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This study examines the relationship between the job satisfaction factors (working conditions, reward and incentives, supervision, job security, fairness and equity and employee’s expectations) and employees’ productivity at Al-Hassa Labor Office, in the western area, KSA. A sample of 70 respondents comprising 34 (48.6%) with secondary school certificates, 27 (38.6%) with bachelor degrees and 9 (12.9%) with other certificates using a simple random sampling method is used in this study. The study was guided by 33 questions which designed to cover the main indicators of the relationship between job satisfaction factors and employees’ productivity. A self-administered questionnaire used a five-point Likert structured used by the researchers. The questionnaire had reliability co-efficient of .80 (Cronbach’s Alpha). Data collected was analyzed using a descriptive statistics. Multiple regression analysis was used to examine the correlation between independent variables and dependent variable. The main findings show a significant correlation between these variables.
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INTRODUCTION

One of the main aspects of the companies and firms today is the measurement of their employee satisfaction. Organizations have to make sure that employee satisfaction is high among the workers, which is a precondition for increasing productivity, responsiveness, and quality and customer service. Its commonly accepted that workforce’s productivity is an essential indicator of any public private sector performance. Moreover it’s still crucial to the whole economic targeted accomplishments too.

Talking about productivity means-for many- in narrow sense, only workforce efficiency and can be defined as: “the ratio of the amount of goods or services produced to the hours of labor needed for their production, namely, the amount of labor,
expended at a normal exertion rate, that participated in that production Sunajko (2010).

LITERATURE REVIEW

Job Satisfaction
The concept of satisfaction was defined by Nancy C Morse (1997) as “Satisfaction refers to the level of fulfillment of one’s needs, wants and desire. Satisfaction depends basically upon what an individual wants from the world, and what he gets.”. Employee satisfaction is a measure of how happy workers are with their job and working environment. It is sure that there may be many factors affecting the organizational effectiveness and one of them is the employee satisfaction. Effective organizations should have a culture that encourages the employee satisfaction, Bhatti and Qureshi, (2007). Employees are more loyal and productive when they are satisfied, Hunter and Tietyen, (1997), and these satisfied employees affect the customer satisfaction and organizational productivity. There is no limit for the employees to reach the full satisfaction and it may vary from employee to employee. Sometimes they need to change their behaviors in order to execute their duties more effectively to gain greater job satisfaction, Miller (2006). Having good relationships with the colleagues, high salary, good working conditions, training and education opportunities, career developments or any other benefits may be related with the increasing of employee satisfaction. Employee satisfaction is the terminology used to describe whether employees are happy, contended and fulfilling their desires and needs at work. Many measures support that employee satisfaction is a factor in employee motivation, employee goal achievement and positive employee morale in the work place. Susan M Heath field (About.Com).

Cranny, Smith and Stone (1992) defined employee’s satisfaction as the combination of affective reactions to the differential perceptions of what he/she wants to receive compared with he/she actually receives. According to Moyes et al. (2008) the employee satisfaction may be described as how pleased an employee is with his or her position of employment. As Spector (1997) defined job satisfaction as all the feelings that a given individual has about his/her job and its various aspects. Employee satisfaction is a comprehensive term that comprises job satisfaction of employees and their satisfaction overall with companies policies, company environment, etc.

Working Conditions
The conditions under which a job is performed can be different from those completely comfortable to those very difficult and dangerous to employees’ life and health. Difficult working conditions can be influenced by: (1) external factors that include climate - meteorological conditions, temperature, humidity, drafts, lighting in the workplace, noise and interference, gases, radiation, dust, smoke and other harmful factors; (2) subjective factors that include gender and age of the worker, fatigue, monotony, unfavorable posture during work, etc.; (3) factors related to the organization of production such as duration of the work shift, work schedule, working time, work pace, excessive strain, etc. Jobs with difficult working conditions may perform only those employees who meet specific requirements in terms of age, sex, qualifications, health, physical and mental condition and psycho-physiological and psychological capabilities. Difficult working conditions influence employees’ performances. It is therefore necessary to take measures to eliminate uncomfortable working conditions or, if
not possible, to take appropriate safety measures. Safety at work is carried out to ensure working conditions without danger to life or health, or, to avoid accidents, injuries, occupational diseases and, or at least mitigate their consequences. In the context of safety at work it should be talking about equipment that employees use in their daily work. Equipment (machinery, equipment, plant, tools, supplies, laboratory equipment, etc.) that employees use in their work has to be functional and correctly to avoid injuries at work or reduced performances. It is important that workers are trained how to work with the equipment because inadequate equipment handling can result in accidents or deviations in performance no matter how much equipment was proper. Training of employees should be also oriented to the proper use of protective equipment and personal protection (Buble, 2006).

**Job’s Security**

Employment security as a term is often used interchangeably with work security and job security. Job security is the most narrowly defined concept: it is the security (of income) associated with having an employment relation as an employee (a job). If interpreted even more strictly, jobsecurity is the security of continued employment in the same occupation with the same employer. Conceptually, work security and employment security are broader concepts, including, among other things, self-employment. But in the social and labor market policy literatures employment security is often used as synonym for job security. Work security can be regarded as an even broader concept than employment security, including work safety issues and quality of work.

**Supervision**

An effective supervision plays an important role to shape the relationship between employees’ and the management. A supervisor’s trust of his or her subordinates may reflect the supervisor’s knowledge that these subordinates are competent, reliable, and responsible in carrying out their assignments (Butler, 1991; Specifically, Ouchi (1981) affirmed that trust between individuals involves expectations of consistent or reliable behavior. Rotter (1971) defined trust as an “expectancy held by an individual or group that the work, promise, or written statement of another individual or group can be relied upon” (p. 444). Golembiewski and McConkie (1975) have expanded on the topic of trust and confidence by writing that it “implies reliance on, or confidence in, some event, process, or person” (p. 133). Gabarro (1987) defined trust in terms of consistency of behavior and posited that “judgments about trust in working relationships become specific based on accumulation of interactions, specific incidents, problems, and events” (p. 104). Griffin (1967) defined trust as “the reliance upon the characteristics of an object, or the occurrence of an event, or the behavior of a person in order to achieve a desired but uncertain objective in a risky situation” (p. 105).

This study researches believe that establishing an organization’s will need a direct supervision which derive the company to a successful or a failure conditions. Successful supervision is a deliberate action that requires capabilities, skills, and desire to learn from the past. All supervisors have their own work duties in addition to their supervisory responsibilities. Managers have a crucial influence on the quality of work life in their companies. Also, Authors agree that effective
supervision encourage their employee’s to
participate in creating the decision made in their
work life environment. The researchers think that
responsible supervisor helps their subordinates
to get the necessary attention and assistance to
perform their jobs as they should. The wide spread
understanding for the new wave of supervision
focus on the worker rather than work outputs. This
corrected concept outlines that where an individual work is
closely monitored and the appropriate assistance
made available to such employee through
supervision, performance is normally higher.

**Employee’s Expectations**

Expectancy theory is based on four assumptions,
one assumption is that people join organizations
with expectations about their needs, motivations,
and past experiences. These influence how
individuals react to the organization. A second
assumption is that an individual’s behavior is a
result of conscious choice. That is, people are
free to choose those behaviors suggested by their
own expectancy calculations. A third assumption
is that people want different things from the
organization (e.g., good salary, job security,
advancement, and challenge). A fourth
assumption is that people will choose among
alternatives so as to optimize outcomes for them
personally (Vroom, 1964).

The expectancy theory based on these
assumptions has three key elements: expectancy, instrumentality, and valence. A person
is motivated to the degree that he or she believes
that (a) effort will lead to acceptable performance
(expectancy), (b) performance will be rewarded
(instrumentality), and (c) the value of the rewards
is highly positive (valence). Vroom suggests that
motivation, expectancy, instrumentality, and valence are related to one another by the
equation: Motivation = Expectancy x
Instrumentality x Valence.

**Reward and Incentives**

Rewards are said to signal the organizational
values to the employees as Trevor (2008)
describes them “as a means of aligning a
company’s most strategic asset – their
employees – to the strategic direction of the
organization”. Ghoshal and Bartlett (1998)
captured the essence of rewarding which is not
only attaching value to the employees but also
more importantly adding value to the people (Armstrong et al., 2010).

It can be said that people are the only scarce
resource companies have which other
competitors cannot copy. Based on this point of
view investment on employees should be of high
importance to the companies which have
understood the real gains they can retrain from
their unique employees (Jensen et al., 2007).
Jensen et al. (2007) also noted how companies
are so hardly trying to distinguish themselves at
the markets by their products, service and price
but neglecting the possibility to stand out from
others with their original employees.

**Fairness and Equity**

The conceptual term (Fairness and Equity) used
heavily in legal and humanitarians fields attached
to the matters of peace and war. In this work,
authors adopted what suggested by Adams
(1965), there are two forms of equity: distributive
equity, which is concerned with the fairness with
which people feel they are rewarded inaccordance with their contribution and in
comparison with others; and procedural equity,
or procedural justice, which is concerned with
the perceptions employees have about the
fairness with which procedures in such areas as
performance appraisal, promotion and discipline are being operated. Interpersonal factors are closely linked to feelings about procedural fairness. Five factors that contribute to perceptions of procedural fairness have been identified by Tyler and Bies (1990). These are:

1. Adequate considerations of an employee’s viewpoint;
2. Suppression of personal bias towards the employee;
3. Applying criteria consistently across employees;
4. Providing early feedback to employees concerning the outcome of decisions;
5. Providing employees with an adequate explanation of the decision made.

**Theoretical Framework**

From the given literature, following research model and hypothesis has been formulated.

| H1: There is a direct relationship between working conditions and employee’s productivity. |
| H2: There is a direct relationship between job security and employee’s productivity. |
| H3: There is a direct relationship between supervision and employee’s productivity. |
| H4: There is a direct relationship between rewards and incentives and employee’s productivity. |
| H5: There is a direct relationship between individual expectations and employee’s productivity. |
| H6: There is a direct relationship between the feeling of equity and employee’s productivity. |

**OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY**

The main objective of this study is to find out the relationship between the job satisfaction factors and employees’ productivity in Al-hassalabor office, eastern area, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. More specific sub-objectives are:

1. To provide theoretical framework of main drivers of job satisfaction factors which influence employee’s productivity.
2. To find out the internal relationship between the job satisfaction factors.
3. To provide some recommendations for the labor office authorities and future studies.

**METHODOLOGY**

This study is an empirical study, based on the primary data which collected by a self-administered questionnaire. A population of 100 employees were worked in Al-hassa Labor Office.
in the eastern area of KSA. The number of questionnaires distributed to cover all the population of this study. Only 70 questionnaires were returned. The questionnaire consists of seven sections namely. The researchers used the Likert five-point structure to measure the main concepts of this study. Descriptive statistics and Pearson correlation analysis were used in this study. A well-known Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 19.0 was used to analyze the data of this study.

**RESEARCH RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

**Biographical information of the respondents (N=100)**

Table 6.1 indicates the age distribution of the sample of respondents from the Labor Office at which the research was conducted. As can be seen from the table, the majority of the sample’s age (n = 27) was more than 35 years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 25 year</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>34.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-35</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>61.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 35</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table indicates that the majority of the sample (38.6%) aging more than 35 years old which reflects the maturity level of the respondents and helps determining their needs and desires and justify the research results.

Table 6.2 indicates the respondents’ qualification level. It indicates that 48.6% of the respondents have a secondary school certificates, 38.6% have a bachelor degrees and 12.9% have other types of certificates, this showing clearly the lack of graduates in this department which affect the development and perceptions of all employees.

Table 6.2 indicates the respondents’ experience level. It can be seen that majority of the respondents who have experience level more than 7 year (50%), less than 4 year (31.4%), 4-6 year (12.9%), no experience (5.7%). This table reinforce the respondent’s contribution as (50%) being in the job for more than 7 years which prove that their experience is important for successful in the job.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>48.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>87.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
perceptions and suggestions toward the reliability of this framework.

Table 6.5 shows that the means for working conditions, job security, supervision, rewards, employee’s expectations and fairness ranged from a low 2.1429 to a high of 3.3286. Results of the descriptive statistics in terms of arithmetic mean and standard deviation show that productivity of employees in the sample is relatively good. The above mean values of independent and dependent variables show that employee’s productivity depend on the job security, supervision, fairness, compared to other variables. This means that the employees under this study perceived the job security as the main factor that contributes to their productivity. This figure might come as the result of the recruitment system that followed by the Labor Office Department. The mean value for employee’s productivity is 3.000 which show that employees of the labor office are overall productive.

**Pearson Correlation Coefficient and Regression Analysis**

X1 = Working conditions, X2 = Job security, X3 = Supervision, X4 = Reward & incentives, X5 = Employee’s expectations, X6 = Fairness, X7 = Employee’s productivity.

As shown in Table 6.5, the correlation matrix indicates that the independent variables (Fairness, Rewards and Incentives, Job security, Supervision, Working conditions, Employee’s
Table 6.5: Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>X1</th>
<th>X2</th>
<th>X3</th>
<th>X4</th>
<th>X5</th>
<th>X6</th>
<th>X7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.833**</td>
<td>.910**</td>
<td>.880**</td>
<td>.949**</td>
<td>.915**</td>
<td>.901**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X2</td>
<td>.833**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.919**</td>
<td>.888**</td>
<td>.869**</td>
<td>.906**</td>
<td>.915**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X3</td>
<td>.910**</td>
<td>.919**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.908**</td>
<td>.951**</td>
<td>.913**</td>
<td>.910**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X4</td>
<td>.880**</td>
<td>.888**</td>
<td>.908**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.916**</td>
<td>.940**</td>
<td>.940**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X5</td>
<td>.949**</td>
<td>.869**</td>
<td>.951**</td>
<td>.916**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.922**</td>
<td>.900**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X6</td>
<td>.915**</td>
<td>.906**</td>
<td>.913**</td>
<td>.946**</td>
<td>.922**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.959**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X7</td>
<td>.901**</td>
<td>.915**</td>
<td>.910**</td>
<td>.940**</td>
<td>.900**</td>
<td>.959**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: **Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

Table 6.7: Summary of Hypothesis Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1  There is a direct relationship between working conditions and employee’s productivity.</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2  There is a direct relationship between job security and employee's productivity.</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3  There is a direct relationship between supervision and employee's productivity.</td>
<td>Supported.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4  There is a direct relationship between rewards &amp; incentives and employee's productivity.</td>
<td>Strongly supported.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5  There is a direct relationship between individual expectation and employee’s productivity.</td>
<td>Supported.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6  There is a direct relationship between fairness and employee's productivity.</td>
<td>Strongly supported.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.8: Summary of Regression analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.958°</td>
<td>.917</td>
<td>.911</td>
<td>.31051</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

expectations) were positively correlated with employee’s productivity. Fairness achieved the highest positive correlation while the employee’s expectation has the lowest correlation with employees productivity.

Thus increase in fairness, rewards and incentives and job security will lead to increase employee’s productivity. Thus, hypotheses H1, H2, H3, H4, H5 and H6 were supported.

According to the output of Table 6.8, R² of .917 indicates that 91.7% of variation in employee productivity is explained by the independent variables: Working conditions, Job security, Supervision, Reward and incentives, Employee’s expectations and the feeling of fairness and equity in the workplace. Meanwhile, 8.3% of the change in employee productivity are explained by other factors which were not taken into consideration in this study.

**CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

The results of correlation matrix in Table 6.7 have
supported the hypothesis that there is a significant relationship between the rewards and incentives and employee’s productivity. This study also shows a strong relationship between the feeling of fairness among employees and their productivity. The rewards and incentives as well as the feeling of fairness have achieved the highest correlation which indicates that the majority of employees in the Labor Office are preferred to get the suitable rewards for their efforts and feeling of the real fairness and equity.

The studies that have dealt with the working conditions as a factor of job satisfaction shows that employees prefer working conditions which are not dangerous and unpleasant (Robbins, 1998). They like working conditions which are similar to the conditions that they have in their homes.

Our results also show that job security has an important relationship to employee’s productivity in the Labor Office of the eastern Area. On the other hand, our results support the importance of job security as a factor of productivity improvement. This result support The International Social Survey Program (ISSP (1989)) survey which reveals that in eight out of the nine OECD countries surveyed, job security was ranked as the most important characteristic of a job among the respondents. Moguerou (2002) using data from the Survey of Doctorate Recipients found that job security is a major determinant of job satisfaction in all sectors of employment for both males and females. This study also reveals that employee’s expectations are positively related to the productivity. This result confirm the theory of expectations by Vroom (1964) who stated that employee’s expectation is one of the most important factors that affect the overall organization’s productivity.

Based on the results of this study, we recommend that the management of the Labor Office in Al-Hassa should pay attentions to all these factors which perceived by the employees as the main drivers for their productivity. The management should set a policy to review all the factors that affect the main productivity drivers regularly in order to help its productivity increased. Specially the age of the respondents showed a very mature level which increased the credibility and reliability of the findings of this study. This study also shows the direct correlation between employee’s productivity and the working conditions, job security, supervision as very popular factors considered very affective on the employees productivities in on all sectors.
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