

## **Scale to Measure the Job Satisfaction of Teachers working in State Agricultural Universities**

**Abdul Sattar Fazely and. M. S. Nataraju**

*1. Ph.D. Scholar and 2. Professor Department of Agricultural Extension,  
University of Agricultural Sciences, GKVK, Bangalore - 560 065  
Corresponding author e-mail : amoghraju@yahoo.com*

### **ABSTRACT**

*A scale to measure the job satisfaction of teachers working in State Agricultural Universities was developed using summated ratings method. The job satisfaction scale developed was found to be reliable and valid. The scale developed is useful in explicitly measuring the job satisfaction of teachers working in State Agricultural Universities. The satisfaction scale was administered to 30 teachers working in the College of Horticulture, University of Horticultural Sciences Campus, Gandhi Krishi Vignana Kendra, Bangalore. It was found that 43.33 per cent of teachers had high level of satisfaction, whereas 30.00 and 26.87 per cent of teachers had medium and low levels of satisfaction towards their job, respectively. It can be concluded that the scale developed is useful in explicitly measuring the satisfaction of teachers towards their job.*

**Key Words :** *Scale, Job, Satisfaction, Teachers, Agricultural University*

In recent years considerable efforts have been made to device and develop strategies and policies for helping agricultural development. Importance has also given to improve in environment or working conditions in the educational organizations which concerned with agricultural development. State Agricultural universities have made a significant contribution in the field of education, research and extension justifying the investment of public fund in them. The teachers working in Agricultural Universities perform three-fold functions namely teaching, research and extension. Teachers are arguably the most important group of professionals for the nation's future. A school without teacher is just like a body without the soul. A teacher, who is happy with his job, plays a pivotal role in the upliftment of society. Well adjusted and satisfied teacher can contribute a lot to the well being of their students.

Job satisfaction is basically an individual matter. Employees search for those aspects of job, which are related to their value system. Some give more value to their income and others attach more importance to the job satisfaction or the type of job. Considering that while individuals vary in their values, there is moderate consistency in the cherished values of the individuals within a specified group. Robert (1952) said that job satisfaction may come from the product or items produced and the speed with which it is accomplished or from features relating to the job and its performance.

The efficiency of any organization is largely dependent on the satisfaction of the employees in their job. Job satisfaction is a combination of psychological and environmental factors that makes a person to feel. In any organization the attitude of its employees towards their work has a great bearing on its success or failure.

The same holds good for the Agricultural Universities as well. Job satisfaction of the teachers in the Agricultural Universities is an important indicator of the health of the organization. The job satisfaction of teachers greatly facilitates the task of administrators because it creates favorable conditions for the overall progress. In this background, the present study has been taken up with the following specific objectives:

- 1- To develop and standardize a scale to measure the job satisfaction of teachers of state agricultural universities.
- 2- To know the job satisfaction level of teachers.

### **METHODOLOGY**

The present study was carried out in College of Horticulture, University of Horticultural Sciences Campus, Gandhi Krishi Vignana Kendra, Bangalore of Karnataka State during 2015. Thirty teachers were personally interviewed using the scale developed to measure their satisfaction towards their job. The collected data were scored and analyzed using frequency, percentage, mean and standard deviation.

### **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

**1. Developing of a scale to measure satisfaction of teachers towards their job :** Job satisfaction of teachers in the present study operationally defined as a result of various attitudes the person holds towards his job, job related factors and life in general.

The method of summated rating suggested by Likert (1932) and Edwards (1969) were followed in the construction of satisfaction scale.

**Collection and editing of items:** A list of 93 items/statements reflecting the satisfaction of teachers towards their job was prepared using the job chart of

teachers developed by State Agricultural Universities. The items/statements so identified were carefully edited in the light of 14 criteria suggested by Edwards (1969), and Thurstone and Chave (1929).

**Relevancy test :** Forty five statements were sent to 120 judges in State Agricultural Universities, Central Agricultural Universities, Indian Council of Agricultural Research institutions and Karnataka State Department of Agriculture with necessary instructions to critically evaluate each statement as to its relevancy to measure the satisfaction of university teachers towards their job and give their response on a five point continuum viz., Most relevant(MR), Relevant (R), Somewhat Relevant (SWR), Less Relevant (LR) and Not Relevant (NR) with the score of 5, 4, 3, 2 and 1, respectively. In all, 60 judges could respond in time. The relevancy score for each item/statement was found out by adding the scores on the rating scale for all the 60 judges. From the data so gathered “Relevancy Percentage”, “Relevancy Weightage” and “Mean Relevancy Score” were worked out for all the 45 statements by using the following formulae:

$$\text{Relevancy Percentage} = \frac{\text{MR} \times 5 + \text{R} \times 4 + \text{SWR} \times 3 + \text{LR} \times 2 + (\text{NR} \times 1)}{\text{Maximum Possible score}} \times 100$$

$$\text{Relevancy Weightage} = \frac{\text{MR} \times 5 + \text{R} \times 4 + \text{SWR} \times 3 + \text{LR} \times 2 + (\text{NR} \times 1)}{\text{Maximum Possible score}}$$

$$\text{Mean Relevancy Score} = \frac{\text{MR} \times 5 + \text{R} \times 4 + \text{SWR} \times 3 + \text{LR} \times 2 + (\text{NR} \times 1)}{\text{Number of Judges responded}}$$

Where,

MR= Most Relevant, R= Relevant, SWR= Some What Relevant, LR=Less Relevant

NR=Not Relevant

Using these criteria individual items/statements were screened for their relevancies. Accordingly, items/statements having relevancy percentage of more than 72 per cent, relevancy weightage of 0.72 and mean relevancy score of more than 3.0 were considered for final selection. By this process, 32 items/statements were isolated in the first stage which were suitably modified and edited as per the comments of judges wherever applicable.

**Item analysis:** To delineate the items/statements based on the extent to which they differentiate the satisfaction items/statements about teacher’s job as favorable or unfavorable, item analysis was carried out on the items/

statements selected in the first stage. A schedule consisting of 32 items/statements was prepared and used for personally interviewing the satisfaction of university teachers on a five point continuum from non-sample area. For item analysis, the respondents were arranged in ascending order based on satisfaction scores. Twenty five per cent of the subjects with the highest total score and 25 per cent with the lowest total scores were selected. These two groups provided the criterion groups in terms of which item analysis was conducted and critical ratio was calculated by using the following formula:

$$t = \frac{\bar{X}_H - \bar{X}_L}{\sqrt{\frac{\left(\sum \bar{X}_H^2 - \frac{(\sum \bar{X}_H)^2}{n}\right) \times \left(\sum \bar{X}_L^2 - \frac{(\sum \bar{X}_L)^2}{n}\right)}{n(n-1)}}$$

Where,

$\bar{X}_H$  = Individual scores in the high group

$\bar{X}_L$  = Individual scores in the low group

n = Number of respondents

Based on the item analysis (‘t’ value), seven statements were non-significant, while three statements were found significant at five per cent and the remaining 22 statements were found significant at one per cent level. Twenty five items/statements which were statistically significant at five per cent and one percent level were retained in the scale to measure satisfaction of teachers towards their job.

**Reliability:** Reliability refers to the precision or accuracy of the measurement or score. A well made scientific instrument should yield accurate results both at present as well as over time (Ray and Mondal, 2011). The split-half method was employed to test the reliability of the satisfaction scale. The value of correlation co-efficient was 0.8840 and this was further corrected by using Spearman Brown formula and obtained the reliability co-efficient of whole set. The ‘r’ value of the scale was 0.9384 which was higher

than the standard of 0.70 indicating the high reliability of the scale. It was concluded that the satisfaction scale constructed was reliable.

**Validity:** Validity of the test is the accuracy with which it measures that which is intended to measure. Construct validity was employed to measure the validity of the scale. The Validity co-efficient for the scale was 0.9687, which was also greater than the standard requirement of 0.70 indicating the higher validity of the developed scale. Hence, the scale is valid. Thus, the developed scale to measure satisfaction of university teachers towards their job was feasible and appropriate.

**Administration of satisfaction scale and method of scoring:** The final scale of 25 items/statements (Table 1) can be administered to the respondents along with five point continuum representing ‘very much satisfied’, ‘satisfied’, ‘partially satisfied’, ‘Dissatisfied and ‘very

much dissatisfied with assigned score of 5, 4, 3, 2 and 1, respectively for positive statements and vice versa for negative statements. The satisfaction score of a respondent can be calculated by adding up the scores obtained by an individual on all items/statements. The satisfaction score of this scale ranges from a minimum of 25 to a maximum of 125. Higher score on the scale indicates that the respondents have higher level of satisfaction towards their job. The satisfaction scale developed was administered to 30 the teachers working in the College of Horticulture, University of Horticultural Sciences Campus, Gandhi KrishiVignana Kendra, Bangalore. The minimum and maximum scores obtained by teachers were 69 and 106, respectively. Based on the mean (89.30) and half standard deviation (7.50) the teachers were categorized into three satisfaction categories viz., low, medium and high.

**Table 1**  
**Scale to measure the satisfaction of teachers towards their job**

Sl. No	Statements	VMS (5)	S (4)	PS (3)	DS (2)	VMD (1)
1	With respect to the posting to the place of liking.					
2	The pre service training given at the time of joining the post.					
3	The policies and procedures of the University in relation to the job.					
4	The budget provided to organize educational activities.					
5	The description of job and responsibilities as a teacher.					
6	The residential facilities provided by the university.					
7	Help guidance and encouragement from superiors.					
8	The scope and opportunity available for self-development.					
9	Freedom for flexibility in work provided by the university.					
10	Medical facilities provided by the university.					
11	Scope to prove the merit and excellence in the university.					
12	Status and prestige as an employee in the university.					
13	With regard to the opportunities in the job to utilize personal abilities.					
14	The recognition given by the students and colleagues.					
15	The promotional opportunities provided in the present job.					
16	The present salary commensurate with the work					
17	The rewards, recognition and incentives provided by the university for good work.					
18	With respect to opportunities created to do higher studies in India and abroad.					
19	Encouragement to participate in seminars, symposia / conferences in India and abroad.					
20	.With respect to transport facilities provided at the university.					
21	Regarding education facilities available for the children.					
22	Provision of equipment, vehicle and other resources necessary to execute the responsibilities.					
23	Appropriate in-service education programmes leading to promotions are available.					
24	Opportunities to express the professional developmental needs.					
25	With regard to the library facilities available in the University.					

VMS= Very Much Satisfied, S= Satisfied, PS= partially Satisfied, DS= Dissatisfied, VMD= Very Much Dissatisfied

**2. Overall satisfaction level of teachers towards their job :** The data in Table 2 relating to the level of satisfaction of teachers indicated that 43.33 per cent of teachers had high level of satisfaction, whereas 30.00 and 26.67 per cent of teachers had medium and low levels of satisfaction towards their job respectively. It can be inferred that majority (73.33%) of the teachers belonged to medium to high levels of job satisfaction categories. More or less similar findings were reported by Manjunatha *et al.*, (1997) and Gopika (2014). The higher and medium job satisfaction may be probably attributed to the recognition by the superiors, intrinsic motivation and satisfaction for having done something good for the benefit of students, and also might be due to the nature of conditions of the performance in the organization. Satisfaction is primarily an indication of self definition of the role to be played in an

express the professional development needs might have influenced the trend of finding.

### CONCLUSION

The satisfaction scale developed is found to be reliable and valid; hence it can be used to measure the satisfaction of teachers towards their job. The developed scale can be used by researchers to measure satisfaction of teachers towards their job. The satisfaction scale developed was administered to 30 teachers of College of Horticulture, University of Horticultural Sciences Campus, Gandhi Krishi Vignana Kendra, Bangalore. It was found that 43.33 per cent of teachers had high level of satisfaction, whereas 30.00 and 26.67 per cent of teachers had medium and low levels of satisfaction, towards their

**Table2**  
**Overall satisfaction of teachers towards their job**

(n=30)

Sr. No.	Perception categories	Vgcej gtu	
		P wo dgt	Rgt 'ēgpv
1.	Low(<81.70)	08	26.67
2.	Medium(81.70 - 96.70)	09	30.00
3.	High(>96.70)	13	43.33
		30	100.00

Mean = 89.20, Standard Deviation = 15.00

organization by individuals which naturally gets conditioned based on the numbers of years of experience in performing different activities. The job description furnished to the teachers by the university, exposure to orientation training sessions, promotional opportunities provided, availability of appropriate in-service education programmes and opportunity to

job, respectively. It can be concluded that the scale developed is useful in explicitly measuring the satisfaction of teachers towards their job.

Paper received on : February 13, 2016

Accepted on : March 03, 2016

### REFERENCES

1. Edwards, A.L., 1969, Techniques of attitude scale construction. *Vakils, Feffer and Simons Pvt. Ltd.*, 9, Sport Road, Ballard Estate, Bombay.
2. Gopika, 2014, Participation in decision making, job satisfaction and job performance of Assistant Horticulture Officers. *M. Sc (Agri.) Thesis (Unpub.)* Univ. Agri. Sci., Bangalore.
3. Likert, R., 1932, A technique for the measurement of attitudes. *Archives of Psychology*, 22(140):55.
4. Manjunatha, B.N., Pillegowda. S. M., Lakshminarayan, M.T. and Narayan, M.L., 1997, Job satisfaction of field extension functionaries, *J. Extn., Edu.*, 8 (5): 1590.
5. Ray, G.L., 1991, Extension communication and management. *Naya Prakash*, Calcutta, India.
6. Ray, G.L., and Mondal, S., 2011, Research methods in social sciences and extension education. *Kalyani Publications*, Calcutta, India.
7. Roberts, M. W., 1952, Second Hand book of research on teaching, *Mc nally publishing House. Co.* Chicago.
8. Thurstone, L.L. and Chave, E.J., 1929, The measurement of attitude. *Chicago University Press*, USA. pp 39-40.