

## Job Performance of State Agricultural University Teachers in Karnataka

ABDUL SATTAR FAZELY AND M. S. NATARAJU

Department of Agricultural Extension, College of Agriculture, UAS, GKVK, Bengaluru-560 065

### ABSTRACT

The present study was conducted during 2014-2015 to analyze the job performance of teachers. Data was collected from a sample of 180 teachers comprising of 60 Assistant Professors, 60 Associate Professors and 60 Professors using a pre-tested interview questionnaire. The results revealed that there was no significant difference in job performance levels of teachers of UAS (B) and UAS (D). It was found from the 't' values that there was no significant difference in the mean job performance scores between Professors and Associate Professors ('t' value =1.488) and between Associate Professors and Assistant Professors ('t' value =1.211). However, there existed a significant difference in the mean job performance score between Professors and Assistant Professors as evident from 't' value (2.100). Education, mass media participation, training undergone, perceived work load, number of publications published, achievement motivation, aspiration, competition orientation, scientific orientation, participation in seminars/conferences, award/recognition received, job experience, organizational climate and attitude towards organizations of teachers had significant to highly significant association with their job performance. Twenty two independent variables selected for the study had contributed to the tune of 69.30 per cent variation on the job performance of teachers. Majority of the teachers suggested that they must be relieved from non-academic /clerical activities (Scrutinizers, warden, members for various committees etc.) (76.11%), deputing them to pursue post-doctoral programme (69.44%) and the University should provide LCD facility in all classrooms (53.33%) for improving their job performance.

THE concept of integration of teaching, research and extension has already proved its worth through remarkable progress made in the field of agricultural education, research and extension by the Agricultural Universities. There is perceptible improvement in the quality of education with more competent teachers, better equipped libraries, laboratories, etc. in the Agricultural Universities. These institutions today are serving as fountain heads of new knowledge earned through purposeful, problem-solving research and have become main centres of dissemination of useful knowledge to the farming community. There are numerous functional specialists in these Universities who have gained confidence through experience in successfully applying scientific knowledge to the solution of practical problems.

Job performance of the employee helps to know their level of performance and delineate the factors responsible for it. Job performance of the teachers is one of the criterion for evaluating the effectiveness of an organization. Employees' performance refers to an act of fulfillment of the requirement of a given job i.e., the manner in which an employee carries out his/her

job efficiently (Sharma (1986). However, in many organizations especially under public sector, the performance of the staff is associated mostly to fulfill the organizational goals such as promotions, transfers and for determining the training needs. But in developmental organizations, the performance of the staff is assessed in order to achieve some targeted objectives. Unless the employees are well informed about their performance and also their strong and weak points, it is very difficult for them to improve their level of performance. This is also considered as important for reinforcing the positive points and overcoming the weakness of the employees. Thus, measurement of job performance and its feedback plays an important role in knowing the efficiency of employees. In this backdrop, the present study is undertaken with the following specific objectives:

To analyze the job performance of teachers.

To find out the association between personal, psychological, socio-economic and communication characteristics of teachers with their job performance.

To enlist the suggestions of teachers for improving their job performance.

#### METHODOLOGY

The study was conducted during 2014-15 at three campuses of University of Agricultural Sciences, Bengaluru (UASB) and three campuses in University of Agricultural Sciences, Dharwad (UASD). Three campuses selected from UAS, Bengaluru were : (1) Agricultural College, GKVK, (2) Agricultural College, Hassan and (3) Sericulture College, Chintamani. Whereas the three campuses selected in UAS, Dharwad campus were: (1) Agricultural College, Dharwad, (2) Forestry College, Sirsi and (3) Agricultural College, Hanumanamatti.

The respondents for this study were the teachers working in the above mentioned six colleges. From each campus, 30 Assistant Professors, 30 Associate Professors and 30 Professors were selected for the study. Sixty Assistant Professors, 60 Associate Professors and 60 Professors from two Universities were sampled for the study. Ex-post facto research design was followed in the present study since the phenomenon has already occurred.

*Job performance (Dependent variable):* The job performance was operationalized as the degree to which the different job duties (activities) were performed by the teachers as the occupants of the post. The job performance of teachers was measured by using the scale developed by Sundaraswamy (1987) with some modifications. The scale consist of 7 items on a three-point continuum, namely, most efficient, efficient and least efficient with score of 3, 2 and 1, respectively. The minimum and maximum one could get was 7 and 21, respectively. The performance score of all the job items was summed up to get the job performance score of teachers. Then the respondents were categorized into low, medium and high levels of job performance based on mean and half standard deviation.

The information about 22 independent variables (Table V) was collected with the help of a pre-tested interview schedule. The collected data was scored, tabulated and analyzed using frequencies, percentage, chi-square test, multiple regression analysis and t-test.

#### RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

*Overall job performance of UASB and UASD teachers:* Data provided in Table I presents the data on the overall job performance of teachers of UASB and UASD. The table indicates that a greater number (36.68%) of UASB teachers were belonging to high level of job performance, while 34.44 and 28.88 per cent of them were belonging to medium and low level of job performance categories, respectively. As high as 71.12 per cent of UASB teachers were found in medium to high level of job performance categories.

TABLE I  
*Overall job performance of UASB and UASD teachers*

Job Performance	Teachers			
	UAS B (n=90)		UASD (n=90)	
	No.	%	No.	%
Low	26	28.88	28	31.11
Medium	31	34.44	29	32.21
High	33	36.68	33	36.68
Total	90	100.00	90	100.00

It could also be seen from the same Table that more number of (36.68%) UASD teachers were belonging to high level of job performance, while 32.21 per cent were having medium and 31.11 per cent of them were having low level of job performance. A majority (68.89%) of the UASD teachers were found in medium to high level of job performance categories.

Better working environment, good salary coupled with promotional opportunities, job security, deputation by the University to higher education and training, availability of ICT tools for teaching etc., are the reasons for majority of teachers of UASB (71.12%) and UASD (68.89%) for performing their job better. Similar findings were reported by Narasimhagowda (1989) and Mohan (2000).

*Test of significance between the UASB and UASD teachers with respect to overall job performance:* Table II reveals that the mean job performance score of UASB teachers (16.99) was more compared to the mean job performance score

TABLE II  
*Test of significance between UASB and UASD teachers with respect to overall job performance*

Teachers	Job Performance	
	Mean Score	't' Value
UAS(B) (n=90)	16.99	0.212 NS
UAS(D) (n=90)	16.01	

NS= Non significant

of UASD teachers (16.01). However, there was no significant difference as evident from 't' value (0.212) in respect of the mean job performance scores between UASB and UASD teachers. It can be inferred that there is no difference in job performance of teachers of UASB and UASD.

*Overall job performance of Assistant Professors, Associate Professors and Professors:* The results in Table III presents the data on the overall job performance of Assistant Professors, Associate Professors and Professors. It could be seen from Table III that 35.00 per cent of the Assistant Professors were belonging to low level of job performance, while one-third (33.34%) and 31.66 per cent of the Assistant Professors were belonging to medium to high level of job performance categories. A majority (68.34%) of the Assistant Professors were belonging to medium to low level of job performance category.

TABLE III  
*Overall job performance of Assistant Professors, Associate Professors and Professors*

Job Performance	Teachers					
	Asst. Prof. (n=60)		Assoc. Prof. (n=60)		Professor (n=60)	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Low	21	35.00	18	30.00	15	25.00
Medium	20	33.34	19	31.66	21	35.00
High	19	31.66	23	38.34	24	40.00
Total	60	100.00	60	100.00	60	100.00

More number (38.34%) of Associate Professors were belonging to high level of job performance, whereas 31.66 and 30.00 per cent of them were belonging to medium and low level of job performance categories. A majority (70.00%) of the Associate Professors were belonging to medium to high level of job performance categories.

Forty per cent of the Professors were belonging to high level of job performance category, while 35.00 and 25.00 per cent of them were belonging to medium and low level of job performance categories. A vast majority (75.00%) of the Professors were belonging to medium to high level of job performance categories.

Lack of experience, more work load and deputing them to non-academic/clerical activities (Marks-card Scrutinizers, Warden, Tour managers etc.,) are the reasons for greater number of Assistant Professors (35.00%) exhibiting low job performance compared to the high level of job performance as exhibited by Associate Professors (38.34%) and Professors (40.00%).

*Test of significance between Assistant Professors, Associate Professors and Professors with respect to job performance :* It is also observed from Table IV that the mean job performance scores of Professors (19.28) were more than the mean job performance scores of Associate Professors (17.01) and Assistant Professors (15.88). It can be inferred from 't' values that there was no significant difference

TABLE IV  
*Test of significance between Assistant Professors, Associate Professors and Professors with respect to job performance*

Teachers	Job Performance	
	Mean Score	't' Value
Assistant Professors (n=60)	15.88	1.211 NS
Associate Professors (n=60)	17.01	
Associate Professors (n=60)	17.01	1.488 NS
Professors (n=60)	19.28	
Professors (n=60)	19.28	2.100 *
Assistant Professors (n=60)	15.88	

NS= Non-significant \* Significant at 5 per cent level

in the mean job performance scores between Professors and Associate Professors ('t' value =1.488) and also between Associate Professors and Assistant Professors ('t' value =1.211). But there existed a significant difference in the mean job performance score between Professors and Assistant Professors as evident from 't' value (2.100).

*Association between the independent variables and job performance of teacher :* The analysis of the chi-square test in Table V revealed

that mass media participation, training undergone, perceived work load, number of publications published, achievement motivation, aspiration, competition orientation, scientific orientation, participation in seminars/conferences and award/recognition received had significant association with the job performance of teachers at five per cent level. On the other hand, variables such as, education, job experience, organizational climate and attitude towards organizations were found to have significant association at one per cent level with the job

TABLE V  
*Association and extent of contribution of independent variables with Job performance*  
(n=180)

Independent Variables	Chi Square Value	Regression Co-efficient	Standard Error	't' Value
Sex	0.692 NS	0.944	0.212	0.225 NS
Age	1.628 NS	0.456	0.122	0.267 NS
Education	14.699 **	0.265	0.828	3.136 **
Family size	2.312 NS	0.824	0.512	0.621 NS
Annual income	1.968 NS	0.319	0.412	1.291 NS
Rural- urban background	2.699 NS	0.014	0.014	0.961 NS
Job experience	20.699 **	0.320	0.922	2.888 **
Rural experience	0.928 NS	0.148	0.231	1.560 NS
Mass media participation	10.699 *	0.211	0.362	1.712 NS
Training undergone	11.621 *	0.324	0.692	2.134 *
Perceived work load	12.681 *	0.243	0.412	1.691 NS
Number of publications	1.938 *	0.763	0.512	0.671 NS
Achievement motivation	10.928 *	0.365	0.012	2.222 *
Aspiration	11.612 *	0.324	0.699	2.156 *
Competition orientation	10.062 *	0.344	0.616	1.788 NS
Scientific orientation	9.962 *	0.335	0.561	1.671 NS
Organizational climate	13.690 **	0.158	0.888	5.613 **
Attitude towards organization	15.699 **	0.235	0.926	3.916 **
Participation on seminars/conferences	11.688 *	0.251	0.421	1.671 NS
Abroad exposure/countries visited	1.699 NS	0.392	0.383	0.976 NS
Awards/Recognition received	12.666 *	0.397	0.791	1.999 *
Number of post graduate students guided	0.968 NS	0.131	0.091	0.691 NS

\*\*Significant at 1 per cent level; \* = Significant at 5 per cent level; NS= Non significant; R<sup>2</sup>=0.693 ; F=15.69\*\*

performance of the teachers. While, the variables such as sex, age, family size, annual income, rural-urban background, rural experience, abroad exposure/country visited and number of students guided had no significant association with the job performance of teachers.

For every unit increase in education, mass media participation, training undergone, perceived work load, number of publications published, achievement motivation, aspiration, competition orientation, scientific orientation, participation in seminars/conferences and award/recognition job experience, organizational climate and attitude towards organizations there will be increase in the job performance level of the teachers. The present findings are in line with the results of Salunkhen *et al.* (2012), Pounraj (2013), Gopika (2015), Manjunath (2015) and Tanweer (2015).

*Extent of contribution of independent variables on the job performance of teachers:* The examination of Table V also reveals that the 22 independent variables had contributed to the tune of 69.30 per cent ( $R^2=0.693$ ) variation on the job performance of teachers. The results further revealed that the independent variables, such as, education, job experience, training undergone, achievement motivation, aspiration, organizational climate, attitude towards organization and awards/recognition received were significant in multiple regression analysis in explaining the variation on the job performance of teachers. The said eight independent variables have immensely contributed to the job performance of teachers. These variables are considered to be the crucial variables in explaining the job performance.

*Suggestions of teachers for increasing their job performance :* It is observed from Table VI that majority of the teachers suggested that they must be relieved from non-academic /clerical activities (Scrutinizers, warden, members for various committees etc.) (76.11%), depute them to pursue post-doctoral programme (69.44%) and the University should provide LCD facility in all classrooms (53.33%) for improving their job performance. Whereas, less than half of the teachers suggested that there should be transparency in transfer policy (once in 5 years ) (45.55%), the University to provide adequate number of computers with speed internet facility (39.44%),

TABLE VI  
*Suggestions of teachers for increasing their job performance*

Suggestions*	Teachers (n=180)	
	No.	%
Deputing teachers to pursue post-doctoral programme.	125	69.44
Good working atmosphere needed for performing good work.	51	28.33
Recruitment of teachers for reducing work load of present faculty	51	28.33
Providing adequate number of computers with speed internet facility	71	39.44
Providing recognition for teachers for good work	42	23.33
Providing adequate funds for conducting research	39	21.66
Establishing adequate laboratory facilities	26	14.44
Transparency in transfer policy (once in 5 years )	82	45.55
Adequate number of staff quarters	24	13.33
Teachers must to be relieved from non-academic /clerical activities (Scrutinizers, warden, members for various committees etc)	137	76.11
Providing LCD facility in all classrooms	96	53.33
Deputing teachers for pre-service/ in-service trainings	69	38.33
Deputing teachers to participate in seminars/ conference/training programme etc.	65	36.11
Adequate transport facilities for taking students to field work/visits to organizations	30	16.66

\*Multiples responses is possible

depute teachers for pre-service/in-service trainings (38.33%), depute teachers to participate in seminars/ conference/training programme etc. (36.11%), provide good working atmosphere needed for performing good work (28.33%), recruit more teachers for reducing work load of present faculty (28.33%), provide recognition for teachers for good work (23.33%), provide adequate funds for conducting research

(21.66%), provide adequate transport facilities for taking students to field work/visits to organizations (16.66%), establish adequate laboratory facilities (14.44%) and provide adequate number of staff quarters (13.33%) for improving their performance.

Majority of UASB and UASD teachers belong to medium to high level of job performance categories and there was no significant difference observed between the Teachers of two farm universities in terms of their job performance. When teachers perceive job as more enjoyable, certainly their performance is going to enhance. It is necessary to improve the job performance of the teachers by the State Agricultural Universities by providing : (a) essential infrastructure facilities, (b) depute them for post-doctoral studies, higher training and seminars. workshops, conference etc., (c) appropriate promotion opportunities and suitable reward for work, and (d) relieve the Assistant Professors from non-academic / clerical activities.

#### REFERENCES

- GOPIKA, M. H., 2015, Study on participation in decision making, job satisfaction and job performance of Assistant Horticulture Officers, *M.Sc. (Agri.) Thesis* (Unpub.), Univ. of Agril. Sci., Bengaluru.
- MANJUNATH, V. B., 2015, Job perception and job performance of Panchayath Development Officers. *Ph.D. Thesis* (Unpub.), Univ. of Agril. Sci., Dharwad.
- MOHAN, B., 2000, A study on the job performance and job satisfaction of Assistant Agricultural Officers in Northern District of Karnataka. *M.Sc. (Agri.) Thesis* (Unpub.), Univ. of Agril. Sci., Dharwad.
- NARASIMHAGOWDA, 1989, Job perception, job satisfaction and job performance of Assistant Horticultural Officers. *M.Sc. (Agri.) Thesis* (Unpub.), Univ. of Agril. Sci., Bengaluru.
- POUNRAJ, A., 2013, Job performance of fisheries extension functionaries in Tamil Nadu. *Madras Agric. J.*, **100** (1 - 3) : 217 - 223.
- SALUNKHEN, S. R., PANDYA, R. D. AND SURENDRA KUMAR RAI, 2012, Role performance of agroservice providers and beneficiaries in Navsari district of Gujarat state. *Rajasthan J. Extn. Edu.*, **20** : 7 - 9
- SHARMA, 1986, Management of Job performance, Gian Publishing House, New Delhi.
- SUNDARASWAMY, B., 1987, A study on need achievement and job performance of Assistant Agricultural Officers in Karnataka State. *Ph. D. Thesis* (Unpub), Tamil Nadu Agricultural University, Coimbatore.
- TANWEER, A., 2015, Knowledge level, role perception and job performance of farm facilitators under Bhoochetana programme of KSDA in Chickballapur District, *M. Sc. (Agri.) Thesis* (Unpub.), Univ. of Agril. Sci., Bengaluru.

**(Received : July, 2016 Accepted : November, 2016)**