

Winner of DR Balyal Memorial Best Paper Award 2017

Job commitment among the scientists of selected state agricultural universities of northern India

PRIYANKA KANDWAL and PRABHJOT KAUR

**Department of Extension Education, Punjab Agricultural University
Ludhiana 141004 Punjab, India**

Email for correspondence: priyakandwal@gmail.com

© Society for Advancement of Human and Nature 2017

Received: 15.3.2016/Accepted: 11.6.2016

ABSTRACT

The study was undertaken with the objective to find out the job commitment of scientists. Hundred and twenty scientists of Punjab Agricultural University, Ludhiana, Punjab and CSKHP Krishi Vishwavidyalaya, Palampur, Kangra, HP were selected using probability proportional to number for the purpose of this study. The data were collected with the help of interview schedule. Findings of the study revealed that there was a non-significant difference in the mean scores of two state agricultural universities except in one aspect where a significant difference in the mean scores of the two universities was found. On further testing the significance of difference in total mean scores of both the universities a non-significant value was found which infers that in overall there was no significant difference in the mean scores of the two universities related to various aspects of job commitment.

Keywords: State agricultural universities; job commitment; non-significant; mean scores

INTRODUCTION

State agricultural universities are the academic organizations whose performance like other organizations depends largely upon their employees and further the performance of these employees depends on their commitment towards their job. This signifies two aspects viz employee devoting himself to the work role with the full sense of sincerity, honesty and responsibility and employee experiencing emotional involvement in the job with the result that one finds it meaningful and purposive in one's life. Commitment implies a sense of fidelity and adherence to certain principles imposed by the individual to reach a goal. The sense of belongingness is core of commitment and it causes a kind of connection, an intimate bond between the committed person and the object of commitment. The sense of commitment makes the individual to gather round a common value, aim and culture. When a person is committed to an organization it shows a strong identification towards the value system and membership of that organization and also agrees with its objectives and is prepared to work as a strong team for and on behalf of the organization. Keeping in view the multifarious advantages of commitment the

implications of the subject have been studied upon university teachers with the objectives to study job commitment, to compare job commitment and to find out the relationship between job commitment and selected socio-personal characteristics among the scientists of selected state agricultural universities of northern India.

METHODOLOGY

A list of scientists of Punjab Agricultural University, Ludhiana, Punjab and CSKHP Krishi Vishwavidyalaya, Palampur, Kangra, HP was procured. From this list 120 scientists were selected by using probability proportional to number of scientists in each university. From Punjab Agricultural University 71 and from CSKHP Krishi Vishwavidyalaya 49 scientists were selected. The selected scientists were further selected on the basis of their major job responsibility and then on the basis of their cadre using probability proportional to cadre. The data were collected by following distributed questionnaire approach and analyzed with the help of common statistical tools appropriate to the nature of data and for the purpose of the study. The statistical tools used

in the analysis were mean score, cumulative frequency cube root method, coefficient of correlation, chi-square test, analysis of variance and z-test.

RESULTS and DISCUSSION

Socio-personal characteristics of the scientists

The study of socio-personal characteristics provides the preliminary idea about the scientists. The general information about the socio-personal characteristics of the scientists have been presented in Table 1.

Age: Age of the scientists varied from 29-59 years. In case of PAU more than 80 per cent of the scientists belonged to 39-59 years of age and only 19.72 per cent fell in the category of 29-39 years. In CSKHPKV more than 22 per cent scientists belonged to 29-39 years of age. Remaining 36.73 and about 41 per cent of the scientists belonged to 39-49 and 49-59 years of age group respectively. So majority of the scientists in both the SAUs belonged to age group of 39-59 years.

Service experience: The service experience ranged from 5 to 35 years. More than three fourth of the scientists (76.06%) from PAU had experience of 15-35 and 23.94 per cent of 5-15 years. In case of CSKHPKV 24.49 per cent scientists had 5-15 years and about 31 and 45 per cent of 15-25 and 25-35 years experience respectively. More than three fourth of the scientists in CSKHPKV were having the service experience of 15-35 years. Thus majority with similar proportion in both the SAUs were having service experience of more than 15 years.

Family background: At PAU 59.15 per cent scientists belonged to urban background but in CSKHPKV the trend was completely opposite as majority of the scientists (85.71%) belonged to rural background.

Marital status: A large majority of scientists of PAU and CSKHPKV (97 and 98% respectively) were married and the remaining were unmarried. This may be due to the reason that majority of scientists joined the service after doing PhD in both the SAUs.

Qualification at the time of joining the service: More than three fourth of the scientists of both PAU and CSKHPKV (76.06 and 75.51% respectively) were having PhD while only 23.94 and 24.49 per cent respectively had MSc qualification at the time of joining the service.

Education of spouse: Education of spouse of the scientists varied from graduate to doctorate. At PAU 85.92 and in case of CSKHPKV 92 per cent of the scientists' spouses were graduates or post-graduates. Only 14 and 8 per cent scientists' spouses of PAU and CSKHPKV respectively were doctorate.

Job commitment of the scientists

Data in Table 2 reveal that in various items of job commitment of the scientists a non-significant difference in the mean score of both SAUs was found except in one item ie not willing to change the profession with the same pay and designation where a significant difference in the mean scores was found. On further testing the significance of difference in total mean scores a non-significant value was found which infers that in overall there was no significant difference in the mean scores of the two SAUs related to the various items of job commitment.

Comparison between the job commitment of two SAUs

Data in Table 3 depict the results of both the SAUs regarding job commitment. Majority of the scientists of both PAU and CSKHPKV had medium job commitment. Nearly 17 and 30 per cent of the scientists of PAU had low and high job commitment respectively. In CSKHPKV 38.77 per cent had high while only 14.29 per cent of the scientists had low job commitment. The results are in contradiction to the work of Kaur (2003).

Association of socio-personal characteristics with job commitment

Regarding the socio-personal characteristics affecting the job commitment, the association between the discrete variables like designation, qualification at the time of joining the service, major job responsibility and education of spouse with job commitment was worked out and data have been presented in Table 4. The relationship of age and service experience with job commitment has been shown in Table 5.

Association between the designation and job commitment of scientists: In PAU among assistant professors or equivalent 15 per cent had medium job commitment, among the associate professors or equivalent 18 per cent and among professors or equivalent 20 per cent were moderately committed to their jobs. Association between designation and job commitment of the scientists was found to be non-significant. These results are in conformity with those

Table 1. Distribution of the scientists according to their socio-personal characteristics

Characteristics	Category/range	PAU (n= 71)		CSKHPKV (n= 49)	
		Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Age (years)	Young (29-39)	14	19.72	11	22.45
	Middle age (39-49)	29	40.84	18	36.73
	Old (49-59)	28	39.44	20	40.82
Job experience (years)	5-15	17	23.94	12	24.49
	15-25	28	39.43	15	30.61
	25-35	26	36.63	22	44.90
Family background	Rural	29	40.85	42	85.71
	Urban	42	59.15	07	14.29
Marital status	Married	69	97.19	48	97.96
	Unmarried	02	2.81	01	2.04
Qualification at the time of joining the service	MSc	17	23.94	12	24.49
	PhD	54	76.06	37	75.51
Designation	Assistant Professor	21	29.58	13	26.53
	Associate Professor	24	33.80	16	32.65
	Professor	26	36.62	20	40.82
Major job responsibility	Teaching	22	30.99	22	44.89
	Research	45	63.38	25	51.02
	Extension	04	5.63	02	4.09
Education of spouse	Graduate	25	35.22	16	32.65
	Post-graduate	36	50.70	29	59.18
	Doctorate	10	14.08	04	8.17

Table 2. Distribution of scientists according to their job commitment

Statement	Mean score		Z-test value
	PAU	CSKHPKV	
Present job is more important than most other things	4.13	4.33	1.21
Feel hurt if anyone speaks ill about my profession	3.63	3.78	0.83
Not just concerned about the job but also interested in progress of university	3.52	3.69	0.07
Matter of pride being a university teacher, extensionist or researcher	3.51	3.59	0.35
Teaching/research/extension is the best profession	3.45	3.44	0.04
Extremely glad on opting for teaching/research/extension profession	3.38	3.43	0.2
Not willing to do something different from the present job	3.32	3.37	0.19
Much to be gained by sticking with this profession till retirement	3.25	3.29	0.16
Talk of teaching/research/extension profession as a great profession	3.15	3.28	0.54
Making meaningful contribution to the university through my work	3.06	3.27	0.89
Not willing to change the profession with the same pay	3.04	2.45	2.39*
Total mean score	3.40	3.45	0.19

*Significant at 5 per cent level

Table 3. Overall job commitment of scientists

Job commitment	PAU (n= 71)		CSKHPKV (n= 49)		F-value
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	
Low (11-26)	12	16.90	7	14.29	0.363
Medium (26-41)	38	53.52	23	46.94	
High (41-55)	21	29.58	19	38.77	

Table 4. Association between different parameters and job commitment of scientists

Parameter	Job commitment (PAU)				Job commitment (CSKHPKV)			
	Low	Medium	High	Total	Low	Medium	High	Total
Designation								
Assistant Professor/equivalent	5 (7.04)	11 (15.49)	5 (7.05)	21 (29.58)	2 (4.08)	6 (12.24)	5 (10.21)	13 (26.53)
Associate Professor/equivalent	5 (7.04)	13 (18.31)	6 (8.45)	24 (33.80)	3 (6.12)	7 (14.29)	6 (12.24)	16 (32.65)
Professor/equivalent	2 (2.81)	14 (19.72)	10 (14.09)	26 (36.62)	2 (4.08)	10 (20.41)	8 (16.33)	20 (40.82)
Total	12 (16.9)	38 (53.52)	21 (29.59)	71 (100)	7 (14.28)	23 (46.94)	19 (38.78)	49 (100)
Qualification at the time of joining the service								
MSc	2 (2.82)	9 (12.67)	6 (8.45)	17 (23.94)	1 (2.04)	5 (10.20)	6 (12.25)	12 (24.49)
PhD	10 (14.08)	29 (40.85)	15 (21.13)	54 (76.06)	6 (12.24)	18 (36.74)	13 (26.53)	37 (75.51)
Total	12 (16.9)	38 (53.52)	21 (29.58)	71 (100)	7 (14.28)	23 (46.94)	19 (38.78)	49 (100)
Job responsibility								
Teaching	4 (5.63)	10 (14.08)	8 (11.28)	22 (30.99)	3 (6.12)	13 (26.53)	6 (12.25)	22 (44.90)
Research	7 (9.86)	25 (35.21)	13 (18.31)	45 (63.38)	4 (8.16)	9 (18.37)	12 (24.49)	25 (51.02)
Extension	1 (1.40)	3 (4.23)	0 (0.00)	4 (5.63)	0 (0.00)	1 (2.04)	1 (2.04)	2 (4.08)
Total	12 (16.9)	38 (53.52)	21 (29.59)	71 (100)	7 (14.28)	23 (46.94)	19 (38.78)	49 (100)
Education of spouse								
Graduate	5 (7.04)	13 (18.31)	7 (9.86)	25 (35.21)	2 (4.08)	9 (18.37)	5 (10.20)	16 (32.66)
Post-graduate	3 (4.22)	21 (29.58)	12 (16.90)	36 (50.70)	4 (8.16)	12 (24.49)	13 (26.53)	29 (59.18)
Doctorate	4 (5.63)	4 (5.63)	2 (2.83)	10 (14.09)	1 (2.04)	2 (4.08)	1 (2.04)	4 (8.16)
Total	12 (16.9)	38 (53.52)	21 (29.59)	71 (100)	7 (14.28)	23 (46.94)	19 (38.78)	49 (100)

PAU= Punjab Agricultural University, CSKHPKV= Chaudhary Sarwan Kumar HP Krishi Vishwaviyalaya, df= Degrees of freedom, NS= Non-significant

Table 5. Relationship of age and service experience with job commitment of scientists

Parameter	Job commitment	
	PAU (r-value)	CSKHPKV (r-value)
Age	0.329*	0.234*
Service experience	0.415*	0.250*

*Significant at 1%

of Ladebo (2004) and Yadav (2011) but are contradictory to Jacobs and Winslow (2004).

Association between qualification at the time of joining the service and job commitment: In case of PAU majority of scientists having both MSc and PhD qualification at the time of joining the service had medium job commitment ie 13 and 41 per cent respectively. The association of qualification at the time of joining the service with job commitment was found to be non-significant. The association of qualification at the time of joining the service with job commitment was found to be positive but non-significant which signifies that there was non-significant relationship between qualification at the time of joining the service and job commitment of the scientists.

Association between major job responsibility and job commitment: In case of PAU majority of the scientists who had teaching, research and extension as their major job responsibility had medium job commitment with nearly 14, 35 and 4 per cent of the scientists respectively falling in the medium job commitment category. In case of scientists who had teaching and research as their major job responsibility 11.28 and 18.31 per cent of the scientists had high while 5.63 and 9.86 per cent of the scientists had low job commitment. However in case of scientists having extension as their major job responsibility 4.23 per cent were having medium and only 1.40 per cent were having low job commitment. Association between major job responsibility and job commitment of the scientists was found to be non-significant. In CSKHPKV more than one fourth scientists who had teaching as their major job responsibility had medium while 12 and 6 per cent had high and low job commitment respectively. Nearly one fourth of the scientists who had research as their major job responsibility were highly while 18 per cent were found to be moderately committed to their job. In case of scientists having extension as their major job responsibility an equal number of scientists were found to have medium and high job commitment. Association between major job responsibility and job commitment of the scientists was found to be non-significant.

Association between education of spouse and job commitment: In PAU among the scientists having graduate spouses, more than 18 per cent had medium while nearly 10 and 7 per cent had high and low job commitment respectively. In case of the respondents

having post-graduate spouses nearly 30 per cent scientists were having medium followed by 16.9 per cent having high job commitment. Among the scientists having doctorate spouses an equal number of scientists with 5.63 per cent fell in the category of low and medium job commitment. In CSKHPKV among the scientists having post-graduate spouses, nearly equal number of scientists were having low and high and 8 per cent had low job commitment. Among the scientists having graduate spouses, 18.37 per cent belonged to medium job commitment category. Nearly 4 per cent of the respondents had high job commitment whose spouses were doctorate. A non-significant association was found between education of spouse and job commitment of the scientists. It showed that education of spouse was not associated with job commitment of the scientists.

Relationship of age and service experience with job commitment

The relationship of age and service experience with job commitment was found by applying coefficient of correlation. The results have been depicted in Table 5. A positive and significant correlation between age and job commitment was found at PAU as well as CSKHPKV which indicates that more the age of the scientist more will be the job commitment. The relationship between service experience and job commitment was also found to be positive and significant in case of both the SAUs thereby indicating that more the service experience more the job commitment. The results found are in line with those found by Ladebo (2004).

REFERENCES

- Jacobs JA and Winslow SE 2004. The academic life course, time pressures and gender inequality. *Community, Work and Family* **7(2)**: 143-161.
- Kaur K 2003. Communication pattern of home scientists regarding development and dissemination of scientific information. PhD thesis, Punjab Agricultural University, Ludhiana, Punjab, India.
- Ladebo OJ 2004. Job behaviour and attitudes of agricultural faculty, beyond the influence of biographical factors. *Journal of Extension Systems* **20(2)**: 89-103.
- Yadav K 2011 Job satisfaction of scientists of selected state agricultural universities of northern region. PhD thesis, Punjab Agricultural University, Ludhiana, Punjab, India.