

The Job Satisfaction of Agricultural Graduates*

V. ALAGESAN and A. JOHN KNIGHT.

The study revealed that those who are new in Government employment were found satisfied with the service security, work load, leave facilities, pension and provident fund associated with the job. None of them was found satisfied with their salary, promotion chances, official recognition, incentives and rewards. The Agricultural Graduates who, are now employed under Bank were satisfied with their job. The Agricultural Graduates employed in co-operative and private organisations were also found to be satisfied except for promotion prospects and promotion rules.

Job satisfaction is considered an important factor in any job, by an employee. Most of the people change their, course by aspiring for other jobs when they are not satisfied with the current job. Porter and Lawler (1965) stated that workers in small Departments and work groups were better satisfied than workers in large departments or work groups. Sinha and Nair (1965) reported that more educated workers tended to place greater emphasis on interesting and challenging work while those with less education tended to give more emphasis to such factors as income, security and fair supervision. Hulin (1968) reported that an increase in the level of job satisfaction led a lowering of turn-over.

The Agricultural graduates were employed in various professions like Deputy Agricultural Officers, Research Assistants, Bank employment, Co-operative and private organisation

employment and Farm Managers, which differ in the nature of work, recognition etc. The present investigation was taken up to study the job satisfaction of these professional groups.

MATERIAL AND METHODS

The study was conducted among 335 Agricultural Graduates who had taken their degree from the Coimbatore and Madurai Agricultural Colleges during the year 1970 to 1974. "Mailed Questionnaire" was used to collect the data. The scale developed by Reddy (1972) was used to measure the job satisfaction.

The respondents were presented with a list containing 12 major job factors which contribute to the satisfaction of a job and they were asked to place these factors on a five point continuum according to their degree of satisfaction. The scores assigned

* The article forms part of M. Sc. (Ag) thesis of the Senior Author, Department of Agril. Extension, Tamil Nadu Agril. University, Coimbatore 641 003.

to] these five points are, fully satisfied 5, satisfied 4, somewhat satisfied 3, least satisfied 2 and not at all satisfied 1.

The respondents were grouped based on their profession at time of collection of data as Deputy Agricultural Officers, Research Assistants, Bank employees, Co-operative and private organisation employees, and Farm Managers.

The total scores for each item was first worked out by adding up the scores given to that item by the respondents and then the mean was calculated by dividing this total by the number of respondents. Like this the mean score for each item was worked out for different professional groups. Based on the mean score, the items were ranked professional groupwise and rank order correlation was worked out adopting Spearman's method, to see whether any two professional group concordant for their job satisfaction.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Job satisfaction of different professional groups:

Deputy Agricultural Officers were satisfied with service security, leave facilities, benefits like provident fund and pension attached with the job as the mean score for these factors are towards the score of four which denotes satisfaction. However, they were not

satisfied with the rest of the job factors, as given in Table I.

In the case of Research Assistants they were satisfied with their service security, leave facilities, benefits like provident fund and pension while they were somewhat satisfied with their work load, work distribution, and supervision by higher ups. In all other factors, they are not satisfied.

With respect to Farm Managers they were found satisfied with service security, work load, leave facilities, work distribution, social recognition and benefits like provident fund and pension, and somewhat satisfied with supervision of work by higher ups. They are less satisfied with all other factors. Thus, it can be seen that those in Government employment were satisfied with the service security, work load, benefits like leave facility, pension and provident fund while no one was found satisfied with their salary, promotion chances etc., which contribute to a larger extent to job satisfaction.

In respect of those employed in Bank it is seen that they were satisfied with all the job factors. In the case of employees of co-operative and private organisations they were also found satisfied with job factors except promotion rules and promotion prospects.

Thus, it can be said that the job satisfaction differs from profession to profession. Perhaps the expression

of less satisfaction among Government employees could have prompted them to aspire for jobs in Nationalised Banks and Co-operative and private organisations.

The variation in rankings of job factors by different profession groups:

With a view to find out whether the ranking of the job factors by the different group agree with each other; rank order correlation was worked out between the groups and are given in Table II. From the Table it can be seen that there is agreement in the ranking of various job factors between all groups except Farm Managers Vs Co-operative and private organisation employees, Farm Managers Vs Bank employees and Research Assistants Vs Bank employees. The

non agreement in ranking between some of the groups may be due to the difference in their nature of job.

REFERENCES

- HULIN, C. L., 1968. "Effects of Changes in Job-Satisfaction levels on Employee Turnover", *J. Appl. Psychol.* 53: pp. 122-26.
- PORTER, L. W. and E. E. LAWLER, 1965 "Properties of Organisation Structure in relation to job Attitudes and Job Behaviour," *Psychol. Bull.* 61: pp. 23-51.
- REDDY, J. KASIRALLA 1972. "A study on Supervisory Functions and Techniques in Practice, in Andhra Pradesh Agricultural Extensions Service," Unpub. Ph. D. Thesis. I. A. R. I. New Delhi.
- SINHA, D and R. R. NAIR 1965. "A study of Job Satisfaction in Factory workers", *Ind. J. Soc. Work* 26, pp 1-8.

TABLE I Job satisfaction mean score for different professional groups

Job factors	Dy. A. Cs	Res. Assts.	Bank employees	Co-op. & Pvt. Orgn.	Farm Managers
Service security	3.64(1)	3.90(1)	4.24(2)	3.67(7.8)	3.64(1)
Leave facilities	3.52(2)	3.87(2)	4.12(5)	4.10(1)	3.45(3.5)
Benefits like P. F. & pension	3.28(3)	3.48(3)	4.04(6)	3.95(2)	3.36(5.5)
Supervision of work by higher ups	2.96(4)	3.13(6)	3.71(9)	3.71(6)	3.00(7)
Social recognition	2.86(5.5)	2.78(9)	4.27(1)	3.76(8)	3.36(5.5)
Salary	2.86(5.5)	2.82(7)	4.18(3)	3.90(3)	2.36(9)
Work load	2.83(7)	3.32(4)	3.84(7)	3.81(4)	3.55(2)
Official recognition	2.65(8)	2.82(8)	4.16(4)	3.52(10)	2.64(8)
Work distribution	2.37(9)	3.24(5)	3.61(10.5)	3.67(7.5)	3.45(3.5)
Incentives and rewards	2.21(10)	1.45(12)	3.78(8)	3.57(9)	2.18(10)
Service promotion rules	1.99(11)	2.52(10)	3.39(2)	3.14(11)	1.91(11)
Promotion prospects	1.37(12)	2.16(11)	3.61(10.5)	2.90(12)	1.36(12)

N.B. Figures given in parentheses indicate the ranks for the mean scores.

TABLE II Spearman's rank order correlation between different professional group for their job satisfaction

Groups to which rank order correlation worked out	rs. value
Farm Managers Vs. Research Assistants	0.8671**
Deputy Agricultural Officers Vs Research Assistants	0.8269**
Deputy Agricultural Officers Vs Co-operative and Private Organisation	0.7518**
Farm Managers Vs Deputy Agricultural Officers	0.7028*
Bank employees Vs Co-operative and Private Organ	0.7011*
Deputy Agricultural Officers Vs Bank employees	0.6643*
Research Assistants Vs Co-operative and private Organisation	0.6591*
Farm Managers Vs Co-operative and Private Organisation	0.5699NS
Farm Managers Vs Bank employees	0.5629NS
Research Assistants Vs Bank employees	0.3384NS

rs = Spearman's rank order correlation coefficient

** = Significant at 0.01 level of probability

* = Significant at 0.05 level of probability

NS = Non significant