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ABSTRACT
This study investigated the effect of job satisfaction on employee productivity in Small and Medium Enterprises using selected bakeries in Anambra State as case study. It adopted survey design. Data were mainly from primary source using structured questionnaire developed on five point likert scale. The population of the study was 986 and complete enumeration was adopted. 750 copies of the questionnaire distributed were correctly filled, returned and used for the analysis. Four hypotheses were tested with ordinary least square (OLS) regression. The R-Squared which is the co-efficient of determination tested the explanatory power of the independent variables in the regression model and was 0.330802 indicating that about 33% of changes in employee productivity can be explained by changes in the predictor variables of job satisfaction. The f-statistics measures the overall significance of the explanatory variables in the model. The calculated value of the f-statistics was 6.372001; its probability value was 0.000048 which is less than 0.05 which showed that there is significant effect between the variables. It was observed that ORGCOM had the highest positive significant contribution to employee productivity because any increase in it will cause a significant increase in employee productivity. ORGSTR was positively insignificant at 5% level. TALDEV and REWREC were negatively insignificant at 5%. The result showed that three out of the predictor variables- talent development, reward and recognition and organisational structure were insignificant to employee productivity while organisational commitment was positively significant. It is recommended that organisations should constantly improve on those three predictor variables with insignificant relationship to employee productivity and effectively explore organisational commitment as a major variable for employee productivity

BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY
Sustainable competitive advantage requires satisfaction of employees for retention to the knowledge base of organizations which is often implicit and hard to transmit between employees. Globally competitive firms rely on such employees because organizational productivity depends on satisfied employees who are more creative, innovative and change positively with time and market
conditions. Employee satisfaction is becoming more challenging for organisations due to several factors. Employers’ need for strategic effort directed at satisfying current employees is now more urgent than ever to improve retention rates and decrease the associated costs of high turnover which is a huge problem for many organizations (Odembo, 2013). The labor market is growing and changing rapidly requiring organizations to adapt to these changes to make them more profitable. Young (2006) explains that firms face the challenge of employees’ turnover because the average worker changes jobs several times between ages of 18 and 37 continuously. Odembo, (2013) confirms that employees change jobs frequently and do not have the firms’ loyalty that existed some years ago when valued employees were hired. Loyalty to employers is also fading thereby compelling firms to raise productivity by managing employee talents better. The hunt for talents has become more competitive as globalization creates demands and opportunities for most employees.

**STATEMENT OF PROBLEM**

Research is equivocal regarding the influence of job satisfaction in organisations. Odembo (2013) observed that lack of empirical evidence exists to indicate that pay alone improves worker satisfaction or reduces dissatisfaction. Khan and Aleem (2014) state that highly paid employees may still be dissatisfied if they do not like the nature of their job and feel they cannot enter a more satisfying job. These contrasting views indicate that there is need for more research in the field of job satisfaction and organizational productivity. This study sets out to investigate the effect of job satisfaction on employee productivity.

**OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY**

The main objective of the study is to investigate the effect of job satisfaction on employees’ productivity in the private sector. The specific objectives are to investigate the effect of talent development on employee productivity, ascertain how reward and recognition influence employee productivity. It is expected to determine how organizational structure enhances employee productivity, and finally to verify how organizational commitment changes employee productivity.

**RESEARCH QUESTIONS**

The study is based on the following research questions:

1. How has talent development affected employee productivity?
2. To what extent do reward and recognition influence employee productivity?
3. How has organizational structure enhanced employee productivity?
4. How does organizational commitment change employee productivity?
RESEARCH HYPOTHESES

1. There is insignificant positive relationship between talent development and employees productivity
2. There is insignificant positive relationship between reward and employees productivity
3. There is insignificant positive relationship between organizational structure and employees’ productivity
4. There is insignificant positive relationship between organizational commitment and employees’ productivity

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

This study will be of great use to the investors, shareholders, managers, Governments and academia and the general public by expanding their knowledge on the predictor variables and employees’ productivity

SCOPE OF THE STUDY

It covers the factors revolving around reward, talent development, organizational structure, and organizational commitment as major variables of job satisfaction that affect employees’ productivity

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE; CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

Employee Productivity Management: Employees productivity management is a process of establishing a shared workforce understanding about what should be achieved at organizational level. It is about aligning the organizational objectives with the employees' agreed measures, skills, competency requirements, development plans and the delivery of results. The emphasis is on improvement, learning and development in order to achieve the overall business strategy and to create a high performance workforce.

Job satisfaction is an attitude which is affective or emotional response toward various facets of one’s job. A person with a high level of job satisfaction holds positive attitudes towards his or her job, while a person who is dissatisfied with his or her job holds negative attitudes about the job. Odembo, (2013) states that it is a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one’s job or job experience. Job satisfaction is also defined as reintegration of effects produced by individual's perception of fulfillment of his needs in relation to his work and the surrounding (Okeke, 2010). Khan and Aleem (2014) pointed out that job satisfaction represents a complex assemblage of cognition, emotion and tendencies. From the above definitions, it is clear that job satisfaction is an unobservable variable. Therefore, there is no definite way of measuring job satisfaction. Employee satisfaction is increasing in importance, as the competition for talent is high and still growing.
THEORETICAL REVIEW

This work is anchored on Hertzberg’s Two Factor theory which determines what employees actually want from their jobs. The respondents described work situations in which they felt good (satisfied) or bad (dissatisfied) in their jobs. The feedback was categorized into satisfaction or dissatisfaction. The characteristics of job satisfaction include advancement, recognition, the work itself, achievement, growth and responsibilities which Hertzberg referred as motivators and those related to dissatisfaction; include working conditions, supervision, interpersonal relationships, company policy and administration referred to as “hygiene factors” (Odembo, 2013). Herzberg’s two-factor theory is an important frame of reference for managers who want to gain an understanding of job satisfaction and related job performance issues. The theory is a useful reminder that there are two important aspects of all jobs: what people do in terms of job tasks (job content), and the work setting in which they do it (job context). Managers should attempt to always eliminate poor hygiene sources of job dissatisfaction in the workplace and ensure building satisfier factors into job content to maximize opportunities for job satisfaction. The theory is relevant and significant to this study in that it recognizes that employees have two categories of needs that operate in them and that both should be addressed. This theory therefore helps in establishing determinants of employees’ satisfaction.

EMPIRICAL REVIEW

On Reward and Recognition for Employee Performance  

Sajuyigbe; Olaoye and Adeyemi (2013) studied impact of reward on employees’ performance in selected manufacturing companies in Ibadan, using survey design was SPSS V16 Regression and discovered that Reward dimensions jointly predict employees’ performance 

Ali (2010) investigated the impact of reward and recognition on job satisfaction and motivation: an empirical study from Pakistan with survey design correlation. Findings indicated that reward and recognition have great impact on motivation and satisfaction 

Akafo, and Agyekum (2015) studied Impact of Reward and Recognition on Job Satisfaction and Motivation using descriptive Survey design. Rewards had positive impact on work motivation but not significant with job satisfaction. Muthoni and Mwangi (2014) studied effect of employee rewards and recognition on job performance in Kenya’s public sector through descriptive survey design. It was observed that organizational support and growth opportunities foster learning and employee competence  

On Talent and Development for Employee Performance Naser, Hassan and Mohammad (2014) carried out study on The effect of implementation of talent management on job satisfaction of governmental organizations using descriptive survey design Kolmogorov - Smirnov one-sample, Paired-sample sign test SPSS. Findings showed that all variables of talent management had positive and significant relationship with job satisfaction. Elahinejad and Gholami (2014) analysed the relationship between talent management and job satisfaction and loyalty among employees of institute for the intellectual development of children and young adults with descriptive survey design. SPSS findings revealed that there is significant effect between talents variables and job satisfaction and loyalty. Amiri; Jandaghi; Akhavan; Seyed and Sabokro-Mehdi (2014) studied Talent Development in light of satisfaction and career success with survey design and discovered that Intrinsic rewards are a mediating variable in employee retention while employee satisfaction is more important than career success to retention Nasrin and Abdolrezagholizadeh (2015) studied The relationship between talent management and job satisfaction of Insurance employees with SEM and LISREL software and found that There is positive relationship between employee tendency and positively with organizational efficiency Karuri and Nahashon (2015) studied effect of talent management on employee outcomes using survey design and SPSS V.20 Regression. Findings revealed that employee outcomes viz teamwork, job satisfaction and employee engagement) were significantly influenced by talent attraction, retention, employee training and career management

On Organisational Structure for Employee Performance Olajide (2015) investigated the effects of organizational structure on job satisfaction in the Nigerian financial sector with descriptive survey design. It was discovered that there is a significant relationship between organizational structure and components of job satisfaction. Manar (2014) studied Impact of organizational structure on organizational commitment: A comparison of public and private sector firms in Jordan with survey design and found out that all structure dimensions were related to organizational commitment in both sectors, except hierarchy of authority and position did not moderate the relationship

On Organisational Commitment for Employee Performance Çiğdem and Belgin (2014) studied the role of career development Programs in organizations and organizational commitment on Job Satisfaction of Employees using survey design. It was discovered that career development programs and organizational commitment had a partial effect on employee’s job satisfaction; organizational commitment affects job satisfaction directly and positively. Career development programs did not affect the level of employee’s job satisfaction Igbaekemen and Idowu (2014) studied the impact of organizational commitment on employees productivity: A case study of Nigeria brewery with narration and found out that organisational commitment to employee and support maximize the
benefit from employee and increase productivity Dixit and Bhati (2012) studied employee commitment and its impact on sustained productivity in Indian auto-component industry using survey design. Findings indicated that employee commitment (Affective, Normative, continuous) are significantly related to sustained productivity. Anam; Muhammad, and Rab (2015) investigated employee loyalty and organizational commitment in Pakistani organizations industry using survey design. Findings revealed that there is a positive and significant impact of organizational commitment on employee loyalty. Folorunso, Adewale, and Abodunde, (2014) studied effect of organizational commitment dimensions on employees performance using survey design. Pearson product moment correlation coefficients and multiple regressions were used to analyse the data. Findings indicated that organizational commitment dimensions jointly and independently influence employees’ performance. Odembo (2013) studied job satisfaction and employee performance within the telecommunication industry in Kenya with descriptive research survey and SPSS with regression. Findings indicated that talent development variables were positively significant with employee satisfaction. Muhammad; Mushtaq; Muhammad; Momal; Amber and Hummayoun (2013) investigated impact of employee’s job satisfaction on organizational performance with survey design. Findings indicated that there is positive correlation between job satisfaction and organizational performance. Al-Jamnal; Al-Khasawneh and Hamadat, (2015) studied the impact of the delegation of authority on employees' performance at great Irbid municipality with survey design means, standard deviation, T-test were applied. Findings indicated that there is a statically significant relationship between delegation of authority and efficiency, effectiveness and empowerment of employees' performance. Afaq; Sardar; Raja; Mohsin and Moazzam (2016) studied impact of training and development of employees on employee performance through job satisfaction with survey design. The result indicated positive impact of training and development and job satisfaction with performance.

**Gap in literature** Research has shown many variables of job satisfaction and those which are foremost in determining employee satisfaction. Sajuyigbe; Olaoye and Adeyemi (2013) discovered that Reward dimensions jointly predict employees’ performance Çiğdem and Belgin (2014) discovered that career development programs and organizational commitment had a partial effect on employee’s job satisfaction; while organizational commitment affects job satisfaction directly and positively. Career development programs did not affect the level of employee’s job satisfaction. Manar (2014) found out that all structure dimensions were related to organizational commitment except hierarchy of authority and position did not moderate the relationship. Dixit and Bhati (2012) indicated that employee commitment (Affective, Normative, continuous) are significantly related to
sustained productivity. Folorunso, Adewale, and Abodunde, (2014) indicated that organizational commitment dimensions jointly and independently influence employees’ performance. Conflicting findings from each variable establishes the gap which this study attempts to fill by combining them to determine the degree of effect derived from each variable. This study identifies reward dimensions, career development dimensions, structure dimensions, and organizational commitment dimensions as foremost variables for it analyses and contribution to knowledge since no previous study had jointly used them.

**METHOD**

Descriptive survey design was employed to determine the relationship between the dependent and the independent variables and to establish any association between these variables. Specifically correlation matrix and multiple regression analysis were used because the methods allow researchers to collect qualitative data which can be analyzed quantitatively using inferential statistics. The population of the study was 986 comprising the entire employees of the ten selected bakeries as obtained from their individual company’s payroll. Blessed Goodwill Awka 150; Our Lady’s bread Onitsha 175; Iruka Bread Onitsha 110 Ngozi Bread Awka 100; High life bakery, Agulu 75; Goodwill Bread Onitsha 85; Oxford Bread Industry Onitsha 104; Ejidike Brad Agulu 56; Tasty Tom Bread Onitsha 85 Favour Bread Awka 46; Total is **986**. Out of the total copies of the questionnaire distributed, 750 were correctly filled, returned and used. **Source:**

Since the entire population is less than One thousand (1000), the study adopted complete enumeration technique to use the entire population. The data were primary data and were collected through direct questionnaire administration which was designed on five point likert scale. Out of the **986 copies** of the questionnaire distributed, **750** were correctly filled, returned, and used. The validity was done relative to content and its face value. The reliability was done by test and re-test method. The Ordinary Least Square regression technique was adopted to analyze the data.

**REGRESSION**

**Model Specification please see appendix**

The model to be regressed in this study is presented in a relational form as follows:

Employee Productivity = f (Job Satisfaction)

Empopro = f (taldev, rewrec, orgstr, and orgcom)

With the linear expression of the model being:

$EMPPRO = \beta_0 + \beta_1 TALDEV + \beta_2 REWREC + \beta_3 ORGSTR + \beta_4 ORGCOM + \mu$

Where $\beta_0$ is constant and $\beta_1 - \beta_4$ are parameters to be estimated.

The apriori expectation is to follow the line of $\beta_1 - \beta_4 > 0$ $EMPPRO = \text{Employee Productivity}$.
TALDEV = Talent development  REWREC = Reward and recognition  ORGSTR = Organizational Structure  
ORGCOM = Organizational Commitment  \( \mu \) = error term

Data Presentation and Analysis

Ordinary least square was used as statistical tool for the analysis.

### Descriptive Stat

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EMPPRO</th>
<th>TALDEV</th>
<th>REWREC</th>
<th>ORGSTR</th>
<th>ORGCOM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean</strong></td>
<td>3.080000</td>
<td>2.726667</td>
<td>2.893333</td>
<td>2.786667</td>
<td>3.270667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Median</strong></td>
<td>3.000000</td>
<td>3.000000</td>
<td>3.000000</td>
<td>3.000000</td>
<td>3.000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maximum</strong></td>
<td>5.000000</td>
<td>4.000000</td>
<td>5.000000</td>
<td>5.000000</td>
<td>5.000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minimum</strong></td>
<td>1.000000</td>
<td>1.000000</td>
<td>1.000000</td>
<td>1.000000</td>
<td>1.000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Std. Dev.</strong></td>
<td>0.845312</td>
<td>0.610289</td>
<td>1.174647</td>
<td>0.826680</td>
<td>1.092550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Skewness</strong></td>
<td>0.046821</td>
<td>-0.546217</td>
<td>0.400297</td>
<td>0.370982</td>
<td>-0.200630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kurtosis</strong></td>
<td>2.756199</td>
<td>3.548050</td>
<td>2.251678</td>
<td>4.17842</td>
<td>2.417028</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Jarque-Bera</th>
<th>Probability</th>
<th>Sum</th>
<th>Sum Sq. Dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>EMPPRO</strong></td>
<td>2.131493</td>
<td>0.344471</td>
<td>2310.000</td>
<td>535.2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TALDEV</strong></td>
<td>46.68038</td>
<td>0.000000</td>
<td>2045.000</td>
<td>278.9667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REWREC</strong></td>
<td>37.52926</td>
<td>0.000000</td>
<td>2170.000</td>
<td>1033.467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ORGSTR</strong></td>
<td>56.25259</td>
<td>0.000000</td>
<td>2090.000</td>
<td>511.8667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ORGCOM</strong></td>
<td>15.65206</td>
<td>0.000399</td>
<td>2453.000</td>
<td>894.0547</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Observations** | 750 | 750 | 750 | 750 | 750 |

Table shows the descriptive statistics of the variables for the study. It presents the standard deviation, mean, median, maximum and minimum values of the data set obtained from the questionnaire. Employee productivity showed a maximum value of 5 and a minimum value of 1 with a mean value of 3.08 and standard deviation of 0.8. The talent and development maximum value is 4 while the minimum value is 1. The mean obtained from the computation gave 2.72 with a standard deviation of 0.61. The reward and recognition showed a maximum value of 5 and a minimum value of 1 with a mean value of 2.89 and standard deviation of 1.17. Organisational structure has a maximum value of 5 and a minimum value of 1. The mean value obtained was 2.72 with a standard deviation of 0.82. The organisational commitment maximum value is 5 and a minimum value of 1. The mean value obtained was 3.27 with a standard deviation of 1.09. The median for all the variables is 3.
Correlation Matrix Result

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>emppro</th>
<th>rewrec</th>
<th>taldev</th>
<th>orgstr</th>
<th>orgcom</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>emppro</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>-0.0317</td>
<td>-0.0197</td>
<td>-0.0061</td>
<td>0.1789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rewrec</td>
<td>-0.0317</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.0226</td>
<td>0.0604</td>
<td>-0.0430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>taldev</td>
<td>-0.0197</td>
<td>0.0226</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.3209</td>
<td>0.0050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>orgstr</td>
<td>-0.0061</td>
<td>0.0604</td>
<td>0.3209</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>-0.0409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>orgcom</td>
<td>0.1789</td>
<td>-0.0430</td>
<td>0.0050</td>
<td>-0.0409</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the above Correlation matrix table, the dependent variable is negatively correlated with rewrec, taldev and orgstr while it is positively correlated with orgcom. Rewrec has positive correlation with taldev and orgstr while it has negative correlation with emppro and orgcom. Taldev has positive correlation with other variables except dependent variable. Orgstr was negatively correlated with emppro and orgcom and positively correlated with rewrec, taldev and orgstr. Orgcom has positive correlation with emppro and taldev and negative correlation with rewrec and orgstr.

Test for Multicollinearity

The term multicollinearity is due to Ragnar Frisch. Originally it meant the existence of a “perfect” or exact, linear relationship among some or all explanatory variables of a regression model. The tests were carried out using correlation matrix. According to Barry and Feldman (1985) criteria; “Multicollinearity is not a problem if correlation coefficient does not exceeds 0.80”. It was observed that there is no problem of Multicollinearity on the variables because none of the variables exceeds 80% as Barry and Feldman 1985 noted.

Dependent Variable: EMPPRO
Method: Least Squares
Date: 01/11/17   Time: 11:32
Sample: 1 750
Included observations: 750
White heteroskedasticity-consistent standard errors & covariance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>t-Statistic</th>
<th>Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>2.737836</td>
<td>0.197663</td>
<td>13.85106</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REWREC</td>
<td>-0.017375</td>
<td>0.025925</td>
<td>-0.670205</td>
<td>0.5029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TALDEV</td>
<td>-0.032212</td>
<td>0.055571</td>
<td>-0.579665</td>
<td>0.5623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORGSTR</td>
<td>0.010339</td>
<td>0.040389</td>
<td>0.255983</td>
<td>0.7980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORGCOM</td>
<td>0.138032</td>
<td>0.028408</td>
<td>4.858893</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R-squared 0.330802 Mean dependent var 3.080000
Adjusted R-squared 0.278891 S.D. dependent var 0.845312
S.E. of regression 0.833441 Akaike info criterion 2.480138
Sum squared resid 517.4954 Schwarz criterion 2.510938
Log likelihood -925.0517 Hannan-Quinn crit. 2.492006
F-statistic 6.372001 Durbin-Watson stat 1.694880
Prob (F-statistic) 0.000048 Wald F-statistic 6.092499
Prob (Wald F-statistic) 0.000079

Interpretation of Result

The R-Squared which is the co-efficient of determination or measure of goodness of fit of the model, tests the explanatory power of the independent variables in any regression model. From our result $R^2$ is 0.330802 indicating that about 33% of changes in employee productivity can be explained (or accounted for) by changes in the predictor variables of job satisfaction leaving the remaining 67% to other variables outside the model as captured by the error term. However, the regression result as estimated is as follows:

$$Y = 13.8511 - 0.6702REWREC - 0.5797TALDEV + 0.2559ORGSTR + 4.8588ORGCOM$$

Where:

$Y$ = Employee Productivity (the dependent variable)

$X_{1,4}$ = Job Satisfaction (the independent variables)

The f-statistics measures the overall significance of the explanatory variables in the model. From our table 4.3 above the calculated value of the f-statistics is 6.372001, its probability value is 0.000048 which is less than 0.05. We accept and state that there is a significance relationship between the variables. This means that the parameter estimates are statistically significant in explaining the relationship in the dependent variable.
The t-statistics helps in measuring the individual contributions of independent variables to the dependent variable with the signs whether positive or negative. The P value determines the level of significance of the individual t values of the independent variables. It is observed from table above that ORGCOM has the highest positive significant contribution to employee productivity because as it increases employee productivity also increases. ORGSTR is positively insignificant at 5% level of significance. Then TALDEV and REWREC are negatively insignificant at 5%.

Test for autocorrelation is used to check for the appropriateness of the model for analysis. Any equation with Durbin-Watson less than or greater than values not approximately 2, is not acceptable. Unacceptable Durbin-Watson suggests that the analysis cannot be relied upon. Our model is free from the problem of autocorrelation because the Durbin Watson value is 1.694880 which is approximately 2.

Hypotheses Testing

The need to examine the relationship between the collected data and the stated hypothesis has called for this section. This result will be compared with the statistical criteria to see if the preconceived notion in this research work holds or not.

Ho1: There is no significant positive relationship between talent development and employees productivity.

From the result of test in table above, the value of t–test for talent and development is -0.579665 with a probability of 0.5623, which is greater than the desired level of significance (0.05). This shows that it is insignificant. We reject the alternative and accept the null hypothesis, that there is no significant positive relationship between talent development and employees productivity, it agrees with the work of Çiğdem and Belgin (2014) that career development programs had a partial effect on employee’s job satisfaction; while organizational commitment affects job satisfaction directly and positively. Career development programs did not affect the level of employee’s job satisfaction.

Ho2: There is no significant positive relationship between reward and recognition and employees productivity.

From the result of test in table above, the value of t–test for talent and development is -0.670205 with a probability of 0.5029, which is greater than the desired level of significance (0.05). This shows that it is insignificant. We reject the alternative and accept the null hypothesis, that there is no significant positive relationship between reward and recognition and employees productivity. It agrees with the work of Akafo, and Agyekum (2015) that rewards had positive impact on work motivation but not significant with job satisfaction.
There is no significant positive relationship between organisational structure and employees’ productivity.

From the result of test in table the value of t-test for talent and development is 0.255983 with a probability of 0.7980, which is greater than the desired level of significance (0.05). We reject the null and accept the alternative hypothesis, that there is positive but insignificant relationship between organisational structure and employees’ productivity

There is no significant positive relationship between organizational commitment and employees’ productivity.

From the result of test in table above, the value of t-test for organizational commitment is 4.858893 with a probability of 0.0000; which is less than the desired level of significance (0.05). We reject the null and accept alternative hypothesis, that there is significant positive relationship between organizational commitment and employees’ productivity

**SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION**

**Summary**
This study examined the effect of job satisfaction on employee productivity using ten selected bakeries as case study. Apart from the broad objective, specific objectives were the effect of Job satisfaction as reflected in talent and development, reward and recognition, organisational structure and organisational commitment. The study adopted survey design. Descriptive statistics and multiple regression analysis were used to verify the hypotheses set to guide the objectives of the study. All tests were carried out at 0.05 level. The results of correlation matrix coefficients indicated that all the independent variables have negative relationship with dependent variable except ORGCOM which is positively correlated. The matrix revealed also that positive relationships exist between the independent variables except ORGCOM which is negatively correlated with REWREC and ORGSTR The results of the multiple regression analysis showed that the model explained 33 percent of the variations in the dependent variable (employee productivity).

**Major findings from the study** revealed that

i. Job satisfaction with regard to talent and development does not have any strong effect on employee productivity because it is negatively insignificant

ii. It was also found that reward and recognition is negatively insignificant and do not contribute positively to employee productivity.

iii. The study equally revealed that organisational structure is positively insignificant. This entails that it contributes positively to the employee productivity but in small measure.
iv. The result also shows that organisational commitment is positively significant which means that any increase in organisational commitment will affect employee job satisfaction which then influences employee productivity very appreciably.

CONCLUSION

Based on the analysis and the findings from the analysis, it is quite modest to conclude that job satisfaction has significant effect on increasing employee productivity. The co-efficient of determination $R^2$ and $F$ value are within acceptable region. The $R^2$ shows that about 33 percent of systematic variations in employee productivity is explained by the predictor variables. The $F$ value is significant at 5 percent and its value compliments the coefficient of determination, $R^2$, to confirm the ‘goodness of fit’ of the model.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The study makes the following recommendations

i. The firms should improve on the development of employee talent,

ii. The firms should improve on reward and recognition of employees,

iii. The firms should constantly modify their organisational structure and

iv. The firms should continue to use organisational commitment as a tool for job satisfaction and employee productivity because it contributes more positively and increases employee productivity.
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