

A Study on Factors Related with Soldiering Level among the Technical Personnel of UAS, Bangalore

K. T. PRIYANKA AND N. R. GANGADHARAPPA

Department of Agricultural Marketing, Co-operation and Business Management
College of Agriculture, UAS, GKVK, Bengaluru - 50 065.

ABSTRACT

This study was taken up with the objective to analyse the factors related with soldiering among the technical personnel of UAS, Bangalore. Results of simple regression analysis showed the negative impact between financial incentives with age and job experience of Assistant Professors and also similar result was observed between leadership and age. Similarly negative impact was found between working hours and situation of Associate Professors. Whereas in case of Professors, negative impact was observed between self-awareness and education.

MANAGEMENT of human resources involves important and complex issues in the form of multidimensional reactions involving employees' perception of the organizational climate and their personality background. The objective realization of management style, leadership, competency in tasks and intergroup relationship depend upon managers. These concepts have changed drastically since the days of scientific management. Today, the impact of modern behavioural sciences have new insight and approaches to the management of human resources. This new insight has highlighted the concept of motivating and appraising the people in an organization as an important strategy. The main concept of the human resources management is the improvement of the people working in the organization with a view of increasing their efficiency through motivation and appraising in all means.

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 including "soldiering", (reflecting the way conscripts may approach following orders), "dogging it", "goldbricking", "hanging it out", and "cacanae". 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 factors related with soldiering among the technical personnel of UAS Bangalore. Certain soldiering dimensions like self-awareness, defining quality and productivity, enabling protocols like organizational climate, management style, working hours and situation, competency in task, financial incentives, leadership and factors influencing for counter productive work behaviour were used to find the factors influencing on soldiering. Factors like age, gender, education and job experience of the technical personnel were considered.

METHODOLOGY

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 Bangalore. 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 correlation and regression were used to analyse the data. The data was analysed systematically to draw valid inferences.

Certain soldiering dimensions like self-awareness, defining quality and productivity, enabling protocols like

organizational climate, management style, working hours and situation, competency in task, financial incentives, leadership and factors influencing for counter work productivity behaviour were taken to find the factors related with soldiering among the technical personnel were taken as dependent factors along with age, gender, education and job experience of the technical personnel were considered as independent factors.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In the Table I, R^2 indicates that there is very less amount of variation in the dependent variables explained by the independent variables among the Assistant Professors. All the four independent variables viz., age, gender, education and job experience has positive contribution towards self-awareness, which means for every unit increase in the independent

TABLE I
Simple regression analysis of dimensions of soldiering with independent variables of Assistant Professors

(n=30)

Sl. No.	Variables	b	Std. error	t	F	R ²
I	Self - Awareness					
1.	Age	0.241	0.162	1.487	2.212	0.075
2.	Gender	4.678	5.306	0.881	0.777	0.029
3.	Education	0.518	3.874	0.133	0.017	0.006
4.	Job experience	0.334	0.229	1.455	2.117	0.072
II	Defining quality and productivity					
1.	Age	0.240	0.125	1.918	3.680	0.119
2.	Gender	-4.714	4.171	-1.130	1.276	0.045
3.	Education	-3.166	3.013	-1.050	1.104	0.039
4.	Job experience	0.318	0.178	1.780	3.170	0.105
III	Enabling protocols of soldiering					
a.	Organizational climate					
1.	Age	0.774	0.377	2.050	4.203	0.134
2.	Gender	-16.035	12.582	-1.274	1.624	0.056
3.	Education	-7	9.230	-0.758	0.575	0.020
4.	Job experience	0.961	0.543	1.771	3.136	0.104
b.	Management style					
1.	Age	-0.029	0.222	-0.132	0.017	0.006
2.	Gender	-0.857	7.098	-0.120	0.014	0.005
3.	Education	14.314	4.306	3.323*	11.04	0.290
4.	Job experience	0.150	0.313	0.481	0.231	0.008
c.	Working hours and situation					
1.	Age	0.082	0.287	0.285	0.081	0.003

Sl. No.	Variables	b	Std. error	t	F	R ²
2.	Gender	-3	9.169	-0.327	0.107	0.003
3.	Education	-2.259	6.601	-0.342	0.117	0.004
4.	Job experience	0.047	0.406	0.117	0.013	0.005
d.	Competency in task					
1.	Age	0.050	0.0248	2.035	4.142	0.133
2.	Gender	-1.071	0.827	-1.294	1.675	0.058
3.	Education	-0.5	0.606	-0.824	0.679	0.024
4.	Job experience	0.069	0.035	1.964	3.861	0.125
e.	Financial incentives					
1.	Age	-0.150	0.058	-2.584*	6.678	0.198
2.	Gender	2.892	2.003	1.443	2.084	0.071
3.	Education	-0.314	1.496	-0.210	0.044	0.001
4.	Job experience	-0.211	0.082	-2.555*	6.531	0.194
f.	Leadership					
1.	Age	-0.415	0.186	-2.224*	4.949	0.154
2.	Gender	8.928	6.248	1.428	2.041	0.070
3.	Education	4.166	4.597	0.906	0.821	0.029
4.	Job experience	-0.524	0.268	-1.951	3.809	0.123
IV	Counterproductive work behaviour					
1.	Age	-0.595	0.376	-1.583	2.507	0.084
2.	Gender	12.5	12.317	1.014	1.029	0.036
3.	Education	5.833	8.966	0.650	0.423	0.015
4.	Job experience	-0.848	0.531	-1.595	2.546	0.086

*Significant at 5 % level

variable, there is increase with certain units of dependent variables. In case of defining quality and productivity, organizational climate, working hours and situation and competency in task, gender and education had negative contribution. Wherein, age and job experience had positive contribution.

Age and gender has negative contribution towards management style, wherein, education and job experience has positive contribution. Whereas in case of financial incentives, only gender had positive contribution and the other factors *viz.*, age, education and job experience had negative contribution. In case of leadership and counterproductive work behaviour, age and job experience had negative contribution, whereas, gender and education had positive contribution. Results of the simple regression analysis of education with management style showed positive impact on soldiering level, which means significant increase of opinion towards management style as the education of the Assistant Professors increases.

Results of simple regression analysis of age with financial incentives showed negative impact on soldiering level, which means significant decrease of financial incentives as the age of Assistant Professors increases. Similar results were found in job experience, which had negative impact on soldiering level indicating significant decrease of financial incentives as the job experience of Assistant Professors increases and leadership had negative impact on soldiering level indicating significant decrease of opinion towards leadership as the age of the Assistant Professors increases.

In the Table II, R² indicates that there is very less amount of variation in the dependent variables explained by the independent variables among the Associate Professors. The coefficients (b) value of age, gender and education had negative contribution towards self-awareness, which means for every unit increase in the age, gender and education there is a decrease with certain units of self-awareness. But, job experience had positive contribution towards self-

TABLE II
Simple regression analysis of dimensions of soldiering with independent variables of Associate Professors

(n=30)

Sl. No.	Variables	b	Std. error	t	F	R ²
I	Self-awareness					
1.	Age	-0.093	0.167	-0.555	0.308	0.011
2.	Gender	-0.035	2.480	-0.014	0.000	0.074
3.	Education	-0.088	1.288	-0.068	0.004	0.004
4.	Job experience	0.408	0.077	5.258*	27.65	0.505
II	Defining quality and productivity					
1.	Age	-0.107	0.214	-0.501	0.251	0.009
2.	Gender	-2.357	3.112	-0.757	0.573	0.020
3.	Education	0.411	1.645	0.250	0.062	0.002
4.	Job experience	0.064	0.140	0.461	0.212	0.007
III	Enabling protocols of soldiering					
a.	Organizational climate					
1.	Age	-0.369	1.453	-0.254	0.064	0.002
2.	Gender	11.5	21.080	0.545	0.297	0.010
3.	Education	3.151	11.094	0.284	0.080	0.003
4.	Job experience	0.360	0.950	0.379	0.143	0.005
b.	Management style					
1.	Age	0.104	0.1808	0.580	0.336	0.012
2.	Gender	1.571	2.837	0.553	0.306	0.010
3.	Education	-0.217	1.389	-0.151	0.023	0.008
4.	Job experience	-0.058	0.118	-0.496	0.246	0.009
c.	Working hours and situation					
1.	Age	-0.224	0.558	-0.402	0.161	0.006
2.	Gender	2.035	8.472	0.240	0.057	0.002
3.	Education	4.209	0.959	0.345	0.920	0.032
4.	Job experience	-0.864	0.327	-2.640*	6.970	0.205
d.	Competency in task					
1.	Age	-0.176	0.199	-0.882	0.778	0.028
2.	Gender	3.055	2.948	1.036	1.073	0.038
3.	Education	0.691	1.541	0.448	0.201	0.007
4.	Job experience	-0.193	0.127	-1.521	2.315	0.078
e.	Financial incentives					
1.	Age	0.090	0.082	1.097	1.204	0.042
2.	Gender	-1.129	1.235	-0.914	0.835	0.030
3.	Education	0.656	0.633	1.037	1.076	0.038
4.	Job experience	0.051	0.054	0.952	0.906	0.032
f.	Leadership					
1.	Age	0.143	0.380	0.377	0.142	0.005
2.	Gender	-0.037	5.660	-0.006	0.428	0.015
3.	Education	-0.509	2.910	-0.175	0.030	0.001
4.	Job experience	0.154	0.248	0.623	0.388	0.014
IV	Counterproductive work behavior					
1.	Age	-0.233	0.338	-0.691	0.478	0.017
2.	Gender	2.370	5.042	0.470	0.220	0.008
3.	Education	-0.779	2.600	-0.299	0.089	0.003
4.	Job experience	-0.249	0.218	-1.142	1.305	0.046

*Significant at 5 % level

awareness, which means for every unit increase in job experience there is unit increase in self-awareness.

The coefficient (b) value of age and gender has negative contribution towards defining quality and productivity, which means for every unit increase in the age, gender and education there is a decrease with certain units of towards defining quality and productivity. But, gender and job experience had positive contribution towards defining quality and productivity, which means for every unit increase in job experience there is unit increase in defining quality and productivity. Whereas, the b value in case of organizational climate is found to be negative only for age of the of the Associate Professors, which means for every unit increase in age, there is certain units of decrease in organizational climate. But, there is a positive contribution of gender, education and job experience towards organization climate, which means for every unit increase in gender, education and job experience there is unit increase in organizational climate.

The b value of education and job experience has negative contribution towards management style, whereas, age and gender of Associate Professors has positive contribution towards management style. Where positive contribution was found in working hours and situation by the gender and education, negative contribution was found by age and job experience of the Associate Professors. Similar results were observed in case of competency task also. Whereas, the negative b value was found in case of financial incentives by the gender and the other factors *viz.*, age, education and job experience had positive contribution towards financial incentives. In case of leadership, gender and education had negative contribution and positive contribution was from age and job experience. The positive contribution was by gender and education towards counterproductive work behaviour was observed and negative contribution was from age.

There are only two cases of significance at 5 per cent level with 50.5 per cent and 20.5 per cent R^2 value for job experience in self-awareness and working hours and situation, respectively. Results of simple regression analysis of job experience with self-awareness indicated positive impact on soldiering level, this means significant increase in self-awareness as

the job experience increases. Similarly, the results of simple regression analysis of job experience in working hours and situation indicated negative impact on soldiering level, this means significant decrease in working hours and situation as the job experience increases.

In the Table III, R^2 indicates that there is very less amount of variation in the dependent variables explained by the independent variables among the Professors. The coefficient (b) value of age, education and job experience has negassment style and leadership, which means for every unit change in age and gender had increase in management style and leadership by certain units. Whereas, education and job experience had negative contribution. The results for working hours and situation and financial incentives had similar output, where age and gender had positive contribution, whereas, education and job experience had negative contribution.

The coefficients (b) value of age, gender and education has negative contribution towards competency in task and counterproductive work behaviour, which means for every unit increase in the age, gender and education there is a decrease with certain units towards competency in task and counterproductive work behaviour. But, job experience had positive contribution towards competency in task and counterproductive work behaviour, which means for every unit increase in job experience there is unit increase in competency in task and counterproductive work behaviour. The results of the simple regression analysis of education with self-awareness showed negative impact on soldiering level, this means significant decrease in self-awareness as education increases. Similar results were observed in financial incentives and counterproductive work behaviour, where job experience has positive impact on soldiering level, which means significant increase in financial incentives and counterproductive work behaviour as job experience increases.

From Table IV it is clear that, among Assistant Professors there is no significant association between any of the independent variables *viz.*, age, gender, education and job experience with any of the dependent variables *viz.*, self-awareness, defining quality and

TABLE III

Simple regression analysis of dimensions of soldiering with independent variables of Professors
(n=30)

Sl. No.	Variables	b	Std. error	t	F	R ²
I	Self-awareness					
1.	Age	-0.009	0.144	-0.066	0.005	0.001
2.	Gender	2	1.274	1.568	2.461	0.083
3.	Education	-4.965	1.969	-2.521*	6.358	0.185
4.	Job experience	-0.143	0.103	-1.387	1.925	0.066
II	Defining quality and productivity					
1.	Age	-0.145	0.206	-0.701	0.492	0.017
2.	Gender	-0.974	1.914	-0.508	0.258	0.009
3.	Education	-5.03	3.032	-1.659	2.755	0.089
4.	Job experience	-0.061	0.154	-0.399	0.159	0.006
III	Enabling protocols of soldiering					
a.	Organizational climate					
1.	Age	0.236	1.169	0.201	0.040	0.001
2.	Gender	-6.615	10.719	-0.617	0.380	0.013
3.	Education	-30	17.559	-1.708	2.918	0.094
4.	Job experience	0.967	0.849	1.139	1.298	0.045
b.	Management style					
1.	Age	0.130	0.211	0.618	0.382	0.013
2.	Gender	0.705	1.962	0.359	0.129	0.004
3.	Education	-1.034	3.221	-0.321	0.103	0.003
4.	Job experience	-0.176	0.154	-1.139	1.297	0.045
c.	Working hours and situation					
1.	Age	-0.219	0.459	-0.477	0.227	0.008
2.	Gender	-2.08	4.239	-0.492	0.243	0.008
3.	Education	4.448	6.944	0.640	0.410	0.014
4.	Job experience	0.172	0.341	0.504	0.254	0.009
d.	Competency in task					
1.	Age	-0.144	0.346	-0.416	0.173	0.006
2.	Gender	-3.423	3.140	-1.089	1.187	0.042
3.	Education	-3.241	5.345	-0.606	0.367	0.012
4.	Job experience	0.267	0.253	1.054	1.112	0.199
e.	Financial incentives					
1.	Age	-0.139	0.308	-0.451	0.203	0.007
2.	Gender	-2.858	2.803	-1.019	1.040	0.037
3.	Education	5.103	4.583	1.113	1.239	0.042
4.	Job experience	0.610	0.197	3.088*	9.539	0.261
f.	Leadership					
1.	Age	0.297	0.614	0.483	0.233	0.008
2.	Gender	4.871	5.614	0.867	0.752	0.027
3.	Education	-4.965	9.371	-0.529	0.280	0.009
4.	Job experience	-0.465	0.449	-1.034	1.070	0.038
IV	Counterproductive work behavior					
1.	Age	-0.008	0.291	-0.029	0.000	0.003
2.	Gender	-0.705	2.681	-0.263	0.069	0.003
3.	Education	-2.137	4.380	-0.488	0.238	0.008
4.	Job experience	0.511	0.192	2.658*	7.067	0.207

*Significant at 5 % level

productivity, organizational climate, management style, working hours and situation, competency in task, financial incentives, leadership and counterproductive work behaviour

From Table V it is clear that, among Associate Professors there is no significant association between age, gender and education with any of the dependent variables viz., self-awareness, defining quality and

productivity, organizational climate, management style, working hours and situation, competency in task, financial incentives, leadership and counterproductive work behaviour. But, there is a significant association at 5 per cent level between job experience with self-awareness and defining quality and productivity. Whereas, there is no significant association between job experience with other dependent variables viz., organizational climate, management style, working

TABLE IV
Correlation of dimensions of soldiering with independent variables of Assistant Professors
(n=30)

Sl. No.	Dependent Variables	Correlation Coefficient			
		Age	Gender	Education	Job Experience
I.	Self-awareness	0.168 NS	0.170 NS	0.012 NS	0.258 NS
II.	Defining quality and productivity	0.257 NS	-0.201 NS	-0.204 NS	0.316 NS
IIIa.	Organizational climate	0.267 NS	-0.224 NS	-0.152 NS	0.313 NS
b.	Management style	-0.031 NS	-0.022 NS	0.537 NS	0.92 NS
c.	Working hours and situation	0.032 NS	-0.061 NS	-0.069 NS	0.22 NS
d.	Competency in task	0.263 NS	-0.227 NS	-0.164 NS	0.343 NS
e.	Financial incentives	-0.328 NS	0.250 NS	-0.027 NS	-0.425 NS
f.	Leadership	-0.282 NS	0.248 NS	0.179 NS	-0.339 NS
IV.	Counterproductive work behaviour	-0.213 NS	0.182 NS	0.131 NS	-0.287 NS

NS- Non significant *Significant at 5 % level of probability

TABLE V
Correlation of dimensions of soldiering with independent variables of Associate Professors
(n=30)

Sl. No.	Dependent Variables	Correlation Coefficient			
		Age	Gender	Education	Job Experience
I.	Self-awareness	-0.063 NS	-0.003 NS	-0.042 NS	0.716 *
II.	Defining quality and productivity	-0.107 NS	-0.142 NS	0.058 NS	0.071 *
IIIa.	Organizational climate	-0.056 NS	0.103 NS	0.060 NS	0.062 NS
b.	Management style	-0.002 NS	0.104 NS	0.052 NS	-0.184 NS
c.	Working hours and situation	0.003 NS	0.045 NS	0.113 NS	-0.347 NS
d.	Competency in task	-0.118 NS	0.185 NS	0.051 NS	0.227 NS
e.	Financial incentives	0.212 NS	-0.175 NS	0.181 NS	0.187 NS
f.	Leadership	-0.004 NS	0.012 NS	0.024 NS	0.041 NS
IV.	Counterproductive work behaviour	-0.187 NS	0.099 NS	-0.005 NS	-0.264 NS

NS- Non significant *Significant at 5 % level of probability

TABLE VI
Correlation of dimensions of soldiering with independent variables of Professors

(n=30)

Sl. No.	Dependent Variables	Correlation Coefficient			
		Age	Gender	Education	Job Experience
I.	Self-awareness	-0.009 NS	0.246 NS	0.024 NS	-0.255 NS
II.	Defining quality and productivity	-0.105 NS	-0.147 *	0.127 NS	-0.062 NS
IIIa.	Organizational climate	0.104 NS	-0.126 NS	0.014 NS	0.175 NS
b.	Management style	0.127 NS	0.032 NS	0.037 NS	-0.207 NS
c.	Working hours and situation	-0.104 NS	-0.047 NS	0.056 NS	0.088 NS
d.	Competency in task	-0.035 NS	0.278 NS	0.112 NS	0.215 NS
e.	Financial incentives	-0.093 NS	-0.148 NS	-0.164 NS	0.503 NS
f.	Leadership	0.063 NS	0.210 NS	-0.027 NS	-0.207 NS
IV.	Counterproductive work behaviour	0.002 NS	-0.064 NS	0.179 NS	0.457 NS

NS- Non significant

*Significant at 5 % level of probability

hours and situation, competency in task, financial incentives, leadership and counterproductive work behaviour.

From Table VI it is clear that, almost similar results were found among the Professors. Where there is no significant association between independent variables *viz.*, age, gender, education and job experience with dependent variables *viz.*, self-awareness, defining quality and productivity, organizational climate, management style, working hours and situation, competency in task, financial incentives, leadership and counterproductive work behavior. But, there is only one case of significance at five per cent level, which is between gender and defining quality and productivity.

Results of simple regression analysis showed the negative impact between financial incentives with age and job experience of Assistant Professors and also similar results were observed between leadership and age. Similarly negative impact was found between working hours and situation of Associate Professors. Whereas, in case of Professors, negative impact was observed between self-awareness and education.

Among Assistant Professors there is no significant association between any of the independent variables and soldiering dimensions. Among Associate Professors there is a significant association at 5 per cent level between job experience with self-awareness and defining quality and productivity. There was only one case of significance at five per cent level, which is between gender and defining quality and productivity among the Professors was found.

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 and 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 Agricultural Sciences, Bangalore, *M.Sc. (Agri), Thesis*, Univ. Agric. Sci., Bangalore.

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