

Predictors of Job Satisfaction Among Extension Program Assistants

Suzanna R. Windon¹

Abstract

Social scientists viewed job satisfaction as a worker's emotions and experience at workplace and his or her responses to that experience. The program assistants are essential extension employees who help extension educators recruit clientele and deliver educational programs. This study was conducted to determine the factors affecting program assistants' job satisfaction. An online questionnaire was utilized to collect data from 149 Ohio State University Extension program assistants. Findings showed that employees job satisfaction does not relate to age, years of service, gender, children living at home under 18, education, program areas, and marital status. Approximately 98% of the variation in overall job satisfaction can be explained by program assistants' satisfaction with pay, promotions, fringe benefits, rewards, organizational procedures, co-workers, the work itself, and communication. The employees showed less satisfaction with pay and promotions. Organization leaders and human resource development professionals should explore all possible alternative ways to enhance the job satisfaction levels of extension program assistants. Moreover, they need to consider addressing issues related to extension program assistants pay and promotion opportunities.

Keywords: extension program assistants, job satisfaction, satisfaction with work-related domains

Introduction

Satisfied employees are more creative, innovative, and positive, and these traits affect their superior performance; on the other hand, dissatisfied employees have lower levels of commitment that negatively affect individual and organizational performance (Rast & Tourani, 2012). Definitions of job satisfaction have evolved over time. Social scientists viewed job satisfaction as a worker's emotions and experience at the workplace and his or her responses to that experience. In 1969, Locke explained job satisfaction using Rand's theory of emotions. He discussed five concepts such as value, emotion, appraisal, satisfaction, and dissatisfaction, and measured their interrelationships. Locke described job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction as "a complex emotional reaction to the job" (p. 314). Locke construed job satisfaction and dissatisfaction as "a function of the perceived relationship between what one wants from one's job and what one perceives it as offering or entailing" (p. 316). Smith, Kendall, and Hulin (1969) defined job satisfaction as a response of the worker to his job. Cranny, Smith, and Stone (1992) delineated job satisfaction as an employee's affective reactions to a job based on the comparison of desired outcomes with actual outcomes. Moreover, the authors emphasized that job dissatisfaction is a result of low productivity and psychological frustration. Porter and Steers (1973) mentioned that the level of employee job satisfaction based on his or her expectations related to pay, promotion, or autonomy.

Higher satisfaction with work domains among extension professionals positively impact employees' job satisfaction and job performance (Harder, Goldthorpe, and Goodwin, 2015, Hodous, Young, Borr, Vetter, 2014; Long & Swortzel, 2007; Schmiesing, 2002, Van Tilburg, & Miller, 1987).

¹ Suzanna R. Windon is an Assistant Professor in the Department of Agricultural Economics, Sociology, and Education at The Pennsylvania State University, 209 B Fergusson Building, University park, PA, 16802, email: sxk75@psu.edu

Similarly, the level of job satisfaction has been examined among agricultural teachers (Bowen, 1980; Bowen & Radhakrishna, 1991; Castillo, 1999, Foor & Cano, 2011; Ritz, Burris, Brashears, & Frazee, 2013; Walker, Garton, & Kitchel, 2004, Turayev, 2007.) Kitchel et al. (2012) indicated that understanding job satisfaction within agricultural education has the potential to impact the profession's future.

According to a human resource professional, Ohio State University (OSU) Extension is experiencing a higher turnover rate among program assistants than extension educators (personal communication, August 17, 2016). Extension program assistants help extension educators. They are responsible for recruiting individuals for educational programs, and they use standardized curriculum materials to provide informal teaching. An assessment of OSU Extension program assistants' overall job satisfaction and satisfaction with other essential work-related domains may help extension administrators generate organizational development strategies to increase job satisfaction among this category of extension employees (Windon, 2017). The purpose of my study was to examine the relationship between dimensions that contribute to employee job satisfaction as a means of strengthening organizational strategic planning efforts.

Theoretical Framework

There are many factors that affect individuals' job satisfaction or job dissatisfaction. Locke (1976) explained job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction as emotional reactions resulting from an individual's perception regarding his or her fulfillers, job value, and needs. He also characterized job satisfaction as enjoyable emotions from individuals' work experiences. Burke (1987) noted that job satisfaction and dissatisfaction differ based on an individual's expectations. Herzberg, Snyderman, and Mausner (1966) suggested that job satisfaction factors are intrinsic whereas job dissatisfaction factors are extrinsic. According to Herzberg's motivation-hygiene (two-factor) theory, intrinsic motivators tend to create motivation when they are present, whereas extrinsic motivators tend to reduce motivation when they are absent. Intrinsic motivators tend to represent less tangible, more emotional needs, such as achievement, advisement, recognition, and growth potential. Extrinsic motivators tend to represent more tangible, basic needs, such as working conditions, company policies, supervisor relationships, peer relationships, fringe benefits, salaries, and job security. Satisfaction and dissatisfaction are independent of each other because extrinsic motivators cause dissatisfaction if they are absent, while intrinsic motivators can provide extra motivation (Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman, 1959; Herzberg et al., 1966). Howard and Frick (1996) indicated that job satisfaction is a multifaceted construct that includes both intrinsic and extrinsic job indicators. Amabile (1993) proposed the following definition:

Individuals are *intrinsically motivated* when they seek enjoyment, interest, a satisfaction of curiosity, self-expression, or personal challenge in their work. Individuals are *extrinsically motivated* when they engage in the work to obtain something that is apart from the work itself. (p. 186)

Unmet employee expectations affect job dissatisfaction or employees' decisions to quit the job (Pearson, 1991). Strong and Harder (2009) used Herzberg's two-factor theory to analyze motivation factors that affect extension employee retention. Among motivating factors were "strong and consistent training and staff development programs, mentoring programs, accolades for work well done, having an appealing vocation, a sense of support within the workplace, and overall job satisfaction." Among hygiene factors were "inadequate salary, poor pay to workload ratio, financial opportunities outside extension, large and abnormal time obligations, issues balancing personal and professional life, and job stress" (Strong & Harder, 2009, p. 2). Cano and Miller (1992) conducted job satisfaction study among agricultural education teachers. They found that the job satisfier dimension included "achievement, advancement, recognition, responsibility, the work itself," and the job dissatisfier dimension comprised

of “interpersonal relationship, policy and administration, salary, supervision/technical, and working conditions” (Cano & Miller, 1992, p. 43).

Ford (1992) wrote that motivation factors are paramount to job satisfaction, whereas the hygiene factors are predictors of job dissatisfaction. Thereby, fulfilled hygiene needs would not achieve satisfaction (Herzberg et al., 1959). According to Herzberg’s motivation-hygiene (two-factor) theory, motivation factors affect satisfaction and motivation. For instance, an employee can feel satisfied and contented about some aspects of his or her job, while simultaneously being despondent about other work-related issues. Steers and Porter (1991) suggested that researchers should contemplate and scrutinize the Herzberg’s motivation-hygiene theory that will help to increase researchers’ and leaders’ understanding of the role of motivation in the work environment.

Three following surveys used extensively in the literature to measure employee job satisfaction: Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire, Cornell Studies of Satisfaction: The Job Descriptive Index, and Spector’s Job Satisfaction Survey. The Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire was developed by Weiss, Dawis, England, and Lofquist in 1967. This instrument includes 20 dimensions that measure employee satisfaction with job environment, namely ability utilization, achievement, activity, advancement, authority, company policies and practices, compensation, coworkers, creativity, independence, moral values, recognition, responsibility, security, social service, social status, supervision-human relations, supervision-technical, variety, and working condition (Weiss, Dawis, England, & Lofquist, 1967, pp. 1-2). Cornell Studies of Satisfaction: The Job Descriptive Index. The primary assumption of the Cornell study regarding job satisfaction was that a “satisfied worker is the productive worker” (Smith et al., 1969, p. 272). Smith et al. (1969) stated that job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction may or may not affect overt employee behavior. The employee satisfaction measures demonstrated “the success of management policies and practices, such as job enlargement, supervisory training, participative management, group decision making, employee welfare programs, bonus or incentive-payment system” (p. 273). The result allowed the author to predict future turnover or turnover intention among personnel. Thus, the Cornell Job Descriptive Index included five dimensions of job satisfaction: (1) satisfaction with work, (2) satisfaction with pay, (3) satisfaction with the opportunities for promotion, (4) satisfaction with supervision, and (5) satisfaction with coworkers (Smith et al., 1996, pp. 274-277). Spector’s Job Satisfaction Survey. Spector (1985) measured job satisfaction by a Job Satisfaction Survey that included the nine dimensions: (1) satisfaction with pay, (2) satisfaction with promotion, (3) satisfaction with supervision, (4) satisfaction with fringe benefits, (5) satisfaction with contingent rewards, (6) satisfaction with operating procedures, (7) satisfaction with coworkers, (8) satisfaction with nature of work, and (9) satisfaction with communication. The reliability coefficient was .91 (Spector, 1985).

A myriad of factors influences extension professionals’ work satisfaction in the workplace (Vlosky & Aguilar, 2009). Vlosky & Aguilar (2009) recommended that employees responsible as well to maximize their satisfaction in the workplace. The authors suggested that employees need to participate in the goal-setting process to ensure that their duties are challenging, which leads to satisfaction. Millilo (1990) indicated that job satisfaction depends on a number of factors and is subject to change. He recommended to conduct a periodic needs assessment to determine the level of job satisfaction of personnel and identify methods for increasing satisfaction. In 1997, Wesolowski and Mossholder wrote that organizations should investigate the role of demographic differences in the workplace. The authors indicated that employees’ demographics have long been studied in connection with a specific workplace phenomenon. Clark (1997) hypothesized that men and women in identical jobs should be equally satisfied. However, the results of his study showed that females have higher levels of job satisfaction. Metle (2001) found that job satisfaction declines with increasing levels of education. Bowen, Radhakrishna, and Keyser (1994) studied 4-H agents and emphasized that older, married, and more experienced agents had higher levels of job satisfaction with their extension work

than younger, single, and less experienced agents. The authors suggested that staff development practitioners should develop an in-service training that will help employees to increase their job satisfaction and offer mentoring program for younger agents. Current information on job satisfaction among extension program assistants was lacking. This study was designed to identify also how program assistants' overall job satisfaction differ from their demographic characteristics such as age, years of service, gender, children living at home under 18, education, program area, and marital status.

Purpose and Methods

Three research objectives guided this study:

1. Describe the level of overall job satisfaction among extension program assistants
2. Determine the relationship between overall job satisfaction and demographic variables such as age, years of service, gender, children living at home under 18, education, program area, and marital status
3. Explain the relationship between overall job satisfaction and the independent variables of satisfaction with pay, opportunity for promotion, fringe benefits, contingent rewards such as appreciation and recognition, organizational procedures, co-workers, the work itself, and organizational communication

The study reported here is an offshoot of a more comprehensive turnover intention study that I conducted in 2017 (Windon, 2017). In the comprehensive study, I examined extension program assistants' turnover intention through job satisfaction, satisfaction with supervisor, and organizational commitment. The job satisfaction was identified as a factor that affected employees' turnover intention. In the research reported here, I investigated eight domains of job satisfaction such as satisfaction with pay, opportunity for promotion, fringe benefits, contingent rewards such as appreciation and recognition, organizational procedures, co-workers, the work itself, and organizational communication that influence employees' overall job satisfaction.

The original instrument comprises 36 items addressing nine domains of job satisfaction. Each job satisfaction domain was measured by four items. In the study reported here, I collected data using 32 items from the original 36-item questionnaire. A satisfaction with supervisor domain was not included in this instrument. The job satisfaction domains and examples of items are presented in Table 1. I obtained permission from the original author to use the JSS in my research.

Table 1

Nine Domains of the JSS Questionnaire and Examples of the Items

Job satisfaction domain	Coefficient <i>alpha</i>	Item example
Satisfaction with pay	.75	"I feel I am being paid a fair amount for the work I do."
Satisfaction with promotional opportunity	.73	"There is really too little chance for promotion on my job."
Satisfaction with fringe benefits	.73	"I am not satisfied with the benefits I receive."
Satisfaction with contingent rewards (appreciation and recognition)	.76	"When I do a good job, I receive the recognition for it that I should receive."
Satisfaction with supervision*	.82	"My supervisor is unfair to me."

Table 1

Nine Domains of the JSS Questionnaire and Examples of the Items Continued...

Satisfaction with operating procedure	.62	“Many of our rules and procedures make doing a good job difficult.”
Satisfaction with co-workers	.60	“I find I have to work harder at my job than I should because of the incompetence of people I work with.”
Satisfaction with nature of work itself	.78	“I feel a sense of pride in doing my job.”
Satisfaction with communication	.71	“Communications seem good within this organization.”

*Note. Satisfaction with supervisor domain was omitted in this study because I intend to conduct future research measuring satisfaction with supervisor using a more robust scale and asking more questions.

I measured job satisfaction constructs using a 6-point Likert-type scale: 1 (*disagree very much*), 2 (*disagree moderately*), 3 (*disagree slightly*), 4 (*agree slightly*), 5 (*agree moderately*), and 6 (*agree very much*) (Spector, 1985, p. 708). In this study, the overall job satisfaction was computed as a mean score of eight domains of job satisfaction. The Cronbach’s alpha coefficient for overall job satisfaction in my study was .90. In my research, satisfaction with supervisor was omitted and viewed as a separate construct.

Data Collection

I collected data from participants using an online survey. I used a two pre-notification and five-contact emails survey approach (Dillman, Smyth, & Christian, 2014). Data collection took place from January 11, 2017 to January 27, 2017. Linder, Murphy, and Briers (2001) suggested comparing early and late respondents to assess non-response error. I used the independent samples *t*-test (alpha level of .05, two tailed) for equality of means on scale scores of constructs between the first early forty and the last forty responses. The *t*-test showed no statistically significant differences between early and late participant, Table 2.

Table 2

Independent Samples t-test for Equality of Means on Scale Scores of Constructs between Early and Late Respondents.

Scale	Respondents				<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
	Early		Late			
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>		
Job Satisfaction	3.74	0.62	3.90	0.67	-1.12	0.27

Data Analysis

I used the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 24 to analyze the data. I utilized descriptive statistics to answer question one. Applications of the Pearson product-moment, Spearman rank-order, and Phi and Cramer’s V correlation coefficients helped define relationships between overall job satisfaction and demographic variables, see Table 3.

Table 3

Different Type of Correlation Coefficient (Lomax and Hahs-Vaughn, 2012)

Variable Y	Variable X		
	Nominal	Ordinal	Interval/Ratio
Nominal	Phi (when both variables are dichotomous) or Cramer's V (when one or both variables have more than two categories)	Rank biserial or Cramer' V	Point biserial (Pearson in lieu of point biserial)
Ordinal	Rank biserial or Cramer' V	Spearman's rho or Kendall's tau	Spearman's rho or Kendall's tau or Pearson
Interval/ratio	Point biserial (Pearson in lieu of point biserial)	Spearman's rho or Kendall's tau or Pearson	Pearson

Multiple regression helped to explain the variation of each independent variable in job satisfaction. The dependent variable and independent variables were suitable for multiple regression analysis because four assumptions such as linearity, homoscedasticity of residuals, independence of residuals, and normality of residuals were met in the study. Also, a Pearson product-moment correlation was used to describe how well the dependent variable explained the set of predictor factors through the assessment of the magnitude of the linear relationship between dependent and independent variables. To describe the magnitude of the correlation between independent and dependent variables, standard Davis (1971) Conventions were used (see Table 4).

Table 4

Describing the Magnitude of Correlations Based on Davis' (1971) Conventions

Magnitude of correlation coefficient	Description
1.00	Perfect association
0.70 or higher	Very strong association
0.50 to 0.69	Substantial association
0.30 to 0.49	Moderate association
0.10 to 0.29	Low association
.01 to 0.09	Negligible association

Note. Adapted from Davis, J.A. (1971) "Elementary survey analysis" Englewood, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Demographic Data

The participants were full-time OSU Extension program assistants. From the population of 182 accessible program assistants contacted, 84% completed the questionnaire. The final data set included responses from 149 employees, after I removed responses with missing data ($N = 149$). The descriptive statistics for the demographic variables are presented in Table 5. To summarize, only frequency distribution for two continuous variables — age and years of service — were grouped. However, all additional analyses used both these variables as continuous data.

Table 5

Summary of Demographic Variables of OSU Extension Program Assistants

Items	<i>n</i>	%	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Age	140		43.10	14.13
Gender				
Female	130	87.4		
Male	17	11.6		
Education				
High school diploma	5	3.4		
Some college, no degree	21	14.3		
Associate degree	20	13.6		
Bachelor's degree	83	55.5		
Master's degree	18	12.2		
Marital status				
Single	41	27.9		
Married	94	63.9		
Divorced	6	4.1		
Widowed	3	2.1		
Domestic partner	3	2.0		
Children living at home under age 18				
Yes	48	32.7		
No	99	67.3		
Years of service to OSU	146		6.31	7.87
0–5	97	34.1		
6–10	14	10.1		
11–15	4	2.9		
16–20	10	7.2		
21–25	9	6.5		
26–30	3	2.2		
31–35	1	0.7		
Program area				
Agriculture and natural resources	8	5.4		
4-H youth development	28	18.9		
Family and consumer sciences	93	62.4		
Other	19	12.8		

Findings

Research objective #1. Describe the level of overall job satisfaction among extension program assistants. I asked participants to report their feelings and perceptions on eight sub-constructs of job satisfaction using a 6-point, Likert-type scale from 1 (*disagree very much*) to 6 (*agree very much*). The total job satisfaction scores were comprised of eight subscale scores that measured satisfaction with pay, promotions, fringe benefits, contingent rewards, operational procedures, co-workers, work, and communication (see Table 6).

Table 6

Descriptive Statistics of Job Satisfaction's Subscale Scores

Variable	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Satisfaction with co-workers	138	5.08	0.93
Satisfaction with work	146	5.03	0.85
Satisfaction with fringe benefits	122	4.71	0.84
Satisfaction with communication	135	4.10	0.98
Satisfaction with rewards	126	3.63	1.15
Satisfaction with operational procedure	137	3.54	0.84
Satisfaction with pay	137	2.44	1.15
Satisfaction with promotion	119	2.37	1.03
Overall satisfaction with job	149	3.90	0.66

Note. Participants rated perceptions of their job satisfaction domains using a 6-point, Likert-type scale from 1 (*disagree very much*) to 6 (*agree very much*).

Research objective #2. Determine the relationship between overall job satisfaction and demographic variables such as age, years of service, gender, children living at home under 18, education, program areas, and marital status. To determine association between overall job satisfaction and demographic variables I used different correlation coefficients based on the variables' level of measurement. The application of the Pearson product-moment association coefficient was used to measure association between overall job satisfaction and demographic continuous variables such as age and years of services variables. The association analysis showed no significant association between overall job satisfaction and age ($r = .061, n = 140, p = .473$), years of service ($r = -.033, n = 146, p = .694$). The application of Spearman rank-order association coefficient was used to measure association between overall job satisfaction and demographic variables with ordinal scales employees' educational level, marital status, and their extension program areas. The association analysis showed no significant association between overall job satisfaction and education level ($r_s = .051, n = 147, p = .537$), program areas ($r_s = .127, n = 148, p = .123$), and marital status ($r_s = .056, n = 147, p = .499$). Phi and Cramer's V association coefficients application was used to measure association between job satisfaction and dichotomous variables such as gender and children living at home under 18. The association analysis showed no significant association between overall job satisfaction and gender ($r_\phi = .040, n = 147, p = .561$), and children living at home under 18 ($r_\phi = -.027, n = 146, p = .690$).

Research Objective #3. Explain the relationship between overall job satisfaction and the independent variables of satisfaction with pay, opportunity for promotion, fringe benefits, contingent rewards such as appreciation and recognition, organizational procedures, co-workers, the work itself, and organizational communication. Application of the Pearson correlation coefficient showed degree of variability of overall job satisfaction and selected job satisfaction domains. A very strong positive association relationship between overall job satisfaction and satisfaction with rewards (.83) and communication (.76). A substantial positive association was found between job satisfaction and satisfaction with co-workers (.63), pay (.63), the work itself (.59), operational procedures (.59), and promotions (.57). A moderate positive association was found between job satisfaction and satisfaction with fringe benefits (.39). Intercorrelation among the overall satisfaction with job and satisfaction domains indicated that collinearity was not a problem in the regression model, Table 7. The effect size of correlation interpretation varied from moderate to very strong.

Table 7

Intercorrelations Among Overall Satisfaction with Job and Job Satisfaction Domains

	JS_AVE	X 1	X 2	X 3	X 4	X 5	X 6	X 7	X 8
JS_AVE	1.000								
X 1	.633**	1.000							
X 2	.611**	.432**	1.000						
X 3	.397**	.331**	.064	1.000					
X 4	.837**	.473**	.508**	.184*	1.000				
X 5	.596**	.209*	.304**	.114	.436**	1.000			
X 6	.634**	.201*	.192*	.205*	.448**	.277**	1.000		
X 7	.594**	.135	.232*	.232*	.449**	.244*	.466**	1.000	
X 8	.764**	.285**	.378**	.205*	.665**	.491**	.540**	.383**	1.000

Note: JS_AVE = Overall satisfaction with job, X 1 = pay, X 2 = promotion, X 3 = fringe benefits, X 4 = rewards, X 5 = operational procedures, X 6 = co-workers, X 7 = work itself, X 8 = communication. * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$

A multiple linear regression analysis was conducted to determine the relationship between overall job satisfaction (dependent variable) and independent variables such as satisfaction with pay, promotions, fringe benefits, rewards, organizational procedures, co-workers, the work itself, and communication. The results indicated that a significant proportion of the total variation in overall job satisfaction was predicted by satisfaction with pay, promotions, fringe benefits, rewards, organizational procedures, co-workers, the work itself, and communication, $F(8, 135) = 1484.7, p < .001$. Multiple R^2 indicates that approximately 98.8% of the variation in overall job satisfaction can be explained by program assistants' satisfaction with pay, promotions, fringe benefits, rewards, organizational procedures, co-workers, the work itself, and communication, see Tables 8. Analysis of variance in overall job satisfaction presented in Table 9. Multiple relations coefficient presented in Table 10. Cohen's f^2 is a measure of effect size used for a multiple regression. Cohen's f^2 for this study is 89.9 that characterizes a large effect size (Cohen, 1988).

Table 8

Multiple Regression Analysis Between Overall Job Satisfaction and Selected Job Satisfaction Domains

Model Fit	Change Statistics								
	R	R ²	Adj. R	SE	R ²	F	df1	df2	p
1	.994	.989	.988	.07349	.989	1484.734	8	135	.000

Note: Dependent variable: job satisfaction Predictors: pay, promotion, fringe benefits, rewards, operational procedures, co-workers, work itself, communication.

Table 9

Analysis of Variance in Overall Job Satisfaction

Model	Sum of Squared	df	Mean Square	F	p
Regression	64.152	8	8.019	1484.734	.000
Residual	.729	135	.005		
Total	64.881	143			

Note: Dependent variable: job satisfaction. Predictors: pay, promotion, fringe benefits, rewards, operational procedures, co-workers, work itself, communication.

Table 10

Multiple Relations Coefficients

Model	B	SER	β	p-value
Constant	-.045	.049		.355
Satisfaction with pay	.143	.006	.255	< .001
Satisfaction with promotion	.105	.007	.167	< .001
Satisfaction with fringe benefits	.086	.007	.118	< .001
Satisfaction with rewards	.138	.008	.242	< .001
Satisfaction with operational procedure	.140	.008	.189	< .001
Satisfaction with co-workers	.133	.008	.181	< .001
Satisfaction with work itself	.144	.009	.184	< .001
Satisfaction with communication	.126	.010	.182	< .001

Discussion

The available information on OSU Extension program assistants' job satisfaction is insufficient, and this study attempted to investigate the underlying factors of job satisfaction and their relationship with demographic characteristics among this category of extension employees. I used an online questionnaire to assess OSU Extension program assistants' job satisfaction and its work-related domains. There were no significant relationships between employees' demographic characteristics and their overall job satisfaction. The results of the study reported here support McCaslin and Mwangi's (1994) research on extension agents' job satisfaction. The authors concluded that agents' demographic characteristics such as gender, age, marital status, formal education, and years of service do not contribute to their level of job satisfaction.

The results of this study confirm the findings of previous extension studies, which indicate that extension professionals have a slightly higher level of satisfaction with the work itself, co-workers, fringe benefits, and communication and less satisfied with their pay and promotion (Harder, Gouldthorpe, & Goodwin, 2015; Hodous, Young, Borr, & Vetter, 2014; Rigg & Beus, 1993; Rousan & Handerson, 1996). Extension program assistants' satisfaction with pay and promotion are an area for further research.

It is essential that extension talent development practitioners utilize the survey results, which presented in this paper to determine the most and least job satisfying factors. It will help to offer a professional development program designed to increase employees' job satisfaction through addressing

work-related domains discussed in this study. In this research, the work-related factors such as pay, promotions, fringe benefits, rewards, organizational procedures, co-workers, the work itself, and communication explain 98% of the variability in overall job satisfaction. Also, it is important to communicate within the extension organization and to the public that many extension program assistants report that they are satisfied with extension work itself, communication, co-workers, and fringe benefits.

Organization leaders and human resource development professionals should review how the pay and promotion could be managed to increase satisfaction levels of organization employees. The results of this study support Herzberg's theory. Less satisfaction with regard to pay and promotion affected employees' job dissatisfaction. Herzberg (1968) wrote that administrators must make sure that employees' salaries are sufficient; otherwise, employees may think to leave the organization. Lindner (1998) analyzed three theories Herzberg's hygiene theory, Adams' equity theory, and Vroom's theory and concluded that employee pay one of the critical factors. He suggested to increase pay by adding higher-level responsibilities to a job and also providing monetary compensation to employees for accepting this responsibility (Lindner, 1998). It is also important to think about promotion opportunities for extension program assistants. For example, extension program assistants who have a bachelor's degree, relevant work experience, and exceed work expectations should have an opportunity to be promoted to the ranks of a program coordinator, program manager, program director, and extension 1 (rank 1 is a lowest rank at OSU Extension system that determined by years of experience and education level; extension educator 1 requires a Bachelor's Degree). It is essential that leaders in the workplace monitor employees' feelings and perceptions as they relate to their job satisfaction and job dissatisfactions. The scales of pay and promotion reveal a need to investigate what changes and actions would enhance employees' job satisfaction levels. The organization leadership team should explore ways to enhance the scales affecting employees pay and promotions. Compensation solutions to consider include implementing merit adjustments. Administrators should consider addressing issues of lower job satisfaction domains, explore all possible alternative ways to enhance employees' job satisfaction.

References

- Amabile, T. M. (1993). Motivational synergy: Toward new conceptualizations of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation in the workplace. *Human resource management review*, 3(3), 185-201. doi:10.1016/1053-4822(93)90012-S
- Bowen, B. E. (1980). *Job satisfaction of teacher educators in agriculture* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Ohio State University, Columbus, OH.
- Bowen, B. E., & Radhakrishna, R. B. (1991). Job satisfaction of agricultural education faculty: A constant phenomena. *Journal of Agricultural Education*, 32(2), 16-22. doi:10.5032/jae.1991.02016
- Bowen, C. F., Radhakrishna, R., & Keyser, R. (1994). Job satisfaction and commitment of 4-H agents. *Journal of Extension*, 32(1), 1-22. Retrieved from <https://www.joe.org/joe/1994june/rb2.php>
- Burke, R. J. (1987). Burnout in police work. An examination of the Cherniss model. *Group & Organization Management*, 12(2), 174-188. doi:10.1177/027105960118701200205
- Cano, J., & Miller, G. (1992). A gender analysis of job satisfaction, job satisfier factors, and job dissatisfier factors of agricultural education teachers. *Journal of Agricultural Education*, 33(3), 40-46. doi:10.5032/jae.1992.03040

- Castillo, J. X. (1999). *The level of job satisfaction among agricultural teacher educators* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Ohio State University, Columbus, OH.
- Clark, A. E. (1997). Job satisfaction and gender: why are women so happy at work? *Labour economics*, 4(4), 341-372 doi.org/10.1016/S0927-5371(97)00010-9
- Cranny, C. J., Smith, P. C., & Stone, E. F. (1992). *Job satisfaction: How people feel about their jobs and how it affects their performance*. New York, NY: Lexington Books.
- Davis, J.A. (1971) "*Elementary survey analysis*" Englewood, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Dillman, D. A., Smyth, J. D., & Christian, L. M. (2014). *Internet, phone, mail, and mixed-mode surveys: The tailored design method*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.
- Foor, R. M., & Cano, J. (2011). Predictors of Job Satisfaction Among Selected Agriculture Faculty. *Journal of Agricultural Education*, 52(1), 30-39. doi:10.5032/jae.2011.01030
- Ford, M. E. (1992). *Motivating humans: Goals, emotions, and personal agency beliefs*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Hahs-Vaughn, D. L., & Lomax, R. G. (2013). *An introduction to statistical concepts*. Routledge. New-York, NY
- Harder, A., Gouldthorpe, J., & Goodwin, J. (2015). Exploring organizational factors related to Extension employee burnout. *Journal of Extension*, 53(2). Retrieved from <https://www.joe.org/joe/2015april/a2.php>
- Herzberg, F., Mausner, B. & Snyderman, B. (1959). *The motivation to work*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Herzberg, F., Snyderman, B. B., & Mausner, B. (1966). *The motivation to work*. New York: The World Publishing Company
- Hodous, B., Young R.B., Borr, M.L., & Vetter, R. (2014). Job satisfaction in the North Dakota State University Extension Service. *Journal of Extension*, 52(5). Retrieved from <https://www.joe.org/joe/2014october/rb3.php>
- Howard, J. L. & Frick, D. D. (1996). The effects of organizational restructure on employee satisfaction, *Group and Organization Management*, 21, pp. 278-285. doi:10.1177/0271059601196213003
- Kitchel, T., Smith, A. R., Henry, A. L., Robinson, J. S., Lawver, R. G., Park, T. D., & Schell, A. (2012). Teacher Job Satisfaction and Burnout Viewed through Social Comparisons. *Journal of Agricultural Education*, 53(1), 31-44. <http://doi:10.5032/jae.2012.01031>.
- Lindner, J. R. (1998). Understanding employee motivation. *Journal of Extension*, 36(3), 1-8. Retrieved from <https://www.joe.org/joe/1998june/rb3.php/nR:/journal-current-issue.php>
- Lindner, J. R., Murphy, T. H., & Briers, G. E. (2001). Handling nonresponse in social science research. *Journal of Agricultural Education*, 42(4), 43-53. doi:10.5032/jae.2001.04043

- Locke, E. A. (1969). What is job satisfaction? *Organizational Behavior and Human performance*, 4(4), 309-336. doi.org/10.1016/0030-5073(69)90013-0
- Locke, E. A. (1976). The nature and causes of job satisfaction. *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 1, 1297-1343. Chicago: RandMc Nally.
- Long, J. L., & Swortzel, K. A. (2007). Factors influencing job satisfaction of extension agents in the Mississippi State University Extension Service. *Proceedings of the 2007 American Association for Agricultural Education Research Conference*, 34, 41-53. Retrieved from http://aaeonline.org/allconferences1.php?show_what=National&sorter_conf=National&sorter_year=2007
- Mallilo, A. (1990). Extension staff satisfaction. *Journal of Extension*, 28(2), 37. Retrieved from <https://www.joe.org/joe/1990summer/rb5.php>
- McCaslin, V. L., & Mwangi, J. (1994). Job satisfaction of Kenya's rift valley extension agents. *Journal of Extension*, 32(3), 1-13. Retrieved from https://www.joe.org/joe/1994october/rb1.php/site_urlindex.php
- Mettle M. A. K. (2001). Education, job satisfaction and gender in Kuwait. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 12(2), 311-332. doi.org/10.1080/09585190122366
- Pearson, C. A. L. (1991). An assessment of extrinsic feedback on participation, role perceptions, motivation, and job satisfaction in a self-managed system for monitoring group achievement. *Human Relations*, 44(5), 517-537. <https://doi.org/10.1177/001872679104400506>
- Porter, L. W., & Steers, R. M. (1973). Organizational, work, and personal factors in employee turnover and absenteeism. *Psychological Bulletin*, 80(2), 151-176. doi:10.1037/h0034829
- Rast, S., & Tourani, A. (2012). Evaluation of employees' job satisfaction and role of gender difference: An empirical study at airline industry in Iran. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 3(7), 91-100.
- Riggs, K., & Beus, K. M. (1993). Job satisfaction in Extension. *Journal of Extension*, 31(2), 22-26, Retrieved from: <http://www.joe.org/joe/1993summer/a5.php/>
- Ritz, R., Burris, S., Brashears, T., & Frazee, S. (2013). The effects of a time management professional development seminar on stress and job satisfaction of beginning agriscience teachers in West Texas. *Journal of Agricultural Education*, 54(3), 1-14. doi:10.5032/jae.2013.03001
- Rousan, L. M., & Henderson, J. L. (1996). Agent turnover in Ohio State University Extension. *Journal of Agricultural Education*, 37, 56-62. doi:10.5032/jae.1996.02056
- Schmiesing, R. J. (2002). *Factors related to Ohio State University extension agents' perceptions of organizational justice and job satisfaction* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Ohio State University, Columbus, OH.

- Smith, P. C., Kendall, L. M., & Hulin, C. L. (1969). *The measurement of satisfaction in work and retirement: A strategy for the study of attitudes*. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Sorensen, T. J., & McKim, A. J. (2014). Perceived Work-Life Balance Ability, Job Satisfaction, and Professional Commitment among Agriculture Teachers. *Journal of Agricultural Education*, 55(4), 116-132. doi:10.5032/jae.2014.04116
- Spector, P.E. (1985). Measurement of human service staff satisfaction: Development of the job satisfaction survey. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 13(6), 693–713. doi/10.1007/BF00929796/pdf
- Steers, R. M., & Porter, L. W. (1991). *Motivation and work behavior*. New York, NY: McGrawHill.
- Strong, R., & Harder, A. (2009). Implications of maintenance and motivation factors on Extension agent turnover. *Journal of Extension*, 47(1). Retrieved from <https://www.joe.org/joe/2009february/a2.php>
- Turayev, O. T. (2007). *Job satisfaction of secondary agricultural education teachers in North Dakota* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). North Dakota State University, Fargo, ND
- Van Tilburg, E. L., & Miller, L. E. (1987). *Predictors of Ohio Cooperative Extension Service county agents' intentions to leave the job*. (Summary of Research No 47). Retrieved from <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED287004>
- Vlosky, R. P., & Aguilar, F. X. (2009). A model of employee satisfaction: Gender differences in cooperative extension. *Journal of Extension*, 47(2), 1-15. Retrieved from <https://www.joe.org/joe/2009april/a2.php>
- Walker, W. D., Garton, B. L., & Kitchel, T. J. (2004). Job satisfaction and retention of secondary agriculture teachers. *Journal of Agricultural Education*, 45(2), 28–38. doi: 10.5032/jae.2004.02028
- Wesolowski, M. A., & Mossholder, K. W. (1997). Relational demography in supervisor–subordinate dyads: Impact on subordinate job satisfaction, burnout, and perceived procedural justice. *Journal of Organizational Behavior: The International Journal of Industrial, Occupational and Organizational Psychology and Behavior*, 18(4), 351-362. doi: 10.1002/(SICI)1099-1379(199707)18:4%3C351::AID-JOB802%3E3.0.CO;2-%23
- Weiss, D. J., Dawis, R. V., England, G. W., & Lofquist, L. H. (1967). Manual for the Minnesota. *Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire. Minnesota studies in vocational rehabilitation, No. XXII*. Minneapolis: Industrial Relations Center, University of Minnesota.
- Windon, S.R. (2017). *Examining Ohio State University Extension program assistants' turnover intention through job satisfaction, satisfaction with supervisor, and organizational commitment*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Ohio State University, Columbus, OH.