AFFECTIVE JOB SATISFACTION AND EMPLOYEE PRODUCTIVITY OF MANUFACTURING FIRMS IN PORT HAR COURT, NIGERIA

Tamunomiebi, M. D., & Daye, B.
AFFECTIVE JOB SATISFACTION AND EMPLOYEE PRODUCTIVITY OF MANUFACTURING FIRMS IN PORT HARCOURT, NIGERIA

Tamunomiebi, M. D., & Daye, B.

1Ph.D, Department of Management, Faculty of Management Sciences, Rivers State University, Nkpolu-Oroworukwo, PMB 5080, Port Harcourt, Nigeria.
2Department of Management, Faculty of Management Sciences, Rivers State University, Nkpolu-Oroworukwo, PMB 5080, Port Harcourt, Nigeria.

Accepted: November 6, 2019

ABSTRACT
This study examined the relationship between affective job satisfaction and employee productivity of manufacturing firms in Port Harcourt, Nigeria. Affective job satisfaction was the independent variable while timeliness, task accomplishment and innovativeness were used as measures of the dependent variable. The study adopted the cross-sectional survey in its investigation of the variables. Primary source of data was generated through self-administered questionnaire. The population of the study was 253 employees of seven (7) selected manufacturing companies in Port Harcourt. The sample size of 155 was determined using the Taro Yamane’s formula for sample size determination. The reliability of the instrument was achieved by the use of the Crombach Alpha coefficient with all the items scoring above 0.70. The hypotheses were tested using the Spearman’s Rank Order Correlation Statistics. The tests were carried out at a 95% confidence interval and a 0.05 level of significance. Empirical findings revealed that affective job satisfaction positively and significantly influences employee productivity in manufacturing companies in Port Harcourt, Nigeria. The result of the findings further revealed that Affective Job Satisfaction gave rise to timeliness, task accomplishment and innovativeness of manufacturing firms in Port Harcourt, Nigeria. The study recommended that manufacturing firms should see increase/prompt payment as a motivation factor that can increase productivity in the organization.
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INTRODUCTION

The business world in which organizations exist are made up of competitors, irrespective of their size and status. In recent times organizations seeking to gain competitive advantage over its rivalry are leveraging on their employee’s productive capacity as a competitive instrument for success in achievement of organizational objectives. More so, as organization battle to get the most from their existing employee in an environment characterized by skill shortages, the role of human resource practices in the organization in fostering job commitment and satisfaction has become imperative, given that many organizations has become aware of the significant impact both positive and negative that employee work outcomes have on their performance and productivity.

Furthermore, successful organisations within the manufacturing sector are strongly committed to look after their employee needs because they belief that fostering employee satisfaction can secure greater employee involvement that will result in high productivity (Tella, Ayeni & Popoola 2007). Managers in the manufacturing firms depend on significant productivity increases to maximize their bottom line. Consequently, employees are asked to do more each day with less, resulting in a mismatch of resources and loss of productivity. Fortunately, employee productivity increases can be achieved by knowing more about your employees and what motivates them. Ofobruku,(2012) observed that reciprocity is a mechanism underlying commitment to work which results in productivity and that employees will offer their commitment to the organisation in reciprocation for the organisation having fulfilled its psychological contract. By fulfilling obligations relating to good working condition, job safety, and effective reward system employers are creating the right platform for job satisfaction.

According to Simatwa (2011) job satisfaction is a function which is positively related to the degree to which one’s personal needs are fulfilled in the job situation. Kuria (2011) argues that employees are most satisfied and highly productive when their job offers them security from economic strain, recognition for their effort, clear policy on grievances, opportunity to contribute ideas and suggestions, participation in decision making and managing the affairs, clear definitions of duties and responsibilities and opportunities for promotion, fringe benefits. Job satisfaction means pleasurable emotional state of feeling that results from performance of work (Simatwa, 2011). Again, the quality of satisfaction an employee derives from his job is determined by the level of employee’s productivity. How well employees get along with the organization influence the employee’s error rate, level of innovation and collaboration with other employees. In order to achieve the required productivity level from the human resource, employee motivation is necessary, given that, employees peg their productivity to the feeling of trust that their efforts will be rewarded by the management. Falola, Ibidunni and Olokundun (2014) pointed out that crucial to the success of an organization is competence of its management and employees’ productivity on the other hand, had been hinged on the employee’s capability and motivation received amongst other factors, to perform the various tasks assigned to the employee.

Furthermore, Aaron (2015) pointed out that the importance of job satisfaction cannot be laid on with a trowel in the organization and that if properly integrated with the organization policy, job satisfaction have the capacity of increasing the productivity of employee and reduce operating cost, increase the operational efficiency and effectiveness, reduce employee turnover, give competitive advantage and lead to economy of scale in the firm. Empirical findings has shown that job satisfaction have positive effect on employees performance and the organization Okpara (2007), Silla, Gracia and Perio (2005), Frye (2004).
The challenges of job satisfaction and employees productivity have been the inability of the human resource management to apply the appropriate method of job satisfaction at the right time and the right direction without bias. The resultant effect of this in Nigerian work organization are poor performance of the firms caused by poor employee productivity, frequent employee turnover and increase cost of operation. The controversial findings of the influence of job satisfaction on employee productivity has over the year created a rift in knowledge, as Akintayo (2011) in his study found that monetary reward does not motivate employees for increase productivity, also Oloyede (2005) found that a conducive working environment is a prerequisite for achieving increase employees productivity. Hence this study have as it point of departure to examine the relationship between affective job satisfaction and employees productivity of manufacturing firms in Rivers State. This study will also be guided by the following research questions:

- To what extent does affective job satisfaction relate with timeliness in manufacturing firms in Port Harcourt?
- To what extent does affective job satisfaction relate with task accomplishment of manufacturing firms in Port Harcourt?
- To what extent does affective job satisfaction relate with innovativeness of manufacturing firms in Port Harcourt?

**Figure 1: Conceptual Framework for the relationship affective job satisfaction and employee productivity**

*Source: Author’s Desk Research, 2019*

**LITERATURE REVIEW**

**Equity theory**

Equity theory, as reviewed by Walster, Berscheid and Walster (1973) shows how a person perceives fairness in regard to social relationship. The theory presupposes that during a social exchange, a person identifies the amount of input gained from a relationship compared to the output, as well as how much effort another person’s puts forth. Based on Adam (1965) theory, Huseman, Hatfield and Miles (1987) further suggest that if an employee thinks there is an inequity between two social groups or individuals, the employee is likely to be distressed or dissatisfied because the input and the output are not equal. Inputs encompass the quality and quantity of the employee’s contributions to his or her work. Examples of inputs include: time, effort, hard work, commitment, ability, adaptability, flexibility, tolerance, determination, enthusiasm, personal sacrifice, trust in superiors, support from co-workers and colleagues and skills. Output (outcomes) on the other hand is the positive and negative consequences that an individual (employee) perceives a participant
has incurred as a consequence of his relationship with another. Examples of outputs include job security, esteem, salary, employee benefits, expenses, recognition, reputation, responsibilities, and sense of achievement, praise, thanks, and stimuli and so on.

The major concern in equity theory is about payment and therefore the cause of concern of equity or inequity in most cases in organizations. In any position in the organization, an employee wants to feel that their contributions and work performance are being rewarded with their pay. If an employee feels underpaid, he would be dissatisfied and therefore becomes hostile towards the organization and co-workers which may ultimately result to lack of motivation and low performance.

Equity is multidimensional in nature. For example, it does not depend on our input-to-output alone. It depends on people’s comparison between own input-output ratio and the ratio of others. Since equity is all about perception, employees form perceptions on what constitute a fair (balance or trade) of inputs and outputs by comparing their situation with other referents in the market place as they see it. From this comparison, when they perceive that their inputs are fairly rewarded by outputs, then they are satisfied, happier and more motivated in their work. They are de-motivated to their job and the organization when they perceive that their ratio of inputs-outputs is less beneficial than the ratio enjoyed by referent others (Ball, 2014). According to Adams (1963), when a person becomes aware of inequity, it causes a reaction in them, potentially some form of tension that is “proportional to the magnitude of inequity present”. It is because of this tension that an individual might react in a way that reduces the tension in him. Equity theory further identifies four mechanisms for job satisfaction (dissatisfaction) as follows: Employees seek to maximize their outcomes (rewards minus outcomes).

Concept of Affective Job Satisfaction
One of the increases or key indicators of employee job satisfaction is affective. The affective component of attitudes account for the feelings or emotions employees associate with their jobs or attitude object as well as the valence of those feelings (Bagozzi, 1978). Positive affective (PA) reflects the extent to which a person feels enthusiastic, active, and alert (Watson, Clark, & Tellegen, 1988). It is sometimes described as enjoying life and feeling fully engaged (Weiss & Cropanzo, 1996). High PA individuals tend to be extroverted, outgoing, and energetic (Watson, Clark, MacIntyre, & Hamaker, 1992). Not surprisingly, these individuals also display more social behavior (Watson et al., 1988) as PA has been linked to extroversion (Watson et al., 1992). Individuals high in PA also tend to be more satisfied with work and life in general as well as being sensitive to the frequency of rewards, suggesting they may orient towards the positive aspects of life (Watson et al., 1988).

Conversely, individuals high in negative affect (NA) are generally uncomfortable or otherwise orient towards life’s negative aspects (Watson & Clark, 1984). NA reflects the extent to which people experience “a general dimension of subjective distress and unpleasant engagement” that may take the form of many emotional states, “including anger, contempt, disgust, guilt, fear, and nervousness” (Watson et al., 1988:1063). People high in NA report more physical complaints (Schaubroeck, Ganster & Fox, 1992; Watson 1988a), as well as more stress (Brief et al., 1988; Schaubroeck, Ganster, & Fox, 1992; Watson 1988b). These findings indicate that “high NA individuals may view their lives as a series of stresses or hassles, regardless of what actually happens to them” (Watson, 1988b: 1028).

Employee Productivity
Employee productivity is the amount of goods and services that a worker produces in a given amount of time. Employee productivity is referred to as labour productivity because it was originally studied only
with respect to the work of labourers as opposed to managers or professionals (Scarth, 2002). According to Mathis and John (2003), productivity is a measure of the quantity and quality of work done, considering the cost of the resources used. The more productive an organization, the better its competitive advantage, because the costs to produce its goods and services are lower. Better productivity does not necessarily mean more is produced; perhaps fewer people (or less money or time) was used to produce the same amount. McNamara (2003) further states that, results are usually the final and specific outputs desired from the employee. Results are often expressed as products or services for an internal or external customer, but not always. They may be in terms of financial accomplishments, impact on a community; and so whose results are expressed in terms of cost, quality, quantity or time. He further notes that measuring productivity involves determining the length of time that an average worker needs to generate a given level of production. You can also observe the amount of time that a group of employees spends on certain activities such as production, travel, or idle time spent waiting for materials or replacing broken equipment. The method can determine whether the employees are spending too much time away from production on other aspects of the job that can be controlled by the business.

Employee productivity may be hard to measure, but it has a direct bearing on a company's profits. An employer fills his staff with productivity in mind and can get a handle on a worker's capabilities during the initial job interview. However, there are several factors on the job that help maximize what an employee does on the job (Lake, 2000). Brady (2000) state that, perhaps none of the resources used for productivity in organizations are so closely scrutinized as the human resources. Many of the activities undertaken in an HR System are designed to affect individual or organizational productivity. Pay, appraisal systems, training, selection, job design and compensation are HR activities directly concerned with productivity.

**Measures of Employee Productivity**

**Timeliness**

Timeliness measures whether a unit of work was done correctly and on time, given that time is the most crucial resource to be considered in the performance of any activity. Time determines the imperative of any other resources in accomplishing organizational set out objectives and goals (Ugwulashi, 2011). It is an essential resource every manager needs to achieve the goals and objectives of an organization (Adeojo, 2012). Time, according to Nwaiwu (2000), is the interval between the beginning and the end of an operation. It is so delicate that it cannot be saved but can only be spent and once misused it can never be regained. Time is an immaterial resource, inelastic, scarce and erodes fast and once spent, cannot be won back, stored or recalled for use (Kalu, 2012). It is an essential resource; it's irrecoverable, limited and dynamic. Irrecoverable because every minute spent is gone forever, limited because only 24 hours exist in a day and dynamic because it is never static (Adeojo, 2012). Managing time appropriately leads to achieving results easily with limited resources. Consequently, any productive system, whatever its structure, human, technology or financial support requires efficient and effective time management procedure. Consequently, Mullins (1999) refers time as one of the most valuable, but limited resources and it is important that administrators utilize time to the maximum advantage. For not realizing time as a scarce resource most employee run out of time before expected result is achieved and this negatively affect their productivity level.

Maduagwu and Nwogu (2006) notes that, every activity is allocated some frames within which an activity is to be accomplished within factory floor. Timeliness is also important for effective inspection
and supervision in the academic workplace in bringing the much needed quality. Effective time process ensures unambiguous objectives, proactive planning, well defined priorities and actions; participatory and successful delegation of activities. Nevertheless, time is continuum and all activities or roles performance depend on it whether voluntary or involuntary in avoiding conflicts. According to Hisrich and Peters (2002), time is a unique quantity an entrepreneur (manager) cannot store it, rent it, and buy it. Everything requires it and it passes at the same rate for everyone. Time management involves investing time to determine what one wants out of his activities. Effective time management is the investment of time in such a way that optimal result is gotten from activities consuming a specific time quantity. Time management hinges on the principle that it is more important to do the right things than to do things right. The ability to choose between the important and the unimportant and be persistent on the correctly chosen sequence is the key determinant of effectiveness in time management.

**Task Accomplishment**

Task accomplishment is a measure of an employee’s productivity and involves their contribution to overall organizational productivity and effectiveness, it refers to actions that are part of the formal reward system and addresses the prescription as indicated in the descriptions of the role (Williams & Karau, 1991). It shows the level or the extent an employee achieves a given target. In general, task accomplishment comprises of activities that translates the organizations policies, missions and resources into tangible and intangible goods produced by the organization and to enable efficient operation of the organization (Motowidlo et al., 1997). Thus, task accomplishment covers the fulfilment of the requirements that are part of the agreement between the employee and the organisation. Borman and Motowidlo (1993) pointed out that task accomplishment is the effectiveness and efficiency with which job incumbents perform activities that contribute to the organization’s technical core and assist in moulding the psychological state of the organization (Borman & Motowidlo, 1993). They further suggested that in accomplishing a given task there are two aspects to it, which are interpersonal facilitation and job dedication. Interpersonal facilitation includes cooperative and helpful acts that help the effectiveness of co-employee. While job dedication includes self-disciplined and motivation to support organizational objectives and goals (Van Scotter & Motowidlo, 1996).

**Innovativeness**

Innovativeness of entrepreneurs is measured by the propensity by which they innovate their business (Miller & Friesen, 1982); their willingness to try new ways which are different from the existing; the enthusiasm to adopt new ideas or new methods to their business operation; and the eagerness to implement the innovation strategy in their business (Khandwalla, 1987). Innovativeness reflects a firm’s tendency to engage in and support new ideas, novelty, experimentation and creative processes (Lumpkin & Dess, 1996) that may result in new products, services, or technological processes and which may take the organization to a new paradigm of success (Swiezczek & Ha, 2003). It also implies seeking creative, extraordinary or strange solutions to problems and needs. Schumpeter (1934) considered entrepreneurship to be essentially a creative activity and entrepreneur as an innovator who carries out new combinations in the field of men, money, material, machine and management. According to him, an entrepreneur is an economic man who tries to maximize his profits by making innovations in any one of the following fields: (1) new products; (2) new production methods; (3) new markets; or (4) new forms of organization. The degree of an entrepreneur’s innovativeness will decide how far and how deep the innovation will go in business in order to meet both the strategic goal formulated for
the business and the requirements from the environment (Hult, Hurley & Knight, 2004). Innovativeness represents a basic willingness to depart from existing technologies or practices and venture beyond the current state-of-the-art (Covin, Green & Slevin, 2006). An innovative strategic posture can be linked to firm performance as it increases the chances that a firm will realize first mover advantage, stay ahead of their competitors, gain a competitive advantage and capitalize on emerging market opportunities that lead to improved financial results (Hult et al., 2004; and Kreiser & Davis, 2010).

**Relationship between Affective Job Satisfaction and Employee Productivity**

The demand for skilled, trained and qualified employees is on the increase as it is a major determinant of an organisation’s competitive advantage. The output and productivity of an organization is measured in terms of the performance of its workforce (Currall. Towler, Judge and Kohn, 2005). Also, better performance of the workforce is a product of the level of satisfaction employees derive from the job set (Sousa-Poza & Sousa-Poza, 2000). Nanda and Brown (2015) investigated the importance of employee performance indicators at the point of hiring and concluded that the level of job satisfaction and motivation affects the employee’s productivity. They further found that high performing employees demand attractive packages from their employers. Sumita, (2004) pointed out that low level of job satisfaction adversely affects on the employee commitment and sequentially effect the achievement of organizational objectives and performance (Meyer, 1999).

In a more current review of the literature Judge, Thoresen, Bono and Patton (2001) provided the most comprehensive assessment of the literature to date. They reviewed the literature on job satisfaction and job performance in an effort to evaluate the state of the literature and to identify possible gaps or weaknesses in previous studies. The results of their meta-analysis enabled a categorization of the studies into seven models illustrating the proposed relationships between job satisfaction and job performance. Judge et al. noted that the findings from the first six models exposed results that were contradictory and conflicting. In an earlier, frequently cited meta-analysis performed by Iaffaldano and Muchinsky (1985). The findings by Judge et al. supported Iaffaldano and Muchinsky’s (1985) contention that the empirical substantiation for the satisfaction-performance relationship does not support the general perceptions “that we logically or intuitively think should interrelate. In the meta-analysis performed by Judge et al. the relationship of interest was between job satisfaction and job performance. As noted, the link between the two variables was weak. Job satisfaction has, however, been shown to have a stronger relationship with other variables such as firm performance.

Research has shown the link between job satisfaction and job performance to be weak. However, researchers have demonstrated a much stronger relationship between job satisfaction and firm performance. In a conceptual discussion of why loyal employees and customers improve the bottom line (financial performance), Brooks (2000) noted that conditions that support high internal customer service predict high customer satisfaction. Internal customer service refers to how employees are treated in the organization and how they treat each other in work-related situations. Those employees who feel they are treated well and receive high levels of customer service from other personnel and departments are less likely to leave the organization. Consequently, companies with low employee turnover and high customer loyalty have larger profits. The conclusion suggests, then, that there are direct, quantifiable links between employee (and customer) variables and financial results.
From the foregoing point of view, we hereby hypothesized thus:

H$_{01}$: There is no significant relationship between affective job satisfaction and timeliness of manufacturing firms in Port Harcourt

H$_{02}$: There is no significant relationship between affective job satisfaction and task accomplishments of manufacturing firms in Port Harcourt

H$_{03}$: There is no significant relationship between affective job satisfaction and innovativeness of manufacturing firms in Port Harcourt.

**METHODOLOGY**

The researcher adopted the cross-sectional survey. The target population of this study was fifty (50) manufacturing companies registered with the Rivers State Ministry of Commerce and Industry, the assessable population was seven (7) selected manufacturing companies in Port Harcourt. The population for the study is two hundred and fifty-three (253) employees, obtained from the human resource departments of the seven (7) selected companies were the sample frame. The sample size for the study was 155. The sampling technique applied in selecting a sample of 155 from a population of 253 in this study was the simple random technique in which every member has an equal chance of being selected.

**RESULTS**

**Bivariate Analysis**

Secondary data analysis was carried out using the Pearson’s Product Moment Correlation Coefficient (PPMCC) at a 95% confidence interval. Specifically, the tests cover a Ho1 hypothesis that was bivariate and declared in the null form. We have based on the statistic of Spearman Rank Order Correlation Coefficient to carry out the analysis. The level of significance 0.05 is adopted as a criterion for the probability of accepting the null hypothesis in (p>0.05) or rejecting the null hypothesis in (p<0.05).

**Table 1: Correlations for Affective Job Satisfaction and the Measures of Employee Productivity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affective job satisfaction</th>
<th>Timeliness</th>
<th>Task accomplishment</th>
<th>Innovativeness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spearman's rho</td>
<td>Affective job satisfaction</td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>.932**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.810**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeliness</td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>.932**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task accomplishment</td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>.878**</td>
<td>.810**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovativeness</td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>.947**</td>
<td>.899**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

*Source: Research Data 2019, (SPSS output version 23.0)*
Table 1 illustrates the test for the three previously postulated bivariate hypothetical statements. The results show that for

**Ho:** There is no significant relationship affective job satisfaction and timeliness in manufacturing firms in Port Harcourt

From the result in the table above, the correlation coefficient (rho) shows that there is a significant relationship between affective job satisfaction and timeliness. The correlation coefficient 0.932 confirms the magnitude and strength of this relationship and it is significant at p 0.000<0.01. The correlation coefficient represents a very high correlation indicative of a very strong relationship between the variables. Therefore, based on empirical findings the null hypothesis earlier stated is hereby rejected and the alternate upheld. Thus, there is a significant relationship between affective job satisfaction and timeliness in manufacturing firms in Port Harcourt.

**Ho:** There is no significant relationship affective job satisfaction and task accomplishment in manufacturing firms in Port Harcourt

From the result in the table above, the correlation coefficient (rho) shows that there is a significant relationship between affective job satisfaction and task accomplishment. The correlation coefficient 0.878 confirms the magnitude and strength of this relationship and it is significant at p 0.000<0.01. The correlation coefficient represents a very high correlation indicative of a very strong relationship between the variables. Therefore, based on empirical findings the null hypothesis earlier stated is hereby rejected and the alternate upheld. Thus, there is a significant relationship between affective job satisfaction and accomplishment in manufacturing firms in Port Harcourt.

**Ho:** There is no significant relationship affective job satisfaction and innovativeness in manufacturing firms in Port Harcourt

From the result in the table above, the correlation coefficient (rho) shows that there is a significant relationship between affective job satisfaction and innovativeness. The correlation coefficient 0.878 confirms the magnitude and strength of this relationship and it is significant at p 0.000<0.01. The correlation coefficient represents a very high correlation indicative of a very strong relationship between the variables. Therefore, based on empirical findings the null hypothesis earlier stated is hereby rejected and the alternate upheld. Thus, there is a significant relationship between affective job satisfaction and innovativeness in manufacturing firms in Port Harcourt.

**FINDINGS**

This study using descriptive and inferential statistical methods investigated the relationship between affective job satisfaction and employee productivity in manufacturing firm in Port Harcourt. The findings revealed a significant positive relationship between affective job satisfaction and employee productivity in manufacturing firm in Port Harcourt. Using the Spearman’s rank order correlation tool and at a 95% confidence interval. The findings of this study confirmed that affective job satisfaction have a positive effect on employee productivity of manufacturing firms in Port Harcourt. This further supports the argument of Watson et al., (1988), that individuals high in PA also tend to be more satisfied with work and life in general as well as being sensitive to the frequency of rewards, suggesting they may orient towards the positive aspects of life.

Also, our study corroborated with the findings of Watson & Clark (1984) who indicated that individuals high in negative affect (NA) are generally uncomfortable or otherwise orient towards life’s negative aspects (Watson & Clark, 1984). NA reflects the extent to which people experience “a general dimension of subjective distress and unpleasant engagement” that may take the form of many
emotional states, “including anger, contempt, disgust, guilt, fear, and nervousness” (Watson et al., 1988:1063). People high in NA report more physical complaints (Schaubroeck, Ganster, & Fox, 1992; Watson 1988a), as well as more stress (Brief et al., 1988; Schaubroeck, Ganster, & Fox, 1992; Watson 1988b). These findings indicate that “high NA individuals may view their lives as a series of stresses or hassles, regardless of what actually happens to them (Watson, 1988b).

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

From the findings the factors that were perceived to affect the job satisfaction included remuneration which the respondents were of the view that various allowances, commissions, pay and also bonuses according to the job that they do would increase or improve the level of job satisfaction. Training and development was also another factor perceived to affect employee job satisfaction since the respondents felt that if offered it would increase current and future skills and would also lead to increased knowledge both in their areas of expertise and in the dynamic technology. Work environment was another perceived factor of job satisfaction which the respondents referred to having favorable working hour, having job security, having positive organization politics, availability of working tools or machinery and also ensuring health and safety at work place. The study also established another perceived factor was opportunity for growth and promotion changes in pay, autonomy and supervision satisfaction. The study concludes that a significant relationship between affective job satisfaction and employee productivity.

Based on the discussion and conclusion above, the following recommendations are hereby made:

- Manufacturing firms should see increase/prompt payment as a motivation factor that can increase productivity in the organization.
- Manufacturing firms should use employee inputs as a criterion for promotion of workers, to encourage most of the hard working employee.
- Manufacturing firms should make the working environment conducive, so that the workers can see their working environment as their second home.
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