

Job Satisfaction and Job Performance of Agricultural Extension Officers working in Rural Development Block of Tamil Nadu

G. PERUMAL¹ and G. C. RAI²

Job satisfaction and Job performance of Agricultural Extension Officers working in Rural Development Blocks of Tamil Nadu were studied. The Agricultural Extension Officers were highly satisfied in regard to job security, co-operation from villagers, help from their officers, supervision of their work by their supervisors etc. and they were highly dis-satisfied in regard to opportunity for further promotion, further education, and dual control of supervision. The maximum number of Agricultural Extension Officers was in the average job satisfaction category and the rest in the other two categories. There was no relationship existed between job satisfaction and job performance of Agricultural Extension Officers.

In any organization, effective job performance is likely to result in effective organizational performance. Job satisfaction simply means the satisfaction of an employee in his job. The more individual's an expectations are met on the job, the greater his satisfaction (Porter and Steers 1973). Job satisfaction in broad terms covers the satisfaction not specially in relation to the job only but also satisfaction in regard to the basic, and general requirements of life.

In this investigation the job satisfaction of Agricultural Extension Officers, the degree to which they were satisfied or dis-satisfied with the various aspects of their job which they performed in the Rural Development Blocks were studied and the result presented here in.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Job performance score : The study was conducted in rural Development Blocks of Coimbatore, Madurai and Tirunelveli districts of Tamil Nadu during 1975. The sample of the study consisted of 127 Agricultural Extension Officers and their 104 superior officers ninety two Block Development Officers and 12 District Agricultural Officers. The job performance of Agricultural Extension Officers was evaluated in the six job areas, namely, education, supply & services, administration & organization, supervision, planning and evaluation on the basis of the assignment given by the State Department of Agriculture, Tamil Nadu, and it was done in the relevant areas of the job by their superior officers (Block Development Officers and District Agricultural

1. Department of Agricultural Extension, Agricultural College & Research Institute, Tamil Nadu Agricultural University, Madurai.

2. Department of Psychology, University of Udaipur, Rajasthan.

Officers) through the job performance chart specially prepared for the purpose. The final job chart consisted of 65 items with aforesaid six job areas.

Scoring the five point continuum of each item of the scale was done as 5, 4, 3, 2 and 1 for 'Most Efficient', 'More Efficient', 'Efficient', 'Less Efficient' and 'Least Efficient' respectively. The maximum score obtainable by an Agricultural Extension Officer in each item of the job performance chart was 5. Since the number of items in each of the job areas in the job performance chart was different, the maximum raw score in each of the areas was also different. Therefore, in order to bring the scores obtained by the Agricultural Extension Officers in different job areas to a common level the scores were converted into percentage.

Job satisfaction score: In order to measure the degree of job satisfaction or job dis-satisfaction on different aspects of job satisfaction, namely, administrative policy of the block, personal satisfaction related to job, working and training facilities and co-operation and assistance from authorities were used Cantril's (1965). The number of items in each of these areas were ten, seven, eight and eight.

The scoring procedure of the items of the job satisfaction ladder was same as given by Cantril, that is, -5 to +5. However, for avoiding plus and minus signs, 5 was added to the original scores obtained by an Agricultural Extension Officer on an item. Thus,

the range of score on an item was 0 to 10. The total scores on the 33 items constituted the job satisfaction score of an Agricultural Extension Officer. This scores also could not be utilized directly for further analysis, because the number of items in each of the job satisfaction aspects was different and the maximum score in each of the aspects was also different. Therefore, it was converted into percentage.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The mean and standard deviation values were worked out with the overall job satisfaction scores as well as the scores in said four different aspects of job satisfaction and the results are shown in Table I.

TABLE I Means and standard deviations of Job Satisfaction Scores - Overall and in different aspects of Job Satisfaction

Scores in	Mean	S.D.
Overall Job Satisfaction	51.90	12.15
Different Aspects of Job Satisfaction Areas :		
Administrative Policy	52.49	13.08
Personal Satisfaction	49.89	14.76
Working and Training Facilities	51.52	15.05
Co-operation and Assistance	53.28	15.52

The mean score of overall job satisfaction of Agricultural Extension Officer was 51.90, that is, the job satisfaction was at the average level. Regarding the different aspects of job satisfaction, they differed, appreciably even in one way analysis of variance.

The correlation coefficient values worked out were significant and positive. This meant that the Agricultural Extension Officers' satisfaction in the four aspects of job satisfaction was closely associated with each other Table II.

TABLE II Inter-correlation Matrix Based on the Job Satisfaction Scores in different aspects of Job Satisfaction

Job aspects	Administra- tive policy	Personal satisfaction	Working and training faci- lities	Co-operation and assis- tance.
Administrative policy	—	0.630*	0.588*	0.660*
Personal satisfaction		—	0.481*	0.594*
Working and Training Facilities			—	0.542*
Co-operation and Assistance				—

After having discussed the different aspects of job satisfaction of Agricultural Extension officers, their job satisfaction with respect to different items of the Cantril's job satisfaction ladder was analysed. In order to do so, the scores obtained on each item were converted into T-score and presented in Table III.

A review of the data revealed that the Agricultural Extension Officers were highly satisfied in regard to job security, co-operation from villagers, help and guidance from officers, supervision of their work by their supervisors and co-operation from divisional level staff. But at the same time, they were highly dis-satisfied as regard to recognition given to their job in the block, frequent transfer of extension personnel, opportunity for further promotion, further education, dual control of supervision and lack of conveyance

TABLE III Job Satisfaction of the Agricultural Extension Officers in the different items of the Job Satisfaction Ladder

(Five ranks from the top and five from the bottom)

Items No.	T-score	Rank	Job satisfaction items
6	60.44	1	Job security
20	56.89	2	Co-operation from villagers
4	56.87	3	Help and guidance from officers in performing the job
23	56.50	4	Supervision of work by higher officers
18	54.85	5	Co-operation from divisional level staff.
3	44.93	29	Recognition given to your job in the block
1	44.91	30	Frequent transfer of Extension Personnel
22	40.83	31	Dual control of Supervision
14	37.93	32	Opportunity for promotion
26	37.67	33	Conveyance and other facilities for performing official duty in the fields

and other facilities for performing official duties and rare promotion changes as reported by Sharma (1969).

On the basis of the T-scores of all the 127 Agricultural Extension Officers in each of the said job items, they were classified into the said three categories.

Out of 127, 23 were above average 88 in the average and 16 in the below average category. From this it is obvious that the maximum number of Agricultural Extension Officers i.e., 69.30 per cent were in average job satisfaction category and the rest distributed in the other two categories. Chakravarty (1971) found that 53 per cent of the Agricultural Extension Officers was satisfied and 47 per cent was dis-satisfied in their job. Further, Kolte (1972) also found that 50 per cent of the Agricultural Extension Officers had job satisfaction above average, others were below average in their job satisfaction.

The correlation coefficient value of the scores was 0.0676 which was not significant, revealing that there was no relationship between job satisfaction and job performance of the Agricultural Extension Officer. (Brayfield and Crockett, 1955 and Varoom, 1964).

REFERENCES

- BRAYFIELD, A.H. and W.H. CROCKETT. 1955. Employee attitudes and employee performance. *Psychol. Bull.*, 52: 396-424.
- CHAKRAVARTY, T.K. 1971. A study of Factors Associated with Job Satisfaction of Block Extension Personnel in two I.A.D.P. Districts of Northern India. *Unpubl. Ph.D. Thesis*, Indian Agricultural Research Institute, New Delhi.
- CANTRIL, H. 1965. *The Pattern of Human concerns*. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press.
- KOLTE, N.V. 1972. Prediction of effective job performance of Agricultural Extension Officers of the Community Development Blocks. *Unpubl. Ph.D. Thesis*, University of Udaipur.
- KORMAN, A.K. 1971. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*. Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs: New Jersey, p. 129-40.
- PORTER, L.W. and R.M. STEERS. 1973. Organizational work and personal factors in employees turnover and absenteeism. *Psychological Bulletin* 80, 2: 151-76.
- SHARMA, S.N. 1969. Study of felt training needs of animal Husbandry Extension Officers in Punjab. *Indian Journal of Extension Education*, 4: 182.
- VROOM, V.H. 1964. *Work and Motivation*. New York: Wiley.