The Relationship between Satisfaction with Supervisor and Demographic Variables among Extension Program Assistants

Suzanna R. Windon
Pennsylvania State University, sxk75@psu.edu

The Relationship between Satisfaction with Supervisor and Demographic Variables among Extension Program Assistants

Suzanna R. Windon

The Pennsylvania State University

The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship between satisfaction with supervisor and demographic variables among Ohio State University Extension program assistants. Participants were 149 Extension program assistants who completed the Satisfaction with My Supervisor survey (Scarpello & Vandenberg, 1987) and a demographics survey. Results, based on a five-point Likert scale, showed that participants rated themselves as slightly satisfied with their supervisors (M = 3.88, SD = .94). Participants reported their highest satisfaction with the way their supervisors listen to them, support them in dealing with other managers, and their fairness in appraising job performance. Overall, respondents were dissatisfied with the way their supervisors inform them about work changes, show concern for their career progress, and the frequency with which they were recognized for doing a good job. Satisfaction with supervisor was not related to level of education, marital status, having children under 18 living at home, program area, years of service, gender, or age. Findings suggest that the Ohio State University Extension organization should assess program assistants' satisfaction with their supervisors and offer leadership professional development for the middle-level managers who serve in supervisory roles.

Keywords: Extension, Extension program assistants, Extension organization, satisfaction with supervisor, leadership

Introduction

In the 1970s, Cooperative Extension organizations dramatically increased recruitment of paraprofessionals, with resulting significant benefit to the Extension system (Boyce, 1970; Parsons & Kiesow, 1975). These paraprofessionals are generally called Extension program assistants. Program assistants are usually full- or part-time adults hired to work under the supervision of professionals, often Extension educators (Parsons & Kiesow, 1975). An Extension educator is a university Extension employee who develops and delivers educational programs in different program areas, for example, agriculture and natural resources, 4-H youth development, community development, or family and consumer science, to help improve in rural and urban areas. Extension program assistants are employed by Ohio State University (OSU) Extension to help Extension educators. Extension program assistants are responsible for recruiting individuals for an educational program. They use standardized curriculum materials to

provide informal teaching and standardized evaluation instruments to assess program participants' knowledge, attitudes, and behavior. OSU Extension has 367 full-time Extension educators and program assistants, with almost 50% classified as program assistants.

Previous studies in the Extension field found that satisfaction with supervisor is a key indicator of employee job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and turnover intention (Carter, Pounder, Lawrence, & Wozniak, 1990; Mowday, Koberg, & McArthur, 1984; Strong & Harder, 2009). Almost all studies of Extension employees' satisfaction with work investigated Extension educators as a subject of study; however, no research examines satisfaction with supervisor among Extension program assistants. This study aimed to rectify the oversight in the literature by examining the extent to which OSU Extension program assistants are satisfied with their supervisors and determining if specific demographics of Extension program assistants, such as level of education, children under 18 living at home, program area, years of services, gender, and age, are related to satisfaction with supervisor.

Literature Review

Research in organizational science has demonstrated the importance of the supervisor's role in determining employee attitudes. The supervisor can play an important role in the well-being of an employee because quality of supervision influences the employee's satisfaction with work (Adebayo & Ogunsina, 2011; Katz, 1978). Previous studies found that factors such as informal and formal feedback, job security, degree of ambiguity, work conflicts, satisfaction with work, and turnover intention all relate to satisfaction with supervisor (Adebayo & Ogunsina, 2011; DeConinck & Stilwell, 2004; Hampton, Dubinsky, & Skinner, 1986; Katz, 1978; Scarpello & Vandenberg, 1987; Wheeless, Wheeless, & Howard, 1984). Previous research has also found that supervisor work ethic was positively related to job and supervisor satisfaction (Vitell & Davis, 1990) and was related to employees' intent to leave the firm (Hampton et al., 1986). DeConinck and Stilwell (2004) found that satisfaction with supervisor has a direct effect on employees' withdrawal from full commitment to their work. They suggested that "employees may still have lower organizational commitment because of dissatisfaction with the supervisor, even though the level of pay or the fairness in which it is distributed (distributive justice) is considered acceptable" (p. 230). Wheeless et al. (1984) conducted research on 158 employees who were classified as nonprofessionals, in three administrative units of an eastern university. They investigated the relationship between job satisfaction and employees' satisfaction with their communication with their supervisor. The results of their study suggested that satisfaction with this communication was highly correlated with job satisfaction. When the supervisor was receptive to employee ideas and demonstrated empathy, these factors led to increases in job satisfaction. Thus, effective communication with the supervisor and perceiving the supervisor as being empathic contributed to employee job satisfaction (Wheeless et al., 1984).

Employees' demographic characteristics, such as age, gender, marital status, tenure, and education, have long been studied in connection with a workplace (Wesolowski & Mossholder, 1997). The authors suggest that organizations should get a better understanding of processes related to employees' demographic differences in the workplace. Campione (2014) examined intergenerational dyad relationships between supervisors and subordinates and emphasized that differences in work expectations, communications, and use of technology existed across generations and affected employees' satisfaction with work and supervisors. Organizations should focus on intergenerational communication that can positively affect retention strategy (Campione, 2014). McCaslin and Mwangi (1994) concluded that Extension agents' demographic characteristics do not contribute to their level of overall job satisfaction. Sorensen and McKim (2014) found very little effect of demographic variables on agricultural teachers in Oregon. Benge and Harder (2017) studied dyadic relationships between County Extension directors and Extension agents in Florida, finding that the relationships between employees and supervisors influenced the employees' satisfaction with work and work productivity.

Theoretical Framework

Previous research has confirmed the relationship between employees' satisfaction with their supervisors and leaders' behavior (Phillips, Douthitt, & Hyland, 2001; Yousef, 2000). Phillips et al. (2001) found that leader behavior was a factor in explaining employee satisfaction with the leader. Leadership studies consistently yield evidence that, when supervisors show concern for others and encourage employees to do well in task performance, it leads to satisfaction with supervisor. Such evidence supports contemporary theories of situational and transformational leadership. According to situational leadership theory, task-oriented and relation-oriented leadership behavior promote employees' satisfaction with their leaders, resulting in a transparent work environment in the organization (Hersey & Blanchard, 1979). For example, in an employee training study, supervisors who received training demonstrated task-oriented and relation-oriented leadership behaviors. These behaviors were positively related to good communication and social support between supervisor and employee, decreased uncertainty between supervisor and employee, and increased employee satisfaction with their supervisor (van der Wal, Schonrock-Adema, Schripsema, Jaarsma, & Cohen-Schotanus, 2016).

Transformational leadership style combines human behavior and ethical aspirations of the leader while creating a transformational effect on both (Burns, 1978). Transformational leadership theory is based on constructs such as true trust, acknowledgment, and encouragement on all levels of the supervisor-employee relationship, which affect the level of employees' satisfaction with supervisor (Mujkic, Sehic, Rahimic, & Jusic, 2014). Leaders who practice transformational style inspire their employees to create new paths of behavior through the process of problem-solving. Previous research found a positive relationship between transformational leadership and the behavior of the follower (Fuller, Patterson, Hester, & Stringer, 1996; Judge & Piccolo, 2004). Bycio, Hackett, and Allen (1995) found a positive correlation between the transformational

leadership style and employee satisfaction. The authors indicated that transformational leadership is the strongest factor in employee satisfaction. Many transformational leadership studies confirmed positive correlations between leaders' behavior and employees' satisfaction with their leaders (Judge & Piccolo, 2004; Laohavichien, Fredendall, & Cantrell, 2009; Podsakoff, MacKenzie, & Bommer, 1996). Transformational leaders tend to have more satisfied followers because they motivate and empower their employees. They also pay attention to employees' needs and development. Moreover, transformational leaders help followers grow their potential by providing constructive feedback (Bass & Riggio, 2006; Northhouse, 2020).

Podsakoff et al. (1996) suggested that leaders need to have a better understanding of how to influence subordinates' attitudes, role perceptions, and performance to increase employees' satisfaction with their leaders. Scarpello and Vandenberg (1992) indicated that employees' opinion about their work impacts the level of their satisfaction with work itself and organizational effectiveness. Summarizing, organizational leaders should be capable of changing employees' opinions toward positive work behavior through building trust, providing positive feedback and support, and empowering subordinates. Balabola (2016) suggested that organizational leaders should increase their leadership capacity when working with subordinates through investment in leadership training and development.

Satisfaction with Supervisor

Over the last fifty years, organizational psychologists have developed several instruments to measure satisfaction with supervisor. The research literature indicates that three major surveys have been used extensively to measure employee job satisfaction: 1) Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (Weiss, Dawis, England, & Lofquist, 1967), 2) Spector's (1985) Job Satisfaction Survey, and 3) The Job Descriptive Index (Smith, Kendall, & Hulin, 1969). The Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire includes items that measure 20 dimensions of employee satisfaction with job environment. Eight of these items measure a supervisor's technical and human relations skills (Weiss et al., 1967). Spector's (1985) Job Satisfaction Survey measures job satisfaction in relation to nine dimensions. Four items of this survey measure satisfaction with supervisor. The Job Descriptive Index was developed based on the main assumption that a "satisfied worker is a productive worker" (Smith et al., 1969, p. 272). The instrument includes judgment scales for trait-like dimensions, using adjectives such as "stubborn," "lazy," and "bad." Most of the previous research utilizing the instruments mentioned above was limited in terms of measuring supervisor behaviors and employee satisfaction with these behaviors. To focus more on the relationship between satisfaction with supervisor and employee behavior, Scarpello and Vandenberg (1987) viewed satisfaction with supervisor as a possible source of employee attitude toward supervisor's behavior. The authors noted, "If subordinate satisfaction with immediate supervision has important implications for organizational effectiveness, there is a need for a valid and diagnostic instrument capable of measuring a large portion of the content domain of the satisfaction with the supervisor construct" (p. 449).

In 1965, Mann viewed supervision as the ability to reconcile and coordinate the employee's goals and needs with the requirements of the organization (Scarpello & Vandenberg, 1987). Mann's (1965) three interrelated types of supervisory skills: (1) technical, (2) human relations, and (3) administrative served as a conceptual foundation for the 18-item Scarpello and Vandenberg Satisfaction with My Supervisor Scale (SWMSS). However, Scarpello and Vandenberg (1987) did not divide their instrument into three scales; they wrote:

> We used Mann's categorization as the criteria against which to judge the consistency of the scale's items to the definition of supervision and thus to ensure that the SWMSS covers a number of aspects of the supervisory role in a parsimonious way. (p. 450)

Scarpello and Vandenberg's (1987) factor analysis revealed that the 18 items loaded into two factors. As a result, the authors viewed the SWMSS instrument as measuring the one global construct of satisfaction with supervisor (Scarpello & Vandenberg, 1987). Moreover, Scarpello and Vandenberg's (1987) approach was anchored in a concept of employees' opinions toward leader's behavior, demonstration of concern for others, task orientation, and relations orientation. Scarpello and Vandenberg's (1987) 18-item SWMSS instrument is focused specifically to "assess subordinate satisfaction with supervision," rather than with work environment (p. 462).

According to Scarpello and Vandenberg (1987), satisfaction with supervisor indicates the degree of satisfaction with the immediate supervisor and differs from being satisfied with the work environment and the work itself. Moreover, the authors emphasized that "currently available job satisfaction questionnaires are inadequate for measuring the satisfaction with the supervisor construct . . . they intended to assess satisfaction with multiple job facets, only one of which is supervision" (p. 448).

Purpose and Research Objectives

The purpose of this study was to investigate factors that affect satisfaction with supervisor among OSU Extension program assistants. Two research objectives guided this study:

1) Describe program assistants' perceptions in terms of satisfaction with their supervisors.
2) Determine whether program assistants' satisfaction with supervisor differed based on demographic characteristics that included educational level, gender, marital status, having children at home under 18 years old, years of services, program areas, and age.

Method

Participants

The target population for this study was OSU Extension program assistants. The research was approved by the university's Behavioral and Social Sciences Review Board. The Office of Human Resources provided Extension program assistants' email addresses. The researcher invited 182 Extension program assistants with full-time appointments as of October 21st, 2016, to participate in the study. OSU Extension program assistants represent Extension employees in the job classification "Program Assistant," and they work in either a county or a state Extension office. The overall response rate was 84% ($N = 153$). After removing responses with missing data, the final data set included responses from 149 employees. Most participants were female (87.4%) with an average age of 43 years ($SD = 14.13$), married (63%), with a bachelor's degree (55.5%), and had worked at the Extension for approximately six years ($SD = 7.87$). More than 30% of respondents had children under 18 who lived at home. Respondents were not equally distributed across program areas. Agriculture and natural resources accounted for 5.4%, 4-H youth development for 18.9%, and family and consumer sciences for 62.4%. There were no respondents from the community development program area. Approximately 13% of respondents were not affiliated with any program areas. A majority of this last group of employees were program assistants who worked on the state level.

Measures

Satisfaction with supervisor was measured using Scarpello and Vandenberg's (1987) SWMSS instrument because of its potential to link supervisor behavior and actions with employee satisfaction. Scarpello and Vandenberg (1987) reported an internal consistency coefficient of .95. All 18 items of the original instrument were used in this study to assess Extension program assistants' satisfaction with supervisor. Instrument items included: "The way my supervisor listens when I have something important to say," "The way my supervisor sets clear work goals," and "The way my supervisor treats me when I make a mistake." Table 1 displays all 18 items. Responses to each item were collected using a five-point Likert scale: 1 = *very dissatisfied*, 2 = *dissatisfied*, 3 = *neither satisfied nor dissatisfied*, 4 = *satisfied*, and 5 = *very satisfied*. The Cronbach's alpha for the SWMSS instrument in this study was .963. The reliability coefficient describes the internal consistency reliability of a set of items.

Table 1. Reliability Statistics of the SWMSS Instrument

Items	Cronbach's Alpha
The way my supervisor listens when I have something important to say	.959
The way my supervisor sets clear work goals	.960
The way my supervisor treats me when I make a mistake	.959
My supervisor's fairness in appraising my job performance	.960
The way my supervisor is consistent in his or her behavior toward subordinates	.961

Items	Cronbach's Alpha
The way my supervisor helps me to get the job done	.959
The way my supervisor gives me credit for my ideas	.960
The way my supervisor gives me clear instruction	.959
The way my supervisor informs me about work changes ahead of time	.959
The way my supervisor follows through to get problems solved	.959
The way my supervisor understands the problems I might run into doing the job	.960
The way my supervisor shows concern for my career progress	.961
My supervisor's backing me up with other management	.961
The frequency with which I get a pat on the back for doing a good job	.961
The technical competence of my supervisors	.960
The amount of time I get to learn a task before I'm moved to another task	.963
The time I have to do the job right	.963
The way my job responsibilities are clearly defined	.961

Procedure

An online survey was used to collect the data using a tailored design method (Dillman, Smyth, & Christian, 2014). A Qualtrics® platform helped to facilitate the distribution of the welcome message, questionnaire, and four follow-up emails. Data were collected from January 11, 2017, to January 27, 2017. Program assistants self-administered the online questionnaire. Participants' answers were grouped and used as aggregated data for further statistical analysis. To motivate employees to participate in the survey, a chance to win one of eight $25 Visa prepaid cards was offered to responding Extension program assistants. Study participants were informed about the incentive and their eligibility for the drawing in the pre-notification, invitation, and follow-up emails. The electronic platform randomly identified eight email addresses. After the data collection procedure was officially finished, the randomly identified participants received their prepaid Visa card by mail.

Data Analysis

The SPSS® v.24 (2016) software was used for statistical analysis. Independent variables and the dependent variable, satisfaction with supervisor, were treated as interval data. A descriptive statistic was utilized to describe the first research objective. A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to determine the existence of statistically significant differences in the means between satisfaction with supervisor and the demographic variables: level of education, children under 18 living at home, program area, years of service, gender, and age. Miller and Smith (1983) suggest comparing early and late respondents to assess nonresponse error, and this analysis was performed for the response data in this study. The first forty respondents were assigned as an early phase respondent group, and the last forty respondents were identified as a late phase respondent group. The early and late phases of responders were determined based on the day and time their questionnaire was submitted. An independent t-test was conducted to

determine if group means for total scores on the measured construct differed for the two groups of respondents (early and late). Results showed no statistically significant difference between early and late respondents on the measures of employee satisfaction with supervisor (Table 2).

Table 2. Independent Samples t-test for Equality of Means on Satisfaction with Supervisor Scale Scores between Early and Late Respondents

	Respondents					
	Early		Late			
Scale	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*t*	*p*
Satisfaction with Supervisor	3.65	0.99	3.86	1.03	-0.94	0.35

Results

The first research objective was to describe program assistants' feelings and perceptions of satisfaction with supervisors. The results for this objective are shown in Table 3.

Table 3. Mean and Standard Deviation of Program Assistants' Satisfaction with Supervisors

Variables	*f*	M	SD
The way my supervisor listens when I have something important to say	146	4.10	1.094
The way my supervisor sets clear work goals	145	3.86	1.074
The way my supervisor treats me when I make a mistake	146	4.07	1.074
My supervisor's fairness in appraising my job performance	141	3.99	1.171
The way my supervisor is consistent in his or her behavior toward subordinates	138	3.92	1.238
The way my supervisor helps me to get the job done	145	3.90	1.151
The way my supervisor gives me credit for my ideas	143	4.02	1.031
The way my supervisor gives me clear instruction	146	3.78	1.177
The way my supervisor informs me about work changes ahead of time	145	3.75	1.267
The way my supervisor follows through to get problems solved	147	3.87	1.124
The way my supervisor understands the problems I might run into doing the job	146	3.88	1.166
The way my supervisor shows concern for my career progress	138	3.64	1.232
My supervisor's backing me up with other management	127	4.02	1.094
The frequency with which I get a pat on the back for doing a good job	144	3.64	1.232
The technical competence of my supervisors	144	4.03	1.060
The amount of time I get to learn a task before I'm moved to another task	133	3.91	1.003
The time I have to do the job right	146	3.94	.984
The way my job responsibilities are clearly defined	147	3.71	1.080

Higher scores indicate greater satisfaction with supervisor. The mean summative score for satisfaction with supervisor was 3.88 ($SD = .94$, $n = 149$). The distribution of the satisfaction with supervisor scores had a high negative skew (-1.01), showing a long-left tail toward lower

values. The survey items scoring the highest mean values were (a) The way my supervisor listens when I have something important to say ($M = 4.10$; $SD = 1.09$), (b) The way my supervisor treats me when I make a mistake ($M = 4.07$; $SD = 1.07$), and (c) The technical competence of my supervisor ($M = 4.03$; $SD = 1.06$).

Program assistants were very satisfied with (a) The way my supervisor listens when I have something important to say (47.3%), (b) My supervisor's backing me up with other management (42.5%), (c) My supervisor's fairness in appraising my job performance (41.8%), (d) The way my supervisor is consistent in his/her behavior toward subordinates (41.3%), and (e) The technical competence of my supervisor (41.0%). Survey items having the lowest mean values were (a) The way my supervisor shows concern for my career progress ($M = 3.64$; $SD = 1.23$), (b) The frequency with which I get a pat on the back for doing a good job ($M = 3.64$; $SD = 1.23$), and (c) The way my job responsibilities are clearly defined ($M = 3.71$; $SD = 1.08$). Program assistants were very dissatisfied and dissatisfied with (a) The way my supervisor informs me about work changes ahead of time (22.9%), (b) The way my supervisor shows concern for my career progress (19.6%), (c) The frequency with which I get a pat on the back for doing a good job (18.1%), (d) The way my supervisor is consistent in his/her behavior toward subordinates (16.6%), and (e) My supervisor's fairness in appraising my job performance (15.6%).

The second research objective was to determine whether program assistants' satisfaction with supervisor differed based on demographic variables of educational level, gender, marital status, children at home under 18 years old, years of services, program areas, and age. A one-way ANOVA was conducted to determine are there significant differences in means of program assistants' satisfaction with supervisor and their demographic characteristics. The assumption of normality was tested, and examination of the residuals and the boxplot showed a normal distribution shape. According to Levine's test, the homogeneity of variance assumption was satisfied. The ANOVA revealed that there were no significant differences in means of satisfaction with supervisor and program assistants' education level ($F = .122$, $df = 4, 142$, $p = .974$), gender ($F = .002$, $df = 1, 145$, $p = .964$), marital status ($F = .625$, $df = 4, 142$, $p = .645$), children under 18 years old living at home ($F = .137$, $df = 1, 145$, $p = .712$), years of service ($F = .599$, $df = 36, 109$, $p = .960$), program area ($F = 1.395$, $df = 3, 144$, $p = .247$), or age ($F = .848$, $df = 43, 96$, $p = .724$).

Discussion

This study makes a unique contribution to the research in the field of Extension organization development and employee satisfaction with supervisor. Previous studies reported that the role of supervisors in organizations is important because they play a critical role in determining employee attitudes and performance (e.g., Kemelgor, 1982; Scarpello & Vandenberg, 1987). The findings of this study show that Extension program assistants were highly satisfied with the following behaviors: how the supervisor listens to them, reacts to mistakes, gives credit for ideas,

supports employees in dealing with other management, is fair in appraising employees' job performance, as well as with the supervisor's technical competence. These results are consistent with the study by Jernigan and Beggs (2005) that suggested supervisor effectiveness is essential because managers are pivotal in enabling the organization to build a committed workforce. Having a supportive supervisor is positively related to employee attitudes toward work (Michael, 2014). Karatepe and Kilic (2007) emphasized that satisfaction with supervisor is positively related to employees' job satisfaction (p. 248). The findings of the present study confirm that leaders' behaviors are important factors of employees' satisfaction with their leaders (Phillips et al., 2001; Shamir & Lapidot, 2003). Moreover, the result of this study supported contemporary leadership theories and provided additional evidence that, when a supervisor shows concern for others and supports employees, it leads to employees' higher satisfaction with their leader.

Findings from this research show that participants are dissatisfied with how the supervisor informs the employee about work changes ahead of time, shows a lack of concern for an employee's career progress, and rarely gives feedback for doing a good job. Jaworski and Kohli (1991) suggested that output-oriented positive feedback is important for improving employee performance. The authors emphasized the need to realize how particular managerial feedback will be understood, accepted, interpreted, and finally responded by the employee. Kemelgor (1982) suggested that "subordinates are going to be more satisfied in an environment where, through value congruence, the supervisor is seen as providing them with or helping them attain important objectives" (p. 157).

Previous research has found a positive linear relationship between satisfaction with supervisor and organizational tenure and employee age (Norris & Niebuhr, 1984). This study found that Extension program assistants' level of education, children under 18 living at home, program area, years of services, gender, and age all showed no statistically significant relationship to satisfaction with supervisor. The Human Resource Generalist of the OSU Extension suggested that differences in satisfaction with supervisor may, in fact, be related to demographic variables, just not the ones considered here (personal communication, August 17, 2016). This is a matter for further research. It may also be the case that the disproportionate number of participants across the different program areas was a factor influencing the results of this study. For example, the majority (62.6%) of participants in this study worked in the family and consumer science program area, approximately 19% in 4-H youth development, 5.4% in the agricultural and natural resources program area, and there were no participants in the community development program area. In addition, most of the respondents in this study were women (87%), which may be another factor affecting the results.

The average age of study participants was 41.3 years old. Half of the participants (50%) were between the ages of 22 and 40, approximately 41% (40.6%) between 41 and 60, and the remaining 8.7% between 61 and 72. This disproportion among the age groups in the study raises some important research questions. Half of the participants are from the 'millennial generation.'

They are well-educated and technologically savvy and represent a significant shift in the constituency of the Extension organization. Millennials in the workplace are very self-driven (Zemke, Raines, & Filipczak, 2013). Members of this generation want benefits that have an immediate impact on their careers (Weingarten, 2009). Leaders who understand this generational profile can establish more effective management practices with employees. Leaders should institute professional development measures to educate personnel about generationally differing perceptions within the workforce (Eggensperger, 2014).

Limitations of the Study

This study used a census survey design. The overall design limited the scope of the study and limits the generalizability of the obtained results because only employees of a single Extension organization in the state of Ohio participated. A cross-sectional research design was utilized; thus, one cannot determine the stability of individual attitudes over time. As previously mentioned, the disproportion in numbers of participants across program areas and gender may have been factors affecting study outcomes. Other facets of the program assistant-supervisor relationship could have influenced employees' satisfaction with their supervisor. However, the findings of this research contribute to the limited scientific literature related to Extension program assistants and their satisfaction with supervisors. The results of this study and the previous research cited can provide some direction for organizations similar to OSU Extension.

Recommendations for Research and Practice

Several practical recommendations may be of value to similar organizations. First, human resources development practitioners should assess Extension program assistants' satisfaction with their supervisors on an annual basis. The results of the assessment will help to create a positive organizational climate by fostering a culture that gives program assistance a sense of being respected and appreciated. Second, Extension organizations should cultivate a supportive supervisory environment. For example, supervisors can show concern for employee's career progress, provide feedback with respect, inform work changes ahead of time, be consistent in behavior toward subordinates, and show fairness in appraising job performance. Third, Extension administration should offer leadership professional development for middle-level managers. Professional development would increase supervisors' awareness about leadership behaviors' influence and their managerial capacity in working with subordinates, which increases employee satisfaction with supervisors.

It is important to continue pursuing research and scientific discussion related to the relationship between supervisor and subordinate. In a general sense, outcomes of the present study suggest there should be further investigation of the effect of supervisor output and feedback on employee performance. There is also a need to examine how a supervisor's professional development can improve an employee's satisfaction with supervisor. Future research should explore how interpersonal trust among supervisors and subordinates affects employees' career progress.

References

Adebayo, S. O., & Ogunsina, S. O. (2011). Influence of supervisory behavior and job stress on job satisfaction and turnover intention of police personnel in Ekiti State. *Journal of Management and Strategy*, *2*(3), 13–20. doi:10.5430/jms.v2n3p13

Balabola, S. S. (2016). The effect of leadership style, job satisfaction and employee-supervisor relationship on job performance and organizational commitment. *The Journal of Applied Business Research*, *32*(3), 935–946. doi:10.19030/jabr.v32i3.9667

Bass, B. M., & Riggio, R. E. (2006). *Transformational leadership* (2nd ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Benge, M., & Harder, A. (2017). The effects of leader-member exchanges on relationships between Extension agents and county Extension directors in Florida. *Journal of Human Sciences and Extension*, *5*(1), 35–49. Retrieved from https://www.jhseonline.com/article/view/631/547

Boyce, V. M. (1970). Training program assistants. *Journal of Extension, Fall,* 38–46. Retrieved from https://www.joe.org/joe/1970fall/1970-3-a6.pdf

Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York, NY: Harper and Row.

Bycio, P., Hackett, R. D., & Allen, J. S. (1995). Further assessments of Bass's (1985) conceptualization of transactional and transformational leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *80*(4), 468–478. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.80.4.468

Campione, W. A. (2014). The influence of supervisor race, gender, age, and cohort on millennials' job satisfaction. *Journal of Business Diversity*, *14*(1), 18–34. Retrieved from http://digitalcommons.www.na-businesspress.com/JBD/CampioneW_Web14-1.pdf

Carter, C. G., Pounder, D. G., Lawrence, F. G., & Wozniak, P. J. (1990). Factors related to organizational turnover intentions of Louisiana Extension Service agents. In H. L. Meadow & M. J. Sirgy (Eds.), *Quality-of-life studies in marketing and management* (pp. 170–181). Blacksburg, VA: International Society for Quality-of-Life Studies.

DeConinck, J. B., & Stilwell, C. D. (2004). Incorporating organizational justice, role states, pay satisfaction and supervisor satisfaction in a model of turnover intentions. *Journal of Business Research*, *57*(3), 225–231. doi:10.1016/S0148-2963(02)00289-8

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.

Eggensperger, B. (2014). The generations in the workplace. *Trustee*, *67*(4). Retrieved from https://www.trusteemag.com/articles/687-the-generations-in-the-workplace

Fuller, J., Patterson, C. E. P., Hester, K., & Stringer, D. Y. (1996). A quantitative review of research on charismatic leadership. *Psychological Reports*, *78*(1), 271–287. doi:10.2466/pr0.1996.78.1.271

Hampton, R., Dubinsky, A. J., & Skinner, S. J. (1986). A model of sales supervisor leadership behavior and retail salespeople's job-related outcomes. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, *14*(3), 33–43. doi:10.1007/BF02723262

Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. H. (1979). *Management of organizational behavior*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Jaworski, B. J., & Kohli, A. K. (1991). Supervisory feedback: Alternative types and their impact on salespeople's performance and satisfaction. *Journal of Marketing Research*, *28*(2), 190–201. Retrieved from https://www.jstor.org/stable/3172807?seq=1#metadata_info _tab_contents

Jernigan, I. E., III, & Beggs, J. M. (2005). An examination of satisfaction with my supervisor and organizational commitment. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *35*(10), 2171–2192. doi:10.1111/j.1559-1816.2005.tb02214.x

Judge, T. A., & Piccolo, R. F. (2004). Transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analytic test of their relative validity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *89*(3), 755–768. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.89.5.755

Karatepe, O. M., & Kilic, H. (2007). Relationships of supervisor support and conflicts in the work-family interface with the selected job outcomes of frontline employees. *Tourism Management*, *28*(1), 238–252. doi:10.1016/j.tourman.2005.12.019

Katz, R. (1978). Job longevity as a situational factor in job satisfaction. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *23*(2), 204–223. doi:10.2307/2392562

Kemelgor, B. H. (1982). Job satisfaction as mediated by the value congruity of supervisors and their subordinates. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *3*(2), 147–160. doi:10.1002/job.4030030202

Laohavichien, T., Fredendall, L., & Cantrell, R. (2009). The effects of transformational and transactional leadership on quality improvement. *The Quality Management Journal*, *16*(2), 7–24. doi:10.1080/10686967.2009.11918223

McCaslin, V. L., & Mwangi, J. (1994). Job satisfaction of Kenya's Rift Valley Extension agents. *Journal of Extension*, *32*(3), Article 3RIB1. Retrieved from https://www.joe.org/joe/1994october/rb1.php/site_urlindex.php

Michael, D. F. (2014). The impact of leader-member exchange, supportive supervisor communication, affective commitment, and role ambiguity on bank employees' turnover intentions and performance. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, *5*(7), 8–21. Retrieved from https://ijbssnet.com/journals/Vol_5_No_7_June_2014/2.pdf

Miller, L. E., & Smith, K. L. (1983). Handling nonresponse issues. *Journal of Extension*, *21*(5), 45–50. Retrieved from http://www.joe.org/joe/1983september/83-5-a7.pdf

Mowday, R. T., Koberg, C. S., & McArthur, A. W. (1984). The psychology of the withdrawal process: A cross-validation test of Mobley's intermediate linkages model of turnover in two samples. *Academy of Management Journal*, *27*(1), 79–94. doi:10.5465/255958

Mujkić, A., Šehić, D., Rahimić, Z., & Jusić, J. (2014). Transformational leadership and employee satisfaction. *Ekonomski vjesnik: Review of Contemporary Entrepreneurship, Business, and Economic Issues*, *27*(2), 259–270.

Norris, D. R., & Niebuhr, R. E. (1984). Professionalism, organizational commitment and job satisfaction in an accounting organization. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, *9*(1), 49–59. doi:10.1016/0361-3682(84)90029-1

Northouse, P. G. (2020). *Introduction to leadership: Concepts and practice* (5th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Parsons, J., & Kiesow, J. (1975). 4-H program assistant's role. *Journal of Extension, July/August,* 11–18. Retrieved from https://joe.org/joe/1975july/1975-4-a2.pdf

Phillips, J. M., Douthitt, E. A., & Hyland, M. H. (2001). The role of justice in team member satisfaction with the leader and attachment to the team. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *86*(3), 316–325. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.86.2.316

Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., & Bommer, W. H. (1996). Transformational leader behaviors and substitutes for leadership as determinants of employee satisfaction, commitment, trust, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Journal of Management*, *22*(2), 259–298. doi:10.1177%2F014920639602200204

Scarpello, V., & Vandenberg, R. J. (1987). The Satisfaction with my Supervisor Scale: Its utility for research and practical applications. *Journal of Management*, *13*(3), 447–466. doi:10.1177%2F014920638701300302

Scarpello, V., & Vandenberg, R. J. (1992). Generalizing the importance of occupational and career views to job satisfaction attitudes. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *13*(2), 129–134. doi:10.1002/job.4030130203

Shamir, B., & Lapidot, Y. (2003). Trust in organizational superiors: Systemic and collective considerations. *Organization Studies*, *24*(3), 463–491. doi:10.1177%2F0170840603024003912

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, IL: 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

Strong, R., & Harder, A. (2009). Implications of maintenance and motivation factors on Extension agent turnover. *Journal of Extension*, *47*(1), Article 1FEA2. Retrieved from https://www.joe.org/joe/2009february/a2.php

van der Wal, M. A., Schönrock-Adema, J., Scheele, F., Schripsema, N. R., Jaarsma, A. D. C., & Cohen-Schotanus, J. (2016). Supervisor leadership in relation to resident job satisfaction. *BMC Medical Education*, *1*(1), 194–210. Retrieved from https://bmcmededuc.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12909-016-0688-z

Vitell, S. J., & Davis, D. L. (1990). The relationship between ethics and job satisfaction: An empirical investigation. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *9*(6), 489–494. doi:10.1007/BF00382842

Weingarten, R. M. (2009). Four generations, one workplace: A Gen X-Y nurse's view of team building in the emergency department. *Journal of Emergency Nursing*, *35*(1), 27–30. doi:10.1016/j.jen.2008.02.017

Weiss, D. J., Dawis, R. V., England, G. W., & Lofquist, L. H. (1967). Manual for the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire. *Minnesota Studies in Vocational Rehabilitation*, *22*. Retrieved from http://vpr.psych.umn.edu/sites/vpr.dl.umn.edu/files/monograph_xxii_-_manual_for_the_mn_satisfaction_questionnaire.pdf

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*, *18*(4), 351–362. doi:10.1002/(SICI)1099-1379(199707)18:4%3C351::AID-JOB802%3E3.0.CO;2-%23

Wheeless, L. R., Wheeless, V. E., & Howard, R. D. (1984). The relationships of communication with supervisor and decision participation to employee job satisfaction. *Communication Quarterly*, *32*(3), 222–232. doi:10.1080/01463378409369555

Yousef, D. A. (2000). Organizational commitment: A mediator of the relationships of leadership behavior with job satisfaction and performance in a non-western country. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, *15*(1), 6–24. doi:10.1108/02683940010305270

Zemke, R., Raines, C., & Filipczak, B. (2013). *Generations at work: Managing the clash of boomers, Gen Xers and Gen Yers in the workplace*. New York, NY: AMACOM.

Suzanna Windon, Ph.D., is an Assistant Professor of Youth and Adult Leadership at the Department of Agricultural Economics, Sociology, and Education, The Pennsylvania State University. Her focus is on youth and adult leadership capacity development and volunteerism.