Variations in Specified Factors among State Agricultural Universities of Northern Region with Respect to Job Satisfaction and Performance

Kiran Yadav[1] and D.S. Dhillon[2]

1. Teaching Personnel, Department of Forestry GBPUA&T, Hill Campus, Ranichauri, Tehri Garhwal, Uttarakhand.
2. Prof. Extension Education, Punjab Agricultural University, Ludhiana, Punjab.

Corresponding author e-mail: kirany39@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The scientific productivity is the resultant outcome of performance being influenced by personal antecedent variables and personal importance enjoyed by the employee the study was conducted in three purposively selected State Agricultural Universities of Northern region of India viz. Punjab Agricultural University; Ludhiana; Govind Ballabh Pant University of Agriculture & Technology ; Pantnagar & Choudhary Charan Singh Haryana Agricultural University , Hisar; Haryana. The total sample comprised of 300 agricultural scientists. Mailed Questionnaire was used to collect the requisite data for this study. With regard to mean scores of job satisfaction in PAU and GBPUAT the opportunity for professional growth (4.76PAU , 4.52GBPUAT) and comforts of physical working conditions (place of work, transportation, light etc.) (4.57PAU , 4.23GBPUAT) showed differences at 1 per cent level of significance and feeling of accomplishment (4.53PAU , 4.32GBPUAT) differed at 5 per cent level of significance. The job performance of PAU respondents was positively correlated with their service experience at 5 per cent level of significance. Job performance with experience of the respondents of GBPUAT showed negative and non significant correlation whereas respondents of HAU reported positive and non-significant correlation in the same respect. The findings of the study imply that the agricultural scientists were most satisfied with the content of their job. All of the job motivator and hygiene characteristics were moderately or substantially related to overall job satisfaction.

Key words: *Scientific productivity; State Agricultural Universities (SAUs); Job performance;*

Agricultural Universities are the major partners of agricultural development under the National Agricultural Research System in most of the developing countries. According to *Taylor et al. (1963)* "Research on scientists and their working environment may prove to be not only the most basic but also most fruitful that can be accomplished in science since it can yield important implications for the entire venture". The scientific productivity is the resultant outcome of performance being influenced by personal antecedent variables such as educational background , length of service , higher trainings , socio psychological factors such as job autonomy, task identity , achievement motivation , job satisfaction , job involvement and personal importance enjoyed by the employee; organizational factors such as organizational commitment. All these have direct or indirect influence on the job perspective of the individual scientist, which ultimately influences his/her scientific productivity directly or indirectly through interaction with each other (*Sharma and Shivamohan, 1975*).

As teaching does require a great deal of thoroughness and commitment, so in teaching it is more important to have mental commitment and loyalty than physical presence (*Akhter et al. 2008*). But if the scientists of agricultural universities are not satisfied with their profession they will not be able to improve their performance and thus will not contribute to their three fold function viz. teaching , research and extension which agricultural scientists have to play. Job satisfaction is not a permanent attitude. Though it is not momentary yet it is only a relatively enduring state which undergoes a change with the needs of the individual, the capacity of work situation in fulfilling these and the individual's own perception of the situation (*Roy and Menon, 1974*).

The concept of job satisfaction, though of considerably recent origin, is closely linked to motivation in the workplace and is a causal factor in improved performance in the workplace. These issues are again linked to job characteristics, which primarily describe the inherent features of a job, which can again motivate or demotivate workers, and whose tweaking can thus change the inherent motivational features of the job.

Job satisfaction describes how content an individual is with his or her job. The happier people are within their job, the more satisfied they are said to be. Job satisfaction is not the same as motivation, although it is clearly linked. Job design aims to enhance job satisfaction and performance; methods include job rotation, job enlargement and job enrichment. Other influences on satisfaction include the management style and culture, employee involvement, empowerment and autonomous work groups. Job satisfaction is a very important attribute which is frequently measured by organizations.

METHODOLOGY

The study was conducted in three purposively selected State Agricultural Universities of Northern regin of India viz. Punjab Agricultural University; Ludhiana; Govind Ballabh Pant University of Agriculture & Technology ; Pantnagar & Choudhary Charan Singh Haryana Agricultural University , Hisar; Haryana. A list of the in position faculty members of College of Agriculture was prepared for each university. From this list, agricultural scientists who had minimum five years experience formed the domain of the present study. One hundred agricultural scientists from each university were randomly selected by allocating the number of agricultural scientists in teaching, research and extension streams proportionally. Further for selecting the scientists from Professors, Associate Professors and Assistant Professors, proportional allocation method was used in each cadre. The total sample comprised of 300 agricultural scientists from the three agricultural universities. Mailed Questionnaire was used to collect the requisite data for this study. The data analysis was done from the questionnaires filled by the respondents. Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) software was used for data analysis. The tools used were comparison of mean scores, standard deviation, correlation analysis, multiple regression analysis and percentages. Some other descriptive and inferential statistics was also used to analyse the data on different aspects of the study.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 1 showed non significant difference between HAU and PAU while in consideration of many components of job satisfaction mean scores of GBPUAT were significantly different from PAU and HAU at 1 per cent level of significance by computing critical differences. Those components were opportunity to help others (4.37_{PAU}, 4.11_{GBPUAT}, 4.44_{HAU}), opportunity to complete work (4.61_{PAU}, 4.27_{GBPUAT}, 4.56_{HAU}), chance to do a whole piece of work (4.27_{PAU}, 3.98_{GBPUAT}, 4.24_{HAU}), the fringe benefits (4.47_{PAU}, 4.26_{GBPUAT}, 4.52_{HAU}) and overall (4.42_{PAU}, 4.22_{GBPUAT}, 4.47_{HAU}). With regard to mean scores of job satisfaction in PAU and GBPUAT the opportunity for professional growth (4.76_{PAU}, 4.52_{GBPUAT}) and comforts of physical working conditions (place of work, transportation, light etc.) (4.57_{PAU}, 4.23_{GBPUAT}) showed differences at 1 per cent level of significance and feeling of accomplishment (4.53_{PAU}, 4.32_{GBPUAT}) differed at 5 per cent level of significance. On the other hand in GBPUAT and HAU, the components like prestige of job inside department (4.35_{GBPUAT}, 4.69_{HAU}), opportunity to do many things (3.73_{GBPUAT}, 4.21_{HAU}) and freedom on job (4.25_{GBPUAT}, 4.48_{HAU}) significantly differed at 1 per cent level and the components like opportunity to do challenging job (4.14_{GBPUAT}, 4.40HAU) , help from the administration in doing job (4.20GBPUAT, 4.45_{HAU}) and fairness of authority (4.43_{GBPUAT}, 4.66_{HAU}) significantly differed in their job satisfaction mean scores at 95 per cent confidence level.

Relationship of socio-personal characteristics of agricultural scientists with their level of job satisfaction, job performance and job preference: Over the past several decades, a number of empirical studies have demonstrated that job-satisfaction levels vary widely in the State Agricultural Universities. The effect of age, tenure, salary, job type, job level, and work environment on agricultural scientists' job satisfaction has been extensively discussed. Studies have underscored the importance of identifying the determinants of agricultural scientists' job satisfaction by linking it to higher production and performance levels and to retention rates.

Table 1. Mean difference of significant determinants of job satisfaction across the universities

Determinants of Job Satisfaction	Universities	Mean	SD	F-ratio	CD	Mean Differences*
Prestige of job inside department	PAU	4.52	0.59			$MD_{PAU-GBPUAT}$ =0.17
	GBPUAT	4.35	0.52	10.33**	0.21	$MD_{GBPUAT-HAU}$ =0.34**
	HAU	4.69	0.46			$MD_{HAU-PAU}$ =0.17
Opportunity for professional	PAU	4.76	0.43			$MD_{PAU-GBPUAT}$ =0.24**
growth	GBPUAT	4.52	0.58	5.75**	0.41	$MD_{GBPUAT-HAU}$ =0.11
	HAU	4.63	0.49			$MD_{HAU-PAU}$ =0.13
Opportunity to help others	PAU	4.37	0.56			$MD_{PAU-GBPUAT}$ =0.26**
	GBPUAT	4.11	0.62	9.00**	0.23	$MD_{GBPUAT-HAU}$ =0.33**
	HAU	4.44	0.56			$MD_{HAU-PAU}$ =0.07
Opportunity to complete work	PAU	4.61	0.49			$MD_{PAU-GBPUAT}$ =0.34**
	GBPUAT	4.27	0.63	11.36**	0.21	$MD_{GBPUAT-HAU}$ =0.29**
	HAU	4.56	0.50			$MD_{HAU-PAU}$ =0.05
Feeling of accomplishment	PAU	4.53	0.58			$MD_{PAU-GBPUAT}$ =0.21*
	GBPUAT	4.32	0.51	3.25*	0.16	$MD_{GBPUAT-HAU}$ =0.12
	HAU	4.44	0.66			$MD_{HAU-PAU}$ =0.09
Chance to do a whole piece of	PAU	4.27	0.63			$MD_{PAU-GBPUAT}$ =0.29**
Work	GBPUAT	3.98	0.85	4.91**	0.22	$MD_{GBPUAT-HAU}$ =0.26**
	HAU	4.24	0.65			$MD_{HAU-PAU}$ =0.03
Opportunity to do	PAU	4.24	0.70			$MD_{PAU-GBPUAT}$ =0.10
challenging job	GBPUAT	4.14	0.67	3.80*	0.19	$MD_{GBPUAT-HAU}$ =0.26*
HAU	4.40	0.65				$MD_{HAU-PAU}$ =0.16
Opportunity to do many things	PAU	3.92	0.80			$MD_{PAU-GBPUAT}$ =0.19
	GBPUAT	3.73	0.92	9.06**	0.31	$MD_{GBPUAT-HAU}$ =1.48**
	HAU	4.21	0.67			$MD_{HAU-PAU}$ =0.29
Comforts of physical working	PAU	4.57	0.57			$MD_{PAU-GBPUAT}$ =0.34**
conditions (Place of work,	GBPUAT	4.23	0.62	7.94**	0.24	$MD_{GBPUAT-HAU}$ =0.28
transportation, light etc.)	HAU	4.51	0.73			$MD_{HAU-PAU}$ =0.06
The fringe benefits	PAU	4.47	0.58			$MD_{PAU-GBPUAT}$ =0.21**
(housing, medical,	GBPUAT	4.26	0.60	4.91**	0.20	$MD_{GBPUAT-HAU}$ =0.26**
provident fund etc.)	HAU	4.52	0.69			$MD_{HAU-PAU}$ =0.05
Freedom on job	PAU	4.43	0.67			$MD_{PAU-GBPUAT}$ =0.18
	GBPUAT	4.25	0.69	3.10*	0.21	$MD_{GBPUAT-HAU}$ =0.23*
	HAU	4.48	0.70			$MD_{HAU-PAU}$ =0.05
Help from the administration	PAU	4.38	0.69			$MD_{PAU-GBPUAT}$ =0.18
in doing job	GBPUAT	4.20	0.70	3.57*	0.22	$MD_{GBPUAT-HAU}$ =1.25*
	HAU	4.45	0.66			$MD_{HAU-PAU}$ =1.07
Fairness of authority	PAU	4.52	0.70			$MD_{PAU-GBPUAT}$ =0.09
	GBPUAT	4.43	0.57	3.17*	0.18	$MD_{GBPUAT-HAU}$ =0.23*
	HAU	4.66	0.67			$MD_{HAU-PAU}$ =0.14
Overall	PAU	4.42	0.61			$MD_{PAU-GBPUAT}$ =4.26**
	GBPUAT	4.22	0.65	6.85**	0.97	$MD_{GBPUAT-HAU}$ =4.71**
	HAU	4.48	0.62			$MD_{HAU-PAU}$ =0.45

*Significant at 5 per cent level of significance ** Significant at 1 per cent level of significance

Happy person may not necessarily be productive person. At the individual level, the evidence suggests the reverse to be more accurate that productivity is likely to lead to satisfaction. When satisfaction and productivity data are gathered for the organization as a whole, rather than at the individual level, the organizations with more satisfied employees tend to be more effective than organizations with fewer satisfied employees. Studies have focused on individuals rather than on the organization. At individual level, measures of productivity do not take into consideration all the interactions and complexities in the work process. Literature has revealed that Job Satisfaction and Accident Research bears witness to the fact that satisfied workers are less likely to face accidents as compared to dissatisfied ones. It has been concluded that accidents are closely linked to job satisfaction of workers and organizations with a low accident toll are likely to have a satisfied workforce. Being well adjusted on the job, the satisfied worker is sure to perform better. In other words, a worker with better job satisfaction tends to be better adjusted on the job, in his home and in social and emotional areas. On the other hand, the discontentment with working life is likely to affect the worker's job adjustment and also the social, emotional and domestic life.

It is envisaged from the data given in Table 2 that in all the three agricultural universities -PAU, GBPUAT and HAU the correlation between the job satisfaction and age of the respondents was negative and non-significant which showed that there was no relationship between age and job satisfaction. In parallel to this study *Brown, Hohenshil and Brown (1998)* had not found a significant relationship between age and job satisfaction, although the age of the participants in the survey tended to be younger. These results are identical with the previous research studies conducted by *Sharma and Jyoti (2006), Amoran et al. (2005).* Few of the previous research studies (*Leary 2000*) had reported a cyclical relationship between the two.

There was no correlation between the job satisfaction and distance (kms) of respondent from their permanent home in PAU and GBPUAT but in case of HAU, there was negative and significant correlation between the job satisfaction and distance (kms) of respondents from their permanent home which explained that less the distance more the job satisfaction of the respondents.

Lewis (1982) found that teachers who had continuous experience in the current school were more satisfied than others. But the findings of the present study revealed positive and non-significant correlation between job satisfaction and service experience in PAU and HAU. On the other side, in GBPUAT, it is noticed from the data in Table 2 that there was negative and non-significant correlation between the job satisfaction and service experience. Further it is noticed that negative non significant correlation between job satisfaction and family income of the respondent was noticed in all the three agricultural universities.

Table 2. Relationship of personal and job related factors of the respondent with job satisfaction and job performance

Factors		Job Satisfaction r-value			Job Performance r-value		
		PAU	GBPUAT	HAU	PAU	GBPUAT	HAU
Age (Years)	25 to 35 35 to 45 > 45	-0.031	-0.169	-0.023	0.299**	-0.039	0.176
Distance(kms)	Upto 50 50 to 150 150 to 250 Above 250	0.041	-0.173	-0.205*	0.041	0.011	0.070
Service Experience (Years)	Upto 5 5 to 10 10 to 15 Above 15	0.050	-0.080	0.015	0.200*	-0.049	0.112
Family Income(Rs)	Low (25,000-75,000) Medium (75,000-1,25,000) High (1,25,000-1,75,000)	-0.079	-0.051	-0.021	0.031	0.153	-0.325**

*Significant at 5 per cent level of significance** Significant at 1 per cent level of significance

The relationship of age of respondents with job performance revealed (Table 2) positive and significant correlation in PAU but in GBPUAT and HAU, the relationship were found non-significant. In parallel to these results, the study conducted by *Quinones et al., 1995* revealed the direct effect of age on performance, which because age tends to reflect accumulated work experiences and it could be expected to positively affect the job performance. A counter-argument is that age-related declines in health inevitably lead to decreased job performance as workers' age increases (*Arvey and Murphy, 1998*).The job performance of PAU respondents was positively correlated with their service experience at 5 per cent level of significance.

Job performance with experience of the respondents of GBPUAT showed negative and non significant correlation whereas respondents of HAU reported positive and non-significant correlation in the same respect.

A perusal of the data given in Table 2 envisaged that the job performance of respondents of HAU showed, a negative and significant correlation between respondent's job performance and family income was observed which revealed that as the income increases, job performance declines.

CONCLUSION

Agricultural scientists of State Agricultural Universities of northern region were generally satisfied with their jobs. The findings of the study imply that the agricultural scientists were most satisfied with the content of their job. All of the job motivator and hygiene characteristics were moderately or substantially related to overall job satisfaction.

Paper received on : May 01, 2012
Accepted on : October 02, 2012

REFERENCES

Akhter, I.; Muniruddin, G. and Sogra, K. J. (2008). A trend analysis of faculty turnover at the Private universities in Bangladesh: A Business School Perspective. *J. Business Studies* **4**:1.

Amoran, O. E.; Omokhodion, F. O.; Dairo M. D. and Adebayo, A. O. (2005). Job satisfaction among primary health care workers in three selected local government areas in southwest Nigeria. *Nigerian J. Medicine* **14** (2):195-199. http://www.ncbi.nim/

Arvey, R.D.and Murphy, K.R. (1998). Performance evaluation in work settings. *Annual Review of Psychology* **49** (1):141–68.

Brown, M.; Hohenshil, T.H. and Brown, D. (1998). School psychologists' job satisfaction in the USA: A national study. *School Psychology International J.* **19** (1):79-89.

Leary, P. and Nestor, P.I. (2000). The relationship between tenure and non tenure track status of extension faculty and job satisfaction. *J. of Extn*. [Online] **38**:4. Available from: http://joe.org./joe/2000august/rb1.html.

Lewis, A.L.F.(1982). Job satisfaction decisional discrepancy, academic social climate and academic achievement in selected title elementary schools, *Dissertation Abstracts International*, **43**:1.

Quinones, M. A.; Ford, J.K. and Teachout, M.S. (1995). The relationship between work experience and job performance:A conceptual and meta-analytic review. *Personnel Psychology*, **48** (4):887-910.

Roy,S.K. and Menon, A.S. (1974). Motivation and Organisational Effectiveness , Shri Ram Center for Industrial Relations and Human Resources. pp. 78-79. New Delhi.

Sharma, K.D. and Shivamohan, M.V.K. (1975), Management of Research in IARI. In: Management of Scientific Research (*Proceedings of the National Seminar on Management of Scientific Research Laboratories, held at Hyderabad on October, 10-12,1983*. Singh J. (Ed.)) pp.228,Administrative staff college Hyderabad ,India.

Sharma, R. D. and Jyoti ,J. (2006). Job satisfaction among school teachers. IIMB *Management Review*, **18** (4): 349-363.

Taylor, C.; Smith,W.R. and Ghiselin, B. (1963). *A Collective & other contributions of one sample of research scientists* pp.53-70. In: Scientific Creativity: Its Recognition & Development, New York.

Titus, O. and Hickson, C. (2003). Some aspects of overall job satisfaction : A binomial logit model, *J . Managerial Psych.*, **18** (4):357- 367.

• • • • •