



## **Effect of Job Sactifaction on Employee Productivity in an Organisation. A Case Study of the Nigeria Bottling Company, Coca-Cola PLC**

**Kolawole, E. Olukemi (PhD)**

College of Social and Management Sciences  
Caleb University  
Imota, Lagos, Nigeria  
E-mail: ebiereolukemi@gmail.com  
Phone: +2348033472786

**Abodunrin, A.O.**

Dean of Postgraduate Studies  
Christ International College of Divinity  
Erinmo, Osun State, Nigeria  
E-mail: Femiabodunrin93@gmail.com  
Phone: +2347033530808, +23408033472786

### **ABSTRACT**

Job satisfaction as an effective tool for an organization productivity using ALPS Nigeria Limited as a case study is an attempt to look at what makes the employees to sactisfied in the performance of these duties so as to enhance productivity. The study intends to examine the effect of compensation and other condition of service on job satisfaction. The study involves both primary and secondary data collection. Primary data collection involve the using of questionnaires while secondary data involve the use of ready data and research materials such as journals and literatures. In all, about 120 workers were interviewed with anonymous questionnaire and then analyzed with statistical package for science students version (SPSS)17. The study revealed that job satisfaction is an invaluable tool for employee's production in an organization. It also showed that compensation package in whatever form has a very positive effect on employee's productivity in the organization. The study therefore recommends that many compensational package and other reward can be used to effect employees satisfaction which in turn will increase their productivity in the long run.

**KEYWORDS:** Productivity, Compensation, Satisfaction, Package, and Organization.

---

### **ISTEAMS Cross-Border Conference Proceedings Paper Citation Format**

Kolawole, E.O. & Abodunrin, A.O. (2017): Effect of Job Sactifaction on Employee Productivity in an Organisation. A Case Study of the Nigeria Bottling Company, Coca-Cola PLC. Proceedings of the 9th iSTEAMS Multidisciplinary Conference, University of Ghana, Legon, Accra Ghana. Pp 486-496

---

### **1. INTRODUCTION**

Organizations all over the world both in public and private sector aims, at maximizing profit through improved productivity, which is as a result of job satisfaction. Job satisfaction therefore refers to as the state at which the job being performed provide comfort, meets employees requirement of needs, guarantee optimum level of performance and desirable behavior. Robbins (2001) sees job satisfaction as an individual's general attitude to her or his job. However job satisfaction to productivity is the ratio of output of acceptable quality of inputs consumed. Productivity is also a measure of well an organization attains it goals. The challenge of job satisfaction has always existed in many organizations across the globe and it is the clue to maximum profit from satisfied customers Business Has a higher probability of survival if the workforce and customers are highly satisfied about the condition of work and services produces respectively. For any worker to be satisfied with his or her job, the job and its condition must certainly meet the needs of such a worker.



Job satisfaction in this context is an essential Ingredient for productivity and performance. When a worker is satisfied or otherwise, this is when a worker is satisfied or otherwise, this is when the worker will be motivated to become more productive. In essence, job satisfaction, depicts how an employee perceive fairness and justice in the promotional system within an organization with respect to the organization policies and procedures, working condition, promotional exercise, pay and benefits lead ship and social relationship and also the nature of job itself. There are five crucial characteristics that should be consider in respect to job satisfaction as an effective tools for employees productivity. These are:

1. Pay: the amount received or perceived quality of pay
2. Job: the extent to which the job task are considered interesting and provide opportunity for learning and accepting responsibilities.
3. Promotion opportunities: availability of promotional opportunity for advancement
4. Supervisor: the ability of the supervisor is to demonstrate interest in and concern for employees
5. Co-workers: the extent to which co-workers are friendly, competent and supportive.

### **1.1 Statement of the Problem**

The problem face by most organizations in the world today is how to provide desired satisfaction to employees through the provision of good administrative policy, relationship between supervisor and employees, provision of adequate working tools, job security and compensating employees for good performance. It must also be noted that human being has some characteristics that distinguishing them form one another.

### **1.2 Objective of the Study**

The main aim of this study is to determine the guidelines to follow to boost workers satisfaction, thereby assisting the organization to attain its goal.

Other objective are

To highlight the needs importance of job satisfaction as an effective tools for measuring employees productivity

To determine the effect of compensational package on employees productivity.

To identify the factors that promotes s job satisfaction with a view to know the relative importance of the factor.

### **1.3 Research Question**

Does compensational package have effect on the employee's productivity?

Is job satisfaction an effective tools for employee's productivity?

What are the factors that determine employees' satisfaction our organization?

### **1.4 Research Hypothesis**

Ho1: compensational package has no significant effect on employee's productivity

Ho2: job satisfaction has no significant on employees' productivity

Ho3: personal development and promotion are not significant factors that affect job satisfaction of workers.

### **1.5 Significant of the Study**

This important study will serve as a guideline for many organizations for reviewing ways in which employees can be satisfied with their job which in turn will reduce employee's turnover and boost productivity. The study will also be of great benefit to future researchers and students who may want to carry out related research. The study may be useful for labour relations effective programming designed at boosting the satisfaction of employees in organization.



## 2. LITERATURE REVIEW

The definitions of job satisfaction are many depending on option, perspectives and objective. Vroom (1964) defined job satisfaction as the positive orientation of an individual toward the work he/she is presently occupying. According to him, different people have different views and pretenses on the job and any positive inclination by the employees towards his or her job is a measure of job satisfaction. Lawler (1973) concluded in his study that employees satisfaction is a combination of satisfaction on different facet of the job viz a viz: pay, job group, supervisors, co-workers etc. he postulated that when employees become dissatisfied when they feel are being given far less than what they deserve. Robbins (2001) sees job satisfaction as an individual general attitude toward his or her job. A person with a high positive attitude toward his/her job will be more satisfied than some one with a low attitude to job.

On the other hand, empirically productivity in business organization is defined as the rate at which employees give service such that the corporate objective of the organization is achieved. It is the level of output of the employees from one period to another. In other production processes, it is amount of time or number of hours it takes an employees to complete a given task satisfactorily or produce a good or render a service satisfactorily. This is often compared to the salary or wage of the individual.

### 2.1 Job Satisfaction and Productivity

There are documentary evidences that job satisfaction does not necessarily leads to improved productivity, instead its productivity that now leads to job satisfaction. An interesting aspect of current thinking about the relationship job satisfaction and productivity is that job satisfaction may be a consequence of, rather than a cause of productivity levels. Locke (1976) theorized that high satisfaction result from high productivity only when there is congruence with employees' important job values i.e recognition. And it does not entail high important cost i.e fatigues, martial problems, e.t.c that the overall consequences are viewed as negative. Lawler and porter (1967) expect high productivity to cause job satisfaction only when an employee perceived both the intrinsic (felling of achievement, learning, happiness, development, e.t.c) and extrinsic rewards (i.e pay, promotion, etc) are fair and associated with superior performance. If the employee does not perceive that intrinsic and extrinsic rewards do not correlate with performance, then increase in performance will not be correlated with increase in satisfaction. The relationship between join satisfaction and productivity may be needs of hunger, thirst, sleep, etc are some of the examples. According to the theory, when these breeds are satisfied, they no longer serve to motivate.

Safety needs: This second level of needs is roughly equivalent to the security need. Maslow stressed emotional as well as physical safety. The whole organism may become a safety seeking mechanism. Yet as its true to motivate.

Affiliation needs are desire for friendship, love and belonging. When an organization does not meet affiliation needs, am of physiological needs, once these safety needs are satisfied, they no longer serve negative or positive. If satisfaction is positive, then it will lead to increase in productivity but the opposite will be the case if the level of satisfaction is negative. The consequences of job satisfaction Include motivation for better commitment and service, reduction in absenteeism, low employee turnover, good health (both physical and mental), improved productivity.

### 2.2 Components of Job Satisfaction

Studies have shown that both intrinsic and extrinsic affect employees satisfaction in an organization. They include job security, recognition, occupation level, vacation policies, decentralization of authority, working conditions, promotion, work group, nature of the work itself, and some other factors.



### 2.3 Theoretical Review

The content theories are static's because they incorporate only one or few point in time and are either past or present time-oriented. The following theories are discussed in order to explain what motivate people at work.

#### a) MASLOV'S HIERARCHY OF NEEDS

Abraham Maslow outlined the overall theory of motivation. Drafting chiefly from humanistic psychology and his clinical experience, he thought that a person's motivational needs could be arrange in a hierarchical manner. In essence, he believed that once a given level of need is satisfied, it no longer served to motivate. The next higher level of needs has to be activated in order to motivate the individual. He identified five levels of needs. They are:

**Physiological needs:** the most basic level in the hierarchy, the physiological needs generally correspond to the primary needs. The employees dissatisfaction may be experienced in term of frequent absenteeism, low productivity, stress related behaviors and emotional breakdown.

**Esteem needs:** Are desire for self-respect, a sense of personal achievement and recognition from others. In order to satisfy this need, people seek opportunity fro advancement, promotion, prestige and status. All of these symbolize their competence and worth.

**Self-actualization needs:** these are desires for personal growth, self-fulfillment and the realization of the individual full potential. Managers who recognize these motivations in employees can help them. Discover the growth opportunities for them. Maslow did not intend that his need hierarchy be directly applied to work motivation. In fact, he did not delve into the motivation aspect of humans in organizations until about 20 years after he proposed the theory.

#### b) Herzberg Two-Factor Theory of Motivation

Another theory worth mentioning is Herzberg theory of motivation. Herberd extended the work of Maslow and developed a specific content theory of work motivation. He conducted a widely reported motivational study on 200 accountants and engineers employed and around Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. He used the critical method of obtaining data for analysis. According to him, the relationship between job satisfaction and motivation is complicated than it seems. By the time he concluded his study, he found out that there are various factors used motivate employees. The factor used to motivate one sector of employees, if the same factor is used for another sector of employees, it may not work because of individual differences. The need of employees are different from one another in his opinion two separate and distinct factors are responsible for motivation and satisfying employees. These are motivator factors and hygiene factors. Motivation factors are aspect of a job content and organizational context that creates positive feelings among employees for example challenge for the work itself, responsibility, recognition, achievement, advancement and growth are all motivational factors.

Hygiene factors are non-work characteristics of the work environment to motivate employees. The include compensation, the organization content that help to create satisfaction which are compensation level of responsibility, working condition, company policies, supervision, co-workers relationship former status and job security. Hygiene factors preventive and environmental in nature and they closely related to Maslow's lower level needs. Other theories of importance in this area are Adherer Erg theory, vroom's expectancy theory, Equity theory of work motivation, control and agency theories.



### 3. METHODOLOGY

A multi stage descriptive study approach was employed in the study. The first stage involved selection of a big corporation: ALPS Nigeria Limited. The second stage involved random selection of three major department of the organization: Account, operations and sales departments. The third stage involved random selection of ten senior and ten junior management staff members. A total of 60 respondents were therefore selected. Members of staff who had worked for onward of five years were involved in the study. A liker scale structured questionnaire was used to interview them. The study intends to identify motivational techniques which could be used to improve the productivity of the employees in relation to their current level of performance.

Instrument: The structured questionnaire featured two sections. Section A is on employee 's bio-data which include age, sex length of service, department, position, martial status salary structure, mode of entry into the organization etc. the second section contains management motivational techniques and organization factors affecting performance and productivity. Some questions are developed on a liker scale.

### 4. METHODS OF DATA ANALYSIS & RESULTS

The data collected was analysis using statiscal package for social

#### Socio-demographic characteristics of respondents

Result showed that 48 (80.0%) were males while 18 (20.0%) were females. About 14 (23.3%) are less than 30 years old, 16 (26.7%) are between 31 and 40 years, 14 (23.3%) are between 41 and 50years,10 (16.7%) are between 51 and 60 years while 6 (10 are older

Science (SPSS) employing the tools for descriptive analysis (frequency and percentage, means standard deviation etc) Chi-square was then used to statistically test for differences between total agree and total disagree. Null hypothesis is only accepted when the level of significance is higher than 0.05.

#### Scoring:

Strongly agree and agree were added together to counted as agree while strongly disagree and disagree were added together to make disagree. Then total agree and total disagree were then tested with Chi-square analysis to find their correlation with opinion of respondents. The undecided option was however excluded from the Chi-square test because of there neutrality. The chi-square was carried out at 5% significance level.

#### Model specification

Employees' productivity (Y) is the dependent variable in this study while job satisfaction (X) is the independent variables. In this instance,

$$Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_1 + \epsilon \dots \dots \dots (1)$$

On break down, the relationship between productivity in the organization as dependent variable and level of satisfaction X1 and the motivational factors X2 as independent variable is given thus:

$$Y_1 = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_1 \dots \dots \dots (2)$$

$$Y_2 = \beta_0 + \beta_2 X_2 \dots \dots \dots (3)$$

Motivational factors X2 as independent variable is given thus:

$$Y_1 = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_1 \dots \dots \dots (2)$$

$$Y_2 = \beta_0 + \beta_2 X_2 \dots \dots \dots (3)$$

Than 60 years. The mean age of respondents is 34.89 ± 4.3 years while the median age is 36.5 years. Most respondents are married 47 (78.3%) while the remaining are single 8(13.3%) and widowed 3(5%) or divorced 2 (3.3%). About half are graduates or HND holders 29 (48.3%) while 25 (41.7%) are holder of NCE/ OND although 2 (3.3%) has postgraduate qualifications.



Half of respondents are senior management staff 30 (50%) while 24 (40%) are junior management staff and the remaining 6 (10%) belong to the executive cadre. About 21 (35.5%) had worked for between 5 and 10 years, 18 (30.0%) had worked for between 16 and 20 years while 9(15.0%) had worked for more than 20 years. The detail is in the table below.

**Table1**

Variables	Freq	%
Sex of respondents	Freq	%
• Male	48	80.0
• Female	18	20.0
Age of respondents (years)		
• <30	14	23.3
• 31 – 40	16	26.7
• 41 – 50	14	23.3
• 51- 60	10	16.7
• >60	6	10
Marital status		
• Single	8	13.3
• Married	47	78.3
• Widowed	3	5.0
• Divorced	2	3.4
Education qualification		
• SSCE certification	4	6.7
• OND/NCE	25	41.7
• HND/ BSC	29	48.3
• Post graduates	2	3.3
Category of staff		
• Lower Management	24	40.0
• Senior Management	30	50.0
• Executives level	6	10.0
Length of service (in years)		
• 5- 10	21	35.0
• 11- 15	18	30.0
• 16- 20	9	15.0

#### 4.1 Relationship between level of satisfaction and productivity in the organization

About 30 (50%) of respondents in this study are reportedly strongly satisfied with the worked relationship with the boss at work w, 12 (20%) are satisfied while 4 (6.7%) are undecided on the question. However,4(6.7%) strongly disagreed with the working relationship with the boss at work. Also 23 (38.3%) are satisfied with the working hour in the organization while 10 (16.7%) are satisfied but 8(13.3%) are undecided while 7(11.75) disagreed and 12(20.0%) strongly disagreed with the working hour. About 14 (23.3%) are strongly satisfied with the relationship among other members of staff, 24 (40.0%) are satisfied but 5 (8.3%) are undecided. 6(10.0%) disagreed while 11(18.3%) strongly disagreed. 12 (20%) are reportedly strongly satisfied with volume of work on daily basis

while 38(63.3%) are reportedly satisfied with the flexibility of schedule of work, 24(40.0%) are satisfied and 12(20%) are reportedly undecided. 13(21.7%) are reportedly strongly satisfied about the amount they were paid as salary, 14(23.3%) are satisfied but 24(\$>)% are reportedly undecided on this question while 5(8.3%) are dissatisfied and 4(6.7%) are strongly dissatisfied about the amount they were paid as salary.



21 (35%) are reportedly strongly satisfied with their promotion, 19(31.7%) are undecided while 7(11.7%) are dissatisfied w and 3(5%0) are strongly dissatisfied with their promotion. 13(21.7%) of respondent strongly affirmed that they will not abandon the organization should they get a another job, 9(15.0%) affirmed but 19(31.7%) remained undecided while 17(28.3%) and 2(3.3%) affirmed and strongly affirmed that they will leave the organization should they get a another job. Also, 14 (23.3%) strongly agreed that their satisfaction has boost their potential level in the organization, 24(40.0%) agreed, while 6(10.0%) disagreed and 11(18.3%) strongly disagreed that their stratification has boosted their potential level in the organization. At the time, 18(30%) of respondents strongly agree that their level of productivity has increased as a result of the satisfaction in the organization, 24 (40%) of respondents agreed while 8(13.3%) reminded.

**Table 2: Level of satisfaction of respondents as an index of productivity**

Statement	Strongly agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly disagree
i am satisfied with working relationship with my boss at work	30 (50.0)	12 (20.0)	4 (6.7)	4 (6.7)	10 (16.7)
I am satisfied with the working hour and schedule of work	23 (38.3)	10 (16.7)	8 (13.3)	7 (11.7)	10 (16.7)
I am satisfied with the work relationship among other members of staff	14 (23.3)	24 (40.0)	5 (8.3)	6 (10.0)	11 (18.3)
I am satisfied with the volume of work on daily basis	12 (20.0)	24 (63.3)	5 (8.3)	2 (3.3)	3 (5.0)
I am satisfied with the flexibility of the schedule in this company	20 (33.3)	24 (40.0)	12 (20.0)	3 (5.0)	1 (1.7)
I am satisfied with the amount they are paying me as salary	13 (21.7)	14 (23.3)	24 (40.0)	5 (8.3)	4 (6.7)
I am satisfied with the promotion I get from time to time	21 (35.0)	19 (31.7)	10 (16.7)	7 (11.7)	3 (5.0)
I will not leave the organization if I get another job	21 (21.7)	19 (15.0)	10 (16.7)	7 (11.7)	2 (3.3)
My satisfaction has help to increase my potentials in the organization	14 (23.3)	24 (40.0)	5 (8.3)	6 (10.0)	11 (18.3)
My satisfaction with the organization boost my productivity	18 (30.0)	24 (40.0)	8 (13.3)	5 (8.5)	5 (8.5)

Source : Field Survey, 2015

The rate of satisfaction and dissatisfaction were compared with the chi-square test at 0.05 significance level and the result is represented in table 3 below. The result showed that the level of satisfaction in the organization is significantly higher than the level of dissatisfaction ( $\chi^2=362.210; p=0.030$ ).

The ANOVA test was carried out to determine the relationship between level of satisfaction and productivity of workers in the organization. The result is present in table 4. At 95% confidence interval and 0.05 significance level, there is a significant relationship between productivity and satisfaction in the organization ( $\chi^2=68.530; p=0.011$ ). In fact, the result depicted that 68.53% of the productivity coefficient is accounted for by level of satisfaction of respondents.



**Table 3: chi-square test of significance**

Chi-Square test	Value	df	Asymp.Sig.(2-sided)	Exact sig.(2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	362.210a	1	.022	.030
Continuity Correlation	320.685	1	.048	
Likelihood Ratio	17.002	1	.037	
Fisher's Exact Test				
N of valid Cases	60			
b. Computed only for a 2x2 table				

**Table 4 : Result of ANOVA test**

ANOVA					
SATISFACTION: PRODUCTIVITY					
	Sum of Squares	df	Means Square	F	Sig.
Between groups	18.055	2	9.028	68.529	.011
Within Groups	63.964	58	.317		
Total	82.020	60			

Source: SPSS Data result

Model for equation 2:  $Y_1 = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_1 \dots \dots \dots (2)$

$Y=18.05578.509$

**4.2 Motivation factors and productivity of employees**

About 24 (40.0%) of respondents strongly agreed that they were adequately compensated for assigned duties, 20(33.3%) were reportedly satisfied while 8(13.3%) were strongly dissatisfied with the way they were compensated for assigned duties. Also, 30 (50.0%) were strongly motivated financially while 30 (50.0%) were reportedly motivated. At the same time, 20(33.3%) strongly agreed that their job was secured while 24(40%) are neutral. Also, 13(21.7%) strongly agreed that their welfare is adequately catered for, 14(23.3%) agreed, 24(40%) of respondents remained undecided while 5(8.3%) disagreed and 4(6.7%) strongly disagreed that their welfare is adequately catered for. Also, 12(20.0%) of respondents strongly agreed that longer hour of work or extra work is adequately compensated while 21(35.0%) agreed but 8(13.3%) remained undecided but 9(15.0%) disagreed and 10(13.3%) strongly disagreed that longer hour or extra work is adequately compensated in the organization.

With regards to the environmental factors that favors productivity, 21 (35.0%) of respondents strongly agreed that the work environment produce good atmosphere for work, 27(45.0%) agreed, 6(10.0%) remained neutral, 9(15.0%) disagreed while 7(11.7%) strongly disagreed that environment atmosphere is good for work. About 16(26.7%) of respondents strongly agreed that their service is well appreciated and adequately rewarded, 24(40.0%) agreed, 6(10.0%) remained neutral, 10(16.7%)disagreed while 4(6.7%) strongly disagreed that their job is satisfying and rewarding, 24(40.0%) agreed 7(11.7%) remained undecided while 8(13.3%) disagreed and 2(3.3%) strongly disagreed, about 14(23.3%) of respondents strongly agreed that their salary is commensurate with their service to the organization, 30 (50.0%) and 4(6.7%) remained undecided and 8(13.3%) and 4(6.7%) disagreed respectively.. lastly,42(70.0%) of respondents strongly agreed that compensational package will motivate them to improve their performance and productivity in the organization while 18(30%) of respondents agreed





**Table 5: Motivational factors affecting productivity and performance in organizations**

Statement	Strongly agreed	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly disagreed
I am adequately	24 (40.0)	20 (33.3)	2 (3.3)	6 (10.0)	8 (13.3)
I am financially motivated	30 (50.0)	30 (50.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
My job is secured	20 (33.3)	24 (40.0)	12 (20.0)	3 (8.3)	1 (1.7)
Longer hours or extra work is adequately compensated	12 (20.0)	21 (35.0)	8 (13.3)	9 (15.0)	7 (11.7)
My environment produce good atmosphere for work	21 (35.0)	27 (45.0)	6 (10.0)	9 (15.0)	7 (11.7)
My services are appreciated and adequately rewarded	16 (26.7)	24 (40.0)	6 (10.0)	10 (16.7)	4 (4.7)
My job is satisfying and rewarded	19 (31.7)	24 (40.0)	7 (11.7)	8 (13.3)	4 (6.7)
My salary is compensated with my service organization	14 (23.3)	30 (50.0)	4 (6.7)	8 (13.3)	4 (6.7)
Compensational package will increase my performance and productivity at work	42 (70.0)	18 (30.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)

Source: Field Survey, 2015

The rate of satisfaction and dissatisfaction with regards to the various factors that motivate employees to increase productivity in the organization were compared with the chi-square test at 0.05 significance level and the result is presented in the table 6 below. The result showed that the motivation for improving productivity is significant high ( $\chi^2=292.462, p=0.021$ ). The ANOVA test was carried out to determine the relationship between the factors highlighted above and productivity of employees in the organization. The result is presented in the table 7. at 95% confidential interval and 0.05 significance levels; there is significant relationship between productivity and various motivational factors used in the organization. ( $\chi^2=28.11; p= 0.36$ ). In fact, the result depicted that 68.53% of the productivity coefficient is accounted for by level of satisfaction of respondents. The result implies that element of motivation in the organization is very effective for improving the productivity of employees in the organization.

**Table 6: Chi-square test of significance**

Chi-Square Test				
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig.
Personal Chi-square	292.462 <sup>a</sup>	1	.019	.012
Continuity Correlation	260.123	1	.028	
Likelihood Ratio	27.002	1	.032	
Fisher's Exact Test				
N of valid Cases	60			

b. computed only for a 2x2 table

K Source: SPSS data result

Model for equation 2:  $Y_2 = \beta_0 + \beta_2 X_2 \dots \dots \dots (3)$

$Y = 22.039 + 28.11 X_2$



TABLE 7: Result of Chi-Square test

ANOVA						
HOW LONG POPTIONS						
	Sum	of	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	22.039		2	8.462	28.11	.036
Within Groups	18.023		58	.403		
Total	40.061		60			

Source: SPSS Data result

## 5. FINDINGS

It was discovering that satisfaction with various working condition, amount of work and duration and also schedules of work and good relationship with the management and other members of staff of the organization is very effective and motivate people effectively and efficiently thereby improving their productivity. There is a significant and positive relationship between job satisfaction and employees' productivity on the one hand; and motivational factors and employees productivity on other hand. Although both of them play vital role in improving the productivity of employees, yet statistical data result showed that level of satisfaction with job is more effective than many motivational factors. To ensure job satisfaction, there should be free flow of information among members of the management and workers should be well compensated satisfactorily.

## 6. CONCLUSION

It is concluded from this study that relationship exist between job satisfaction, motivational factors and employees productivity in the organization. Such motivational factors may not be big but will help to show recognition and appreciation of service rendered by the employees. Motivation factors that are many and they not necessarily financial or monetary according to vroom theory of motivation, it must serve to recognize and appreciate the employees for the service rendered.

## REFERENCE

1. Asika, N (2003). Research methodology in behavioral sciences, Longman Nigeria PLC, Lagos Fred, KL.(20005). Organization behavior. 10<sup>th</sup> edition McGraw Hill, New York.
2. Bray, F.A. and crocket, W. H.(1955). Employees attitude and Employees performance. Physiological bulletin
3. Hoppock .R. (1978). Job satisfaction. 6<sup>th</sup> edition
4. Vroom, V.H.(1964). Work and Motivation. Wiley publishers, New York
5. Lawler, E. E. (1978). Motivation in work organizations. 10<sup>th</sup> edition; Brooks and Cole, New York.
6. Locke E.A. (1988). Nature and Cause of Satisfaction, Handbook Industrial and Organization Psychology, Rand McNally publishers, Chicago.
7. Harper and Row publishers, New York Wanous, J.P. (1974). A causal correlation analysis of job satisfaction performance relationship. Jrnal of Applied Psychology, 2(23): 45-48.