Madras agric. J. 65 (10): 654-657, Oct., 1978.

## Job Content and Context Factors in Job Satisfaction of Deputy Agricultural Officers

K.R. MENON<sup>1</sup>, N. VISWANATHAN<sup>2</sup> and S. BALASUBRAMANIAN

The various hypotheses, of two factor theory of Job satisfaction were tested with 230 Deputy Agricultural Officers working in the Community Development Blocks of Tamil Nadu. The data point out that the job factors are unipolar variables and the satisfaction and dissatisfaction in these factors are not the opposite poles of the same feeling. However, the data did not support the variable independence among motivators and hygienes and their presumed unidirectional roles. Thus, the motivation-maintenance theory advocated has no generality. The study also indicated that among the Deputy Agricultural Officers, there is less satisfaction in job factors like promotion chances, independence in relation to the job and department policies and practices.

It is generally held that satisfaction and dissatisfaction are opposite ends of the same continuum of feelings about various aspects of the job, as per the 'traditional theory' of job satisfactions. Horzberg et al (1959), on the contrary reported that job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction are not caused by the same feelings and this came to be known as 'two factor theory'. As per this theory the motivators, like responsibility, achievement, recognition etc., contribute primarily to satisfaction. Similarly, the hygienes, like company policies, salary etc., contribute to feeling of being away from unhappiness, but do not as a wie contribute to satisfaction. However, f these factors are not given their full play in an individual's work life, disatjsfaction happens subsequently. But according to Lahivi and Srivastava 1967), Sarveswara Rao and Ganguly 1971) and Sarveswara Rao (1971 and 1972) the generality of the twoactor theory was questionable. This

study deals with the roles played by job content and job context factors in determining job satisfaction of Dy. Agrl. Officers working in the Community Development blocks of Tamil Nadu.

The following hypotheses were test ted in this study:

- Satisfaction and dissatisfaction are unipolar and separate feelings.
- The contribution of motivators to satisfaction is more than that of hygienes.
- The contribution of hygienes to dissatisfaction is more than that of motivators.
- The contribution of motivators to satisfaction is greater than the contribution of hygienes to satisfaction.

<sup>1 - 3:</sup> Department of Agricultural Extension, Tamil Nadu Agricultural University, Coimbatore-641003.

## MATERIAL AND METHODS

The required informations were coljected from Deputy Agricultural Officers of Tamil Nadu, through a mailed guestionnaire which consisted of two parts: Part I - Dealt with demographic charcteristics of the subjects and Part II-A and Part II B were related to satisfaction and dissatisfaction with various job factors. A list of 15 job factors, 7 motivators (Content factors) and 8 hygienes (Context factors) were selected from different literature (Sarveswara Rao and Gangully, 1970; Sarveswara Rao 1972). The two unipolar scales for satisfaction and dissatisfaction consisted of 5 point Likert-type horizontal graphic rating scales. The Deputy Agricultural Officers were asked to mark a point showing their degree of dissatisfaction on the dissatisfaction scale. Directions were given to them to express their satisfaction on the satisfaction scale.

"

Think of a time when you felt exceptionally good about your present job either recently or any other time. The following are some of the factors which may have contributed to your feeling of satisfaction at that time. Put a "

" mark showing the extent to which each factor contributed to your feelings of satisfaction on the scales below ". Directions for dissatisfaction scale were similar except the

TABLE I. Means, Standard deviations and mean differences between factors in job satis-

Job Factor	Satisfaction		Dissatisfaction		Mean	
/ t	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Difference	
Motivators						
Responsibility	3.481	1,263	2.428	1.484	1.053*	
Work itself	2.781	1.240	2.802	1.522	0.021	
Promotions	1.396	0.870	3.668	1.653	2.272	
Ability utilization	2.861	1.245	2.406	1.479	0.455	
Independence	2.380	1.332	2.877	1.563	0.497	
Achievement	3.134	1.069	2.150	1.356	0.984	
Recognition	2.497	1.220	2.481	1.466	0.016	
Hygienes						
Relation with co-workers	3.332	1.115	2.263	1.328	1.049	
Salary	2,551	1.103	2.439	1.450	0.112	
Job status	2.524	1,118	2.583	1.575	0.059	
Technical supervision	2.914	1.079	2.422	1.453	0.492	
Job security	3.150	1.047	2.182	1.440	0.9684	
Personal life	2.717	1.209	2.246	1.539	0.471	
Relations with Supervisor	3.182	1.135	2.273	1.499	0.909*	
Departmental policies &						
practices	2.225	1.125	2.877	1.656	0.652	

P=0.01.

words "bad" and "dissatisfaction" were substituted for the words "good" and "satisfaction". To eliminate posible "response set", job factors were randomly presented in these two scales.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Statistical data regarding means, standard deviations and mean differences for satisfying and dissatisfying job situations are presented in Table I.

From the table it is seen that the mean satisfaction score is significantly higher than the mean dissatisfaction score in respect of 8 out of the 15 job factors. This shows that the presence of any of these factors gives more satisfaction than the amount of dis-satisfaction caused by its absence. With regard to job factors like promotions, indepence and department policies and practices, the mean dissatisfaction score is significantly higher than the mean satisfaction So the absence of any of these factors gives more dissatisfaction than the amount of satisfaction caused by its presence. Factors like work itself, recognition, salary and job status acted as bipolar variables as the differences between the mean satisfaction and dissatisfaction scores are not significant. The remaining eleven factors acted as unipolar variables. So hypothesis (i) is supported.

In order to test the hypotheses (b), (c), (d) and (e) paired 't' tests in the two scales were carried out, both dimension-wise and variable wise. The results are presented in Table II and III.

TABLE II Comparison of mean score: between the group's motivators and hygienes.

Scale	Mean of motivators	Mean of Hygienes	Difforence	t	HeniarKs
Satisfac- tion	2.647	2.824	0.177	0.643	NS
Dissatis- faction	2.686	2.413	0,273	1.378	พร

TABLE III Comparison of mean scores between the scales satisfaction and dissatisfaction.

Scale	Mean satis- faction score	Mean dissa- lisfaction	score	•	Remarks	
Motivators	2.647	2,686	0.039	0.084	N.S	
Hygienes	2.824	2.413	0.411	1.970	N.S	

From the Table II it is seen that the differences between mean satisfaction scores for motivators and hygienes contribute to satisfaction. Similarly the difference between mean dissatisfaction scores for motivators and hygienes is also not significant. So both motivators and hygienes contribute to dissatisfaction. Thus, the hypothesis (ii) and (iii) are not supported.

It is evident from Table III that among the motivators as well as among hygienes the degree of satisfaction or dissatisfaction expressed by the groups did not differ significantly. There is no support to indicate that motivators contributed more to satisfaction than to dissatisfaction or hygienes contributed more to dissatisfaction than to satisfac-

tion. Hence hypothesis (iv) and (v) are not supported. However the mean satisfaction score for hygiene is greater than the mean dissatisfaction score. So it can be said that hygienes contribute more to satisfaction than to dissatisfaction.

The findings of this study give only limited support to the motivation-maintence theory proposed by Herzberg. This study confirms the findings of Herzberg et al and others that satisfaction and dissatisfaction are not the opposite poles of the same feeling. Of the 15 factors. 11 factors acted in unipolar direction showing that dissatisfaction is not the same continuum and can not be used to represent the two feelings, satisfaction and dissatisfaction. However, some of the important variables were contrary to the predictions of the two-factor theory. Recognition which is an important content factor acted as a bipolar variable. So also salary and job status acted as bipolar variables. Further analysis revealed that both motivators and hygiene factors contribute to satisfaction and dissatisfaction and thus, questions the two-factor theory's another important assumption of variable indepence of job factors. Again the contribution of motivators to dissatisfaction is more than to satisfaction while the contribution of hygiene factors to satisfaction is more than to dissatisfaction, though the differences are not significant. This also indicates that the two-factor

theory does not hold water in this study. Thus, the two-factor theory of job satisfaction advanced by Herzberg et al. gets only a limited support from this study.

The present study reveals that the Dy. Agrl. Officers are dissatisfied with their promotion chances, independence they have in their work and the department policies and practices. So necessary steps can be taken by the administrators to increase the Dy. Agrl. Officers' satisfaction in these job-factors. This will help them to do their work with better satisfaction in the job.

## REFERENCES

- HERZBERG, F., B. MAUSNER, and B.B. SNY-DERMAN. 1959. "The Motivation to work". (2nd Edn) New York, Wiley.
- LAHIRI. D. K. and S. SRIVASTAVA, 1967. Determinants of satisfaction in middle management personnel. J. Applied Psychology, 51: 254-65.
- RAO, G.V. SARVESWARA and T. GANGULY. 1971. Perceived need satisfaction and importantance of supervisory and clerical personnel. In J. Psychology, 46: 31-43.
- RAO, G.V. SARVESWARA. 1971. Job content factors in Job satisfaction of female clarical employees. 1971. In J. Soc. work. 32: 45-51.
- RAO, G.V. SARVESWARA. 1972. Intrinsic and Extrinsic Fectors in Job statisfaction of male clerical employees. J. Psychological Studies. 17: 45-51.