

## Extent of job satisfaction of sub assistant agriculture officers of the department of agricultural extension

Afroza Hossain<sup>1</sup>, Md. Omar Faruk<sup>2</sup>, Md. Shadat Ulla<sup>1</sup>, Md. Sekender Ali<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Agricultural Extension and Information System, Sher-E-Bangla Agricultural University, Dhaka, Bangladesh

<sup>2</sup>Upazila Agriculture Officer, Department of Agricultural Extension, Khamarbari, Dhaka, Bangladesh

### ARTICLE INFO

#### Article history

Accepted 24 June 2019  
Online release 30 June 2019

#### Keyword

Job satisfaction  
SAAOs  
DAE  
Bangladesh

#### \*Corresponding Author

Afroza Hossain  
Email:  
[afrozahossain1989@gmail.com](mailto:afrozahossain1989@gmail.com)

### ABSTRACT

The main purpose of the study was to determine the extent of job satisfaction of Sub Assistant Agriculture Officers (SAAOs) of Department of Agricultural Extension. Attempts were made to describe some selected characteristics of the SAAOs and examine relationships of each of the characteristics with their job satisfaction. Data were collected from 39 SAAOs of six upazilas under Faridpur district. A set of questionnaire was prepared keeping in mind the objectives. Data were collected from the Sub Assistant Agriculture Officers during their upazila level meeting from 10-31 July, 2014. Age, professional commitment, job performance, technological knowledge, problem confrontation capacity, motivation, supervision personality, training exposure and initiativeness for addressing farmer's problem of the SAAOs were considered as the selected characteristics of SAAOs for the study. Pearson's Product Moment correlation coefficient was used for determining the correlation between each of the selected characteristics of the SAAOs with their job satisfaction. From the coefficient analysis it was found that the age, personality and initiativeness for addressing farmer's problem had significant relationship with their job satisfaction.

### Introduction

Job satisfaction describes how content an individual is with his or her job. It is a generalization of effective orientation to all aspects of job. It is the extent to which one feels good about the job. On the other hand job satisfaction is one's state of mind regarding to the nature of their work. The job satisfaction is not related with salary but also concern with working environment, communication, relationship with workers, supervision style, personality and training opportunity. The important issues which are related with job satisfaction are relationship with worker and immediate boss, job security, place of posting, working environment, autonomy and independence, career development opportunities, job prestige, involvement in decision making, client-contact opportunities, etc. People are interested to work in the organization as well as the services where they get more satisfaction (Jonardhan, 1980).

Agricultural extension is a service or a system which assists farm people, through educational procedures, to improve farming methods and techniques increase production efficiency and income, bettering their levels of living and lifting the social and educational standards of rural life (Agricultural extension Manual, 1999). The DAE had been emerged mainly for transfer of agricultural technology among farmers with a package program of information, education and motivation (Bhuiyan, 1999).

In Bangladesh, the DAE is the main organization for conducting extension activities in the rural areas.

DAE plays a vital role regarding farmers' education on improved farming method and techniques to increase their production efficiency and income. Four cadres of personnel are engaged in farmer's educational activities. They are administrators, supervisors, subject matter specialists and front line extension workers like SAAO. SAAOs as supervisors supervise the activities of farmer and monitor farmer field. It was not know whether the Sub Assistant Agriculture Officers were satisfied with their jobs. As the Sub Assistant Agricultural Officers are one of the grassroots level workers of DAE, they have a great responsibility to implement the DAE's extension activities in the field. The level of job performance of the Sub Assistant Agricultural Officers is crucial to the success or failure of the DAE's extension programs. The better performance of SAAOs highly contributes towards the achievement of DAE's objectives. But the performance of the SAAOs is likely to be influenced by personal, social, economical, job related and other factors. It is, therefore, necessary to know how the Sub Assistant Agricultural Officers are performing in the field to achieve the objectives of DAE.

The development and management of DAE need information on job satisfaction of Sub Assistant Agricultural Officers in order to make sound decision, for preventing and solving their problem. A job satisfaction survey is a procedure by which employees report their feelings towards their jobs and satisfaction. Every organization gives many facilities for their employees. Although government has given many facilities, still Sub Assistant Agricultural Officers face many problems that hinder job performance and job satisfaction. Since Sub

Assistant Agricultural Officers play a vital role for transfer of technology for the success of DAE and it is necessary to conduct an empirical research on this issue.

## Methodology

### Locale of the study

Department of Agricultural Extension (DAE) has countrywide extension service network. There are 64 districts, 492 Upazilas and approximately 12000 DAE blocks in Bangladesh. The extension service of DAE has been constituted by appointing Director General, Directors, Additional Directors, Deputy Directors, Upazila Agricultural Extension Officers, and Sub-Assistant Agricultural officers at national, regional, zonal, unit and block level respectively. Out of nine upazilas of Faridpur district, six upazilas namely, Faridpur Sadar, Boalmari, Bhanga, Nagarkanda, Charbhadrasan & Shaltha was purposefully selected as locale of the study.

### Population and Sampling

The Sub Assistant Agriculture Officers (SAAOs) of six upazilas of Faridpur District were population of the study. Thus a total of 170 SAAOs constituted the population of the study. From the selected six upazilas, questionnaires were distributed to the SAAOs during upazila level meeting for data collection. It was found that only 39 SAAOs filled up all the items of the questionnaires. These 39 SAAOs were constituted the study sample.

### Instrument for collection of data

In a research study, preparation of a set of questionnaire for collection of data is done with very careful consideration. The researcher prepared a set of questionnaire with utmost care for collecting data from the respondents. Objectives and variables of the study were kept in view while preparing the interview schedule.

Scales were developed for assigning suitable scores in respect of job satisfaction of SAAOs. Before final draft the questionnaire was pretested by administering the same on several SAAOs of different upazilas under Faridpur District. The pretest was necessary to locate faulty questions and statements. An alterations and adjustments were made in the schedule on the basis of experience of the pretest. The set of questionnaire was then multiplied in its final form for collection of data.

### Data collection

The data has collected by the researcher herself from Sub Assistant Agriculture Officers through personal contact and group meeting from 10 July, 2014 to 31 July, 2014. Out of which 39 fully filled up questionnaire has brought under study by the researcher.

### Measurement of variables

### Job satisfaction

This was measured by computing the scores assigned for job satisfaction. For measuring job satisfaction, 15 aspects of job satisfaction were selected. The SAAOs were asked to indicate their opinion against the 15 aspects of job satisfaction. To compute job satisfaction score, a 4 point scale was used. Scores were assigned to each of the aspects as Highly satisfied (3), Medium satisfied (2), Low satisfied (1), Not at all satisfied (0). The Job satisfaction score assessed by a SAAO was by summing up the score of all the 15 items together. Thus job satisfaction score of a respondent could range from '0' to 45 where '0' indicates no job satisfaction and 45 indicate highest job satisfaction.

### Age

The age of a respondent was measured in terms of actual years from his birth to the time of interview on the basis of his response. A score of one (1) was assigned for each year of age. For example, if any respondent's age was 35 years then he has given a score of 35.

### Professional commitment

By asking questions consisting of related statements, professional commitment was measured against which score were assigned as 3- High commitment, 2- Medium commitment, 1-Low commitment. Ten Professional commitments were identified. The score obtained against each commitment was summed up and range from 10 to 30 where '10' indicates lowest commitment and 30 indicate highest commitment.

### Job performance

Job performance of SAAOs was measured by asking questions consisting of job related statements, against which scored were assigned as Very good (4), Good (3), Medium (2) and Poor (1). Fifteen job performance activities were identified. All of these activities were measured by using 4 (four) point scale as mentioned above. The scores obtained against each activity were summed up and ranged from '15' to 60 where '15' indicates lowest job performance and 60 indicate highest job performance.

### Technological Knowledge

By asking 10 (ten) selected questions, technological knowledge of the respondents was measured and one (1) mark was assigned for each of the question. Full marks was given for fully correct answer and partial score was given for partially correct answer, whereas wrong answer or no answer was given 0 (zero). Technological knowledge score of the respondents could range from 0-10 while '0' indicate very low knowledge and '10' indicate very high knowledge.

### Problem confrontation capacity

Problem confrontation capacity was measured by asking questions consisting of job related problems, against which score were assigned as 4- High

confrontation, 3- Medium confrontation, 2- Little confrontation, 1- Very Little confrontation. Ten problem confrontation capacities were identified. The score obtained against each item was summed up and ranged from 10 to 40 where '10' indicates lowest problem confrontation capacity and 40 indicate highest problem confrontation capacity.

### **Motivation**

Motivation was measured by asking questions, against which score were assigned as 4-highly motivation, 3- Optimum motivation, 2- Medium motivation, 1- Low motivation. Ten motivation capacities were identified. The score obtained against each item was summed up and ranged from 10 to 40 where '10' indicates lowest motivation and 40 indicate highest motivation.

### **Supervision**

Based on supervision abilities of the respondents were scored as 4- highly, 3- medium, 2-low and 1-very low. Ten supervision capacities were identified. The score obtained against each item was summed up and ranged from 10 to 40 where '10' indicates lowest supervision and 40 indicate highest supervision.

### **Personality**

Personality was measured by asking questions consisting personality related statements, against which score were assigned according to the degree of personality state as high (4), medium (3), low (2) and very low (1). Ten personality activities were identified. The score obtained against each personality were summed up and ranged from 10 to 40 where '10' indicates lowest personality and 40 indicate highest personality.

### **Training exposure**

Training exposure score was measured based on the respondents participation in different agriculture related training program. A score of one (1) was assigned for each day of training and zero (0) for no training.

### **Initiativeness for addressing farmers' problem**

It was measured by asking questions to SAAOs about their Initiativensness for addressing farmers' problem, against which scores were assigned according to the degree of initiativensness for addressing farmer's problem as stated as highly aware, little aware and very little aware with score 4, 3, 2, 1 respectively. Ten items of initiativensness for addressing farmer's problem of addressing farmers' problem were identified. The score obtained against each problem were summed up and ranged from 10 to 40 where '10' indicates lowest addressing farmers' problem and 40 indicate highest addressing farmers' problem.

### **Statistical analysis of data**

Data collected from the respondents were compiled, coded, tabulated and analyzed in accordance with the objectives of the study. Various statistical measures such as frequency counts, percentage distribution, average, and standard deviation were used in describing data. SPSS (version 11.5) computer program were used for analyzing the data. The categories and tables were used in describing data. The categories and tables were also used in presenting data for better understanding.

For determining the association of the selected characteristics of the SAAOs with their job performance, Pearson's Product Moment Correlation was used. Five percent (0.05) level of probability was used as the basis for rejecting any null hypothesis. In order to find out the relationship between the selected dependent and independent variables correlation coefficient (r) was done.

## **Results and Discussion**

### **Selected characteristics of the Sub Assistant Agriculture Officer**

In the present study, ten characteristics of the SAAOs were selected for investigation. The characteristics included: age, professional commitment, job performance, technological knowledge, problem confrontation capacity, motivation, supervision personality, training and initiativensness for addressing farmer's problem. The salient features of the different characteristics have been presented in Table 1.

**Table 1.** Salient features of the Sub Assistant Agriculture Officers' selected characteristics

| Characteristics                                       | Possible range | Observed range | Mean  | SD    |
|---|----------------|----------------|-------|-------|
| Age (year)  | Unknown        | 23-58          | 47.26 | 9.76  |
| Professional commitment (score)                       | 10-30          | 24-30          | 28.15 | 1.14  |
| Job performance (score)                               | 15-60          | 39-55          | 46.67 | 3.67  |
| Technological knowledge (score)                       | 0-10           | 6-10           | 8.12  | 1.15  |
| Problem confrontation capacity (score)                | 10-40          | 16-30          | 22.49 | 2.80  |
| Motivation (score)                                    | 10-40          | 26-39          | 34.05 | 3.46  |
| Supervision (score)                                   | 10-40          | 23-40          | 33.18 | 3.15  |
| Personality   | 10-40          | 30-40          | 35.08 | 2.78  |
| Training Exposure (score)                             | Unknown        | 0-105          | 8.13  | 17.56 |
| Initiativeness for addressing Farmers problem (score) | 10-40          | 26-37          | 32.85 | 2.92  |

**Table 2.** Classification of sub assistant officer according to their characteristics

| Characteristics                                |                      | SAAOs |         | Mean  | SD    |
|--|----------------------|-------|---------|-------|-------|
|  |                      | No.   | Percent |       |       |
| Age  | Age                  |       |         |       |       |
|  | Young Age (Below 35) | 7     | 17.95   |       |       |
|  | Middle Age (35-50)   | 14    | 35.90   | 47.26 | 9.76  |
|  | Old Age (Above 50)   | 18    | 46.15   |       |       |
|  | Total                | 39    | 100.00  |       |       |
| Professional commitment                        | Medium (24-27)       | 7     | 17.95   |       |       |
|  | High (28- 30)        | 32    | 82.05   | 28.15 | 1.14  |
|  | Total                | 39    | 100.00  |       |       |
| Job performance                                | Low(below 43)        | 8     | 20.51   |       |       |
|  | Medium (43-53)       | 30    | 76.92   | 46.67 | 3.67  |
|  | High (above 53)      | 1     | 2.56    |       |       |
|  | Total                | 39    | 100.00  |       |       |
| Technological knowledge                        | Medium (5-8)         | 19    | 48.72   |       |       |
|  | High (Above 8)       | 20    | 51.28   | 8.12  | 1.15  |
|  | Total                | 39    | 100.00  |       |       |
| problem confrontation                          | Low (Below 24)       | 31    | 79.49   |       |       |
|  | Medium (24-29)       | 7     | 17.95   | 22.49 | 2.80  |
|  | High (Above 29)      | 1     | 2.56    |       |       |
|  | Total                | 39    | 100.00  |       |       |
| Motivation                                     | Low (Below 30)       | 6     | 15.38   |       |       |
|  | Medium (30-35)       | 19    | 48.72   | 34.05 | 3.46  |
|  | High (Above 35)      | 14    | 35.90   |       |       |
|  | Total                | 39    | 100.00  |       |       |
| Supervision                                    | Low (Below 32)       | 13    | 33.33   |       |       |
|  | Medium (33-36)       | 22    | 56.41   | 33.18 | 3.15  |
|  | High (Above 36)      | 4     | 10.26   |       |       |
|  | Total                | 39    | 100.00  |       |       |
| Personality                                    | Low (Below 33)       | 10    | 25.64   |       |       |
|  | Medium (33-37)       | 20    | 51.28   | 35.08 | 2.78  |
|  | High (Above 37)      | 9     | 23.08   |       |       |
|  | Total                | 39    | 100.00  |       |       |
| Training exposure                              | Low (Below 7)        | 31    | 79.49   |       |       |
|  | Medium (7-20)        | 3     | 7.69    | 8.13  | 17.56 |
|  | High (Above 20)      | 5     | 12.82   |       |       |
|  | Total                | 39    | 100.00  |       |       |
| Initiativeness for addressing farmers' problem | Low (Below 30)       | 7     | 17.95   |       |       |
|  | Medium (30-35)       | 26    | 66.67   | 32.85 | 2.92  |
|  | High (Above 35)      | 6     | 15.38   |       |       |
|  | Total                | 39    | 100.00  |       |       |
| Job satisfaction                               | Low (Below 35)       | 16    | 41.03   | 22.44 | 4.55  |

|                 |    |        |
|-----------------|----|--------|
| Medium (36-45)  | 21 | 51.28  |
| High (Above 46) | 2  | 7.69   |
| Total           | 39 | 100.00 |

### Age

Age of the Sub Assistant Agriculture Officers ranged from, 23-58 years and the average was 47.26 with a standard deviation of 9.76. This indicates that the study group was moderately heterogeneous in terms of age level. On the basis of their age, the Sub Assistant Agriculture Officers were classified into three categories namely, 'young', 'middle' and 'old' aged (Table 2).

It was observed that the highest proportion (46.15 %) of the Sub Assistant Agriculture Officers were old aged, while 35.90 % and 17.95 % of respondents were middle and young aged category. It shows that 53.85 % of the Sub Assistant Agriculture Officers belonged to the young and middle aged categories (Table 2). The young and middle aged categories of SAAOs are supposed to be the best job performer along with job satisfaction.

### Professional commitment

Data revealed that the highest proportions (82.05 %) of the Sub Assistant Agriculture Officers were in high professional commitment category, while 17.95 % belonged to the medium category. The table also revealed that 100 % of the Sub Assistant Agriculture Officers belonged to the medium to high professional commitment categories. Conclusion could be drawn that higher the professional commitment-higher the job satisfaction and higher the job performance.

### Job performance

The score of job performance of the Sub Assistant Agriculture Officers ranged from 39-55 against the possible range 15-60 and the mean was 46.67 with a standard deviation of 3.67. On the basis of their job performance, the Sub Assistant Agriculture Officers were classified into three categories namely, 'low job performance', 'medium job performance' and 'high job performance' (Table 2). The highest proportions (76.92 %) of the Sub Assistant Agriculture Officers were in medium job performance category, while 20.51 % belonged to the low job performance category. Only 2.56 % of the Sub Assistant Agriculture Officers were in the high job performance category. The table also revealed that 97.44 % of the Sub Assistant Agriculture Officers belonged to the low to medium job performance categories.

### Technological knowledge

The score of technological knowledge of the Sub Assistant Agriculture Officers ranged from 6-10 against the possible range 0-10 and the mean was 8.12 with a standard deviation of 1.15. It was observed that the highest proportions (51.28 %) of the Sub Assistant Agriculture Officers were in high technological knowledge category, while 48.72 %

belonged to the medium technological knowledge category. The table also revealed that 100 % of the Sub Assistant Agriculture Officers belonged to the medium to high medium categories (Table 2).

### Problem confrontation capacity

The score of problem confrontation capacity of the Sub Assistant Agriculture Officers ranged from 16-30 against the possible range 10-40 and the mean was 22.49 with a standard deviation of 2.80. The highest proportions (79.49 %) of the Sub Assistant Agriculture Officers were in low problem confrontation category, while 17.95 % belonged to the medium problem confrontation category. Only 2.56 % of the Sub Assistant Agriculture Officers were in the high problem confrontation category (Table 2). The table 2 also revealed that 97.44 % of the Sub Assistant Agriculture Officers belonged to the low to medium problem confrontation categories. SAAOs by virtue of their professional commitment address farmer's problems. When an officer is able to address others problem he is supposed to solve his own problem also. So, the table reasonably proved that lower the problem confrontation capacity lower the job satisfaction.

### Motivation

The score of motivation of the Sub Assistant Agriculture Officers ranged from 26-39 against the possible range 10-40 and the mean was 34.05 with a standard deviation of 3.46. The data indicated-that the highest proportion (48.72 %) of the respondents had medium level of motivation while 35.90 % had high level of motivation and 15.38 % of the respondents had low level of motivation. More than 3/4<sup>th</sup> of the respondents (84.62%) had motivation ranged from medium to high (Table 2). SAAOs motivate farmers and become motivated themselves through performing their duties and responsibilities. They experience both intrinsic motivation (motivate farmers to adopt new technology) and extrinsic motivation (perform assigned technical function).

### Supervision

The score of supervision of the Sub Assistant Agriculture Officers ranged from 23-40 against the possible range 10-40 and the mean was 33.18 with a standard deviation of 3.15. This indicates that the study group was moderately heterogeneous in terms of supervision. The highest proportion (56.41 %) of the respondents had medium level of supervision while 33.33 % had low level of supervision and 10.26 % of the respondents had high level of supervision. About 90% of the respondents had supervision ranged from low to medium (Table 2). It can be said that supervision has relation with job satisfaction. Supervision is the aggregate of a number of activities. In this study fifteen items of supervision were considered as SAAOs supervisory job.

### Personality

The score of personality of the Sub Assistant Agriculture Officers ranged from 30-40 against the possible range 10-40 and the mean was 35.08 with a standard deviation of 2.78. The highest proportion (51.28 %) of the respondents had medium personality while 25.64 % had low personality and 23.08 % of the respondents had high level of personality. Almost 2/3<sup>rd</sup> of the respondents had personality ranged from low to medium. However 74.36% of the respondents had medium to high personality. Personality is the most important issue of human behavior (Table 2). A SAAO works with many other officers of his own organization and other development organization. He should have leadership ability, agricultural knowledge, problem handling capacity and the like so that his colleagues and client system think him/her as an important person of DAE.

### Training exposure

The score of training of the respondent ranged from 0-105 with an average 8.13 with a standard deviation of 17.56. The highest proportion (79.49 %) of the respondents had low training while 12.82 % had high training level. Almost 3/4<sup>th</sup> of the respondents had training exposure ranged from low to medium. Conclusion could be drawn that higher the training exposure - higher the job satisfaction (Table 2). It is obviously seen that SAAOs had no higher training. Training is an important aspect of career development of agricultural extension officers through which they can update their technological knowledge along with administration capacity. But unfortunately respondents of the study had low and medium level of training.

### Initiativeness for addressing farmers' problem

The score of Initiatives for addressing farmers' problem of the respondent ranged from 26-37 against the possible range of 10-40 with an average of 32.85 with a standard deviation of 2.92. Data indicated that highest proportion (66.67 %) of the respondents had medium initiatives for addressing farmers' problem while 17.95 % had low initiatives for addressing farmers' problem and 15.38 % of the respondents had high level of initiatives for addressing farmers'

problem (Table 2). The data reveal that a large proportion of SAAOs had medium initiatives for addressing farmers' problems. In fact the main function of agricultural extension is to address farmers' problem. Most of the SAAOs were conscious about farmers' problems. However the 66.67% of the respondents dealt with and deliver solution on current field problems. It can be said that SAAOs can achieve job satisfaction by addressing farmers' problems.

### Job satisfaction of Sub Assistant Agriculture Officers of DAE

The score of job satisfaction of the Sub Assistant Agriculture Officers ranged from 29-48 against the possible range 0-45 and the mean was 22.44 with a standard deviation of 4.55. The highest proportion (53.85%) of the respondents had medium job satisfaction while 41.03 % had low level of job satisfaction and 5.13 % of the respondents had high level of job satisfaction (Table 2).

There were different dimensions of measuring job satisfaction. Some SAAOs were satisfied if his/her salary and allowances are sufficient, some were satisfied of favorable office environment, some of them satisfied of enough scope of promotion, some were satisfied if his boss appreciated him, some were satisfied just being a government officer; some were satisfied being posted to suitable places and so on. SAAOs are very responsible person of DAE. It is their consciousness to make the working environment happy and satisfactory. Moreover no SAAO was found to be totally unsatisfied.

Job satisfaction differs from person to person and organization to organization. So, job satisfaction is such phenomenon which comes from not only their job, but also from one personal, social organizational administration and economical condition.

### Comparative study among fifteen criteria of job satisfaction of SAAOs

Job Satisfaction index obtained from self evaluation rating score ranged from 15 to 107 against the possible range 0 to 117.

**Table 3.** Rank order of Satisfaction index of fifteen items of job satisfaction

| SI No | Aspects of job environment                               | Extent of job satisfaction |                  |     |         |     | Performance incidence | Rank order |
|-------|--|----------------------------|------------------|-----|---------|-----|-----------------------|------------|
|       |  | Highly Satisfied           | Medium Satisfied | Low | Not all | at  |                       |            |
| 1     | Receiving appreciation from higher authority and clients | 12                         | 25               | 1   | 1       | 87  | 3                     |            |
| 2     | Sufficient salary and allowances                         | 2                          | 10               | 20  | 7       | 46  | 10                    |            |
| 3     | Serving DAE, as a venture some job                       | 34                         | 2                | 1   | 1       | 107 | 1                     |            |
| 4     | Opportunity to increase technological knowledge          | 4                          | 24               | 10  | 1       | 70  | 7                     |            |
| 5     | Place of posting   | 14                         | 16               | 7   | 2       | 81  | 5                     |            |
| 6     | Enjoying the nature of job                               | 16                         | 17               | 3   | 3       | 85  | 4                     |            |

|    |  |    |    |    |    |    |    |
|----|--|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| 7  | Facility of travel and transport                                     | 1  | 1  | 17 | 20 | 22 | 14 |
| 8  | Facilities of office inputs  | 1  | 11 | 18 | 9  | 43 | 11 |
| 9  | Scope of promotion   | 1  | 1  | 10 | 27 | 15 | 15 |
| 10 | Having opportunity to understand the social system of farm community | 2  | 5  | 24 | 8  | 40 | 12 |
| 11 | Facilities of extension training                                     | 2  | 11 | 21 | 5  | 49 | 9  |
| 12 | Cooperativeness of farmers   | 21 | 15 | 1  | 2  | 94 | 2  |
| 13 | Favorable office environment   | 6  | 25 | 3  | 3  | 71 | 6  |
| 14 | Opportunity for higher education                                     | 3  | 3  | 8  | 25 | 23 | 13 |
| 15 | Opportunity for learning to cope with problematic situations.        | 3  | 16 | 13 | 7  | 54 | 8  |

Table 3 indicated the comparative rank order of the job satisfaction items. Fifteen items of job satisfaction were taken into consideration. Among those "serving DAE is a venture some job" topped the list. The respondents reasonably pointed out the serving DAE is a venture some job as a major job satisfaction item. "Farmers found to be very co-operative" obtained second position. "Scope of promotion" obtained lowest position.

#### Relationship of selected characteristics of SAAOs with the extent of job satisfaction

**Table 4.** Pearson product moment correlation coefficient analysis of ten selected characteristics of the SAAOs with their job satisfaction

|   | Selected characteristics of the SAAOs         | Calculated value of "r" | Tabulated value of "r" |               |
|---|---|-------------------------|------------------------|---------------|
|   |   |                         | At 0.05 level          | At 0.01 level |
| Job satisfaction of the Sub Assistant Agriculture Officers of DAE | Age   | 0.393*                  | 0.304                  | 0.406         |
|   | Professional commitment                       | 0.261 <sup>NS</sup>     |                        |               |
|   | Job performance                               | -0.158 <sup>NS</sup>    |                        |               |
|   | Technological knowledge                       | 0.277 <sup>NS</sup>     |                        |               |
|   | problem confrontation capacity                | 0.295 <sup>NS</sup>     |                        |               |
|   | Motivation                                    | -0.179 <sup>NS</sup>    |                        |               |
|   | Supervision                                   | 0.297 <sup>NS</sup>     |                        |               |
|   | Personality                                   | 0.383*                  |                        |               |
|   | Training                                      | 0.050 <sup>NS</sup>     |                        |               |
|   | Initiativeness for addressing farmers problem | 0.454**                 |                        |               |

The age, personality and initiativeness for addressing farmer's problem of the SAAOs had significant positive relationship with their job satisfaction indicating higher the age, personality and initiativeness towards solving farmer's problem, greater the job satisfaction of SAAOs (Table 4). Similar to this study, Karim (1990) observed a significant and positive relationship between age of the subject Matter Officers (SMOs) and their job satisfaction. Wright (1995) found that personality reflects the motivation of people to do their tasks and the talents represent the abilities.

On the other hand professional commitment, technological knowledge, problem confrontation capacity, supervision and training had no significant relationship with the job satisfaction of SAAOs (Table 4). Mishra and Chan Dargi, (2006), found that Job performance was significantly associated with

This section deals with the relationship of the 10 independent variables with the job satisfaction of the SAAOs. The selected independent variables were age, professional commitment, job performance, technological knowledge, problem confrontation capacity, motivation, supervision, personality, training, and initiativeness for addressing farmer's problem which were indicated by X<sub>1</sub>, X<sub>2</sub>, X<sub>3</sub>, X<sub>4</sub>, X<sub>5</sub>, X<sub>6</sub>, X<sub>7</sub>, X<sub>8</sub>, X<sub>9</sub> and X<sub>10</sub>. Correlation coefficient matrix has been used to examine the relationship among the independent variables with the job satisfaction.

professional commitment separate relationship correlation analysis for men and women respondents showed that there was no significant relationship between professional commitment and Job Satisfaction. Similar observation reported by Veerabhadraiah and Jalikal (1983) in India who found no significant relationship between the training in administration and management, and job involvement of the Deputy Directors and Assistant Directors of Agriculture. Mahboob et al. (1978) stated that there was no significant relationship between the Union Agricultural problem awareness of Union Assistants and their job satisfaction. However, Drysdale and Mulford (2005) described supervision as the ability to effectively guide and evaluate the job performance of the workers.

But job performance and motivation had negative relationship with the job satisfaction of SAAOs. The

result of this study coincides with the study of Sandu and Singh (1977). Rahman (1990) observed that the job satisfaction of Block supervisors was independent to their job performance. Mahboob et al. (1978) on the basis of a study reported that though there was some variation in their job satisfaction, the statistical test did not suggest any significant relationship between the two variables. Perumal (1975) in a study also found that job satisfaction of the Agricultural Extension Officers had no significant relationship with their job performance. Salim (2006) conducted a study on job performance of SAAOs and found no significant relationship between academic achievement and extent of job performance. However, motivation has been noted to be imperative in ensuring job satisfaction which is considered as a pro-active human resource management strategy by Oloruntoba and Ajayi (2003).

## Conclusion

The highest proportion (51.28 %) of the respondents had medium job satisfaction while 41.03 % had low level of job satisfaction and 7.69% of the respondents had high level of job satisfaction. These facts lead to the conclusion that there is much scope to raise the job satisfaction level of the Sub Assistant Agriculture Officers of DAE. The morale of the Sub Assistant Agriculture Officers can be kept must high through improving their job satisfaction level by providing better salary and job environment. Age of the SAAOs had significant positive relationship with their job satisfaction. Therefore it may be concluded that aged farmers had the higher job satisfaction and vice-versa. Personality of the SAAOs had significant positive relationship with their job satisfaction. Therefore it may be concluded that SAAOs having more personality had the higher job satisfaction. The SAAOs Initiativeness for addressing farmers' problem had significant positive relationship with their job satisfaction. It is therefore concluded that SAAOs having more score on initiativeness for addressing farmers' problem had the higher job satisfaction.

## Recommendations

Recommendations formulate on the basis of the findings and conclusions of this study are presented below:

1. Overall job satisfaction of SAAOs was not satisfactory. Achieving this, policy and procedure in respect of extension service will need a very careful consideration and modification according to necessity. It is recommended that adequate steps like proper supervision, guidance, counseling and training of SAAOs should be taken to ensure high level of job satisfaction. DAE needs to provide necessary supports and facilities like office room, transport, more travel allowance, training materials, agricultural inputs, credit etc. to the SAAOs to perform their job properly so that they remain satisfied with their job.
2. Age of the SAAOs had significant positive relationship with their job satisfaction. Therefore it may be recommended that steps should be taken

by DAE for the young aged SAAOs for increasing their job satisfaction by proper training and providing necessary facilities.

3. Personality of the SAAOs had significant positive relationship with their job satisfaction. Therefore, it may be recommended that attempts should be taken for the SAAOs for developing their personality.
4. Initiativeness for addressing farmer's problem of the SAAOs had significant positive relationship with their job satisfaction. Therefore it may be recommended that necessary facilities are to be provided to the SAAOs, so that they could address the problems of the farmers.
5. To increase the initiativeness for addressing farmer's problem, the SAAOs should be involve with the IPM club, Farmers Field School & training programs, organized by local DAE officers. DAE should take care of this kind of activities.
6. DAE should undertake measures of personality development of SAAOs' through conducting workshop, training etc.

## References

- Agricultural extension Manual, 1999.  
[https://dae.portal.gov.bd/sites/default/...bd/.../Extension\\_n\\_Manual](https://dae.portal.gov.bd/sites/default/...bd/.../Extension_n_Manual)
- Bhuiyan (1999). Extension Organization and Management. Dept. of Agricultural Extension and Information System, Sher-e-Bangla Agricultural University, Dhaka, Bangladesh.
- Drysdale D.G. and Mulford B. (2005). Successful principal leadership: Australian case studies. *J. Edu Admin.*, 43(6), 539-551.
- Jonardhan K.S. (1980). A Study of Job Performance and Job Satisfaction of Agricultural Extension Officers and Factors Associated with them. An M. Sc.A g. Thesis, University of Agricultural Sciences, Bangalore.
- Karim A.S.M.Z. (1990). Job performance of The Subject Matter Officers under the T & V System on Extension Work in Bangladesh. A Ph.D. Thesis, Dep't. of Argil. Ext. Edu., BAU, Mymensingh.
- Mahboob SG, Rasul G, Alam MS and Islam MM (1978). A Study of Union Assistants in Bangladesh, Deptt. of Agricultural Extension & Teachers' Training, BAU, Mymensingh.
- Mishra D and Chandargi DM (2006). A study on profile characteristics of men and women extension officers and their job performance and job satisfaction. Dept. of Agricultural Extension, University of Agricultural Sciences, Dharwad- 58000s.
- Oloruntoba A and Ajayi MT (2003). Motivational Factors and Employees job satisfaction in large scale private farms in ogun state, Nigeria J. International Agriculture and Extension Education. 10 (1): 67-72.
- Perumal G (1975). A Study of job performance, Psychological Characteristics, Communication Behavior and Training Aspect of the Agricultural Extension Education Officers of Tamil Nadu. A Ph.D. Thesis, Division of Agricultural Extension, IARI, New Delhi.
- Rahman MM (1990). Job performance of the Block Supervisors working Under Training and Visit System in the Department of Agricultural Extension (DAE). A Ph.D. Thesis. Deptt. Of Agril. Ext. Edu., BAU, Mymensingh.
- Salim MAS (2006). Job Performance of Sub Assistant Agricultural Officers, an M. S. Thesis, Sher-e -Bangla Agricultural University, Dhaka.



Sandu NS and Sing R (1977). Determinants of Job satisfaction among the Agricultural Extension Officers of the Punjab. *Indian J Exten Edu*, 13:42-47.

Veerabhadraiah V and Jalihal (1983). Job involvement of extension supervisors. *Indian J. Exten. Edu.*, 19(3&4): 1-9.

Wright MP (1995). Cognitive Ability as a Moderator of the Relationship between Personality and Job Performance. *J. Manag.*, 2(6): 1129-1139.