 18.20, defining quality and productivity was 19.13, organizational climate was 153.00, management style was 37.00, working hours and situation was 69.30, competency in task was 28.86, financial incentives was 19.93, leadership was 60.20 and counterproductive work behaviour was 30.93.

It is observed from Table II that the maximum and minimum scores scored by the technical personnel, which gives an inference about soldiering level. The

TABLE I

Dimensions wise soldiering level among the technical personnel of UAS, Bengaluru

(n=20)

Dimensions	Assistant Professor		Associate Professor		Professor	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Self - awareness	18.23	5.28	18.53	3.32	18.20	2.10
Defining quality and productivity	17.40	4.13	17.20	4.22	19.13	3.07
Organizational climate	166.96	12.60	150.76	28.45	153.00	17.82
Management style	43.80	6.73	39.53	3.83	37.00	3.11
Working hours and situation	65.80	8.72	63.60	11.38	69.30	6.75
Competency in task	34.00	0.83	28.76	4.00	28.86	5.19
Financial incentives	18.30	2.03	17.56	1.65	19.93	4.52
Leadership	70.66	6.34	59.66	7.72	60.20	9.09
Counterproductive work behaviour	32.33	12.10	34.50	6.80	30.93	4.25

TABLE II

Maximum and minimum scores scored by the technical personnel for each soldiering dimension

(n=90)

Dimensions	Assistant Professor		Associate Professor		Professor	
	Max	Min	Max	Min	Max	Min
Self - awareness	24	11	23	10	23	15
Defining quality and productivity	28	13	27	11	24	14
Organizational climate	182	152	202	99	182	126
Management style	49	12	43	32	43	32
Working hours and situation	78	52	84	50	82	60
Competency in task	35	33	32	22	39	23
Financial incentives	21	16	20	15	31	15
Leadership	79	64	72	49	70	37
Counterproductive work behaviour	44	16	45	26	39	25
Average Scores	60	41	61	35	60	39

total scores for each soldiering dimension was different for which maximum and minimum scores that one has scored are presented in the table. For the soldiering dimensions self-awareness, defining quality and productivity, organizational climate, management style, working hours and situation competency in task financial incentives, leadership and factors influencing on counterproductive work behaviour, the maximum scores scored by the Assistant Professors were 24, 28, 182, 49, 78, 35, 21, 79 and 44, respectively. For the same soldiering dimensions, the minimum scores scored by the Assistant Professors were 11, 13, 152, 12, 52, 33, 16, 64 and 16, respectively. The Average score of the maximum scores was 60 and minimum scores was 41.

For the same soldiering dimensions the maximum scores scored by the Associate Professors were 23, 27, 202, 43, 84, 32, 20, 72 and 45, respectively. Similarly the minimum scores scored by the Associate Professors were 10, 11, 99, 32, 50, 22, 15, 49 and 26, respectively. The average score of the maximum scores was 61 and minimum scores was 35.

Similarly in the case of Professors, the maximum scores scored for the soldiering dimensions were 23, 24, 182, 43, 82, 39, 31, 70 and 39, respectively and the minimum scores were 15, 14, 126, 32, 60, 23, 15, 37 and 25, respectively. The average score of the maximum scores was 60 and minimum scores was 39.

Table III shows that maximum percentage of technical personnel are under medium level of soldiering. wherein among the 30 Assistant Professors considered for the study, medium level of soldiering was reported for defining quality and productivity, organizational climate, working hours and situation, financial incentives and leadership (80.00, 36.66, 73.33, 63.33 and 66.66 %) followed by high level of soldiering (20.00, 33.33, 26.66, 33.33 %) and low level of soldiering (0.00, 30.00, 0.00, 3.33 and 0.00 %). Remaining dimensions *viz.*, self-awareness, management style and counter productive work behaviour had medium level of soldiering with maximal per cent of 50.00, 90.00 and 66.66 per cent followed by low level of soldiering (30.00, 6.66 and 33.33 %) and high level of soldiering (20.00, 3.33 and 0.00 %). Whereas, for competency in task, all the Assistant Professor are under medium level of soldiering.

TABLE III

Categorization of technical personnel based on soldiering level

(n = 90)

Dimensions	Category	Asst. Prof.	Assoc. Prof.	Prof.
Self - awaaareness	Low	30.00	10.00	10.00
	Medium	50.00	76.66	76.66
	High	20.00	13.33	13.33
Defining quality and productivity	Low	0.00	6.66	20.00
	Medium	80.00	73.33	63.33
	High	20.00	20.00	16.66
organizational climate	Low	30.00	26.66	13.33
	Medium	36.66	63.33	66.66
	High	33.33	10.00	20.00
management style	Low	6.66	23.33	10.00
	Medium	90.00	50.00	76.66
	High	3.33	26.66	13.33
working hours and situation	Low	0.00	13.33	13.33
	Medium	73.33	66.66	73.33
	High	26.66	20.00	13.33
Competency in task	Low	0.00	20.00	0.00
	Medium	100	80.00	86.66
	High	0.00	0.00	13.33
Financial incentives	Low	3.33	13.33	10.00
	Medium	63.33	50.00	70.00
	High	33.33	36.66	20.00
Leadership	Low	0.00	26.66	10.00
	Medium	66.66	50.00	76.66
	High	33.33	23.33	13.33
Counterproductive work behaviour	Low	33.33	20.00	10.00
	Medium	66.66	53.33	70.00
	High	0.00	26.66	20.00
Over all	Low	6.66	30.00	26.66
	Medium	60.00	60.00	53.33
	High	33.33	10.00	20.00

Among the 30 Associate Professors considered for the study, medium level of soldiering was reported for self-awareness, defining quality and productivity, management style, working hours and situation, financial incentives and counterproductive work behaviour (76.66, 73.33, 50.00, 66.66, 50.00 and 53.33 %) followed by high level of soldiering (13.33, 20, 26.66, 20.00, 36.66 and 26.66 %) and low level of soldiering (10.00, 6.66, 23.33, 13.33 and 20 %). Remaining dimensions *viz.*, organizational climate, competency in task and leadership had medium level of soldiering with the maximal per cent of 63.44, 80.00 and 50.00 per cent followed by low level of soldiering (26.66, 20.00 and 26.66 %) and high level of soldiering (10.00, 0.00 and 23.33 %).

Among the 30 Professors considered for the study, medium level of soldiering was observed for dimensions like self-awareness, organizational climate, management style competency in task, financial incentives, leadership and counterproductive work behaviour (76.66, 66.66, 76.66, 86.66, 70.00, 76.66 and 70.00 %) followed by high level of soldiering (10.00, 13.33, 10.00, 0.00, 10.00, 10.00 %). Whereas for the dimension defining quality and productivity, medium level of soldiering was observed with maximal per cent of 63.33 followed by low level of soldiering (20.00 %) and high level of soldiering (16.66 %). In case of working hours and situation, medium level of soldiering was observed for both low and high level of soldiering.

Medium level of soldiering was observed among the technical personnel of UAS, Bangalore. 60 per cent of Assistant Professors were under medium level of soldiering followed by high and low level of soldiering with 33.33 and 6.66 per cent, respectively. 60 per cent of Associate Professors were under medium level followed by low and high level of soldiering with 30 and 10 per cent, respectively. Similarly, 53.33 per cent of professions were under medium level of soldiering followed by low and high level of soldiering with 26.66 and per cent, respectively.

REFERENCES

- FREDERICK., W, TAYLOR., 1911, The principles of scientific Management new york : Harper Bros, 5 - 29
- GIRIJA, P. R., SHIVAMURTHY, M. AND NIRANJAN, B. S., 1994, Job satisfaction job stress of Agricultural graduates in *Karnataka. J. Extn. Edu.* 5 (4), 945 - 945
- RICKY W. GRIFFIN, 1997, An Introduction to Management, 5th edition, A.I.T.B.S. Publications. Texas A & M University, 32 - 64.
- RUKUNDO AIMABLE., 2011, An analysis of job perception and job performance of teachers in the University of Agriculture Science, Bangalore, *M.Sc. (Agri), Thesis (Unpub)*, Department of Agricultural Extension, University of Agricultural Science, Bangalore.

(Received : December, 2015 Accepted : July, 2016)