Role of job satisfaction components on organizational productivity (case study of Pegah Fars Co)
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Abstract: The present study aims to investigate the role of job satisfaction components on organizational productivity (Case study of Pegah Fars Co). The population includes 40 employees working in human resources management and finance and accounting departments of Pegah Fars milk. In this study, simple random sampling is used for sampling. About 15 percent of the statistical community has been selected as the sample size and operation of these samples was taken. In the present study Smith, Kendall and Halin job satisfaction questionnaire and Hersey and Blanchard and Goldsmith productivity questionnaire were used. Research method has been applied and to identify the relationship between the independent variable and the dependent variable, the Pearson correlation coefficient was used and to rank each of the independent variables in research in terms of importance and impact on the dependent variable, Friedman ANOVA test was used. In this study, a main hypothesis and five sub-hypotheses were formulated, the results showed that in 95%, reliability, value of Sig = 0.004 and the Pearson correlation coefficient for the test is 0.472, so there is a relationship between job satisfaction components and organizational efficiency.
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1. Introduction

Job satisfaction is a person’s general attitude about work. He, who has a high level of job satisfaction, has a positive attitude towards his/her job. Anyone who is not satisfied with his job has a negative attitude towards the job (Robbins, 1943). According to many experts, job satisfaction is one of the most challenging organizational concepts and it is basis for many of management policies to increase organization productivity and efficiency (Homan, 2005). Today productivity and efficiency have the most precious place for managers and all are seeking greater efficiency and their efforts are formed in this direction to guarantee organizational stability in today's competitive world. New achievements in management science, considers achieving high performance in organizations due to human resource development (Asadi, 2001).

Human resources play an important role in promoting community affairs and I is considered as the most effective basis for economic, social and cultural developments. Human is the most important organization capital. If we remove the human factor, what remains includes facilities such as buildings, machinery and equipment, materials, etc. which in itself is not usable and will have no value. The human gives spirit to objects and uses them to improve and develop his/her life. Human is the largest and most valuable asset of an organization that is never reflected in balance sheet and profit and loss statements while organization profitability is by humans and humans are the backbone of success. So the human factor should be treated with dignity and respect because there has been excessive time spent in educating specialist and committed human to reach peak efficiency after years of planning. In case of withdrawal from the organization, they are not easily replaceable, and loss of them in a short time has great disservice to the organization. In other words, a powerful and efficient manpower supply is limited and time consuming, and requires enormous cost and time and energy. In this paper, an overview of efficiency and job satisfaction concepts, relationship between job satisfaction and organizational efficiency and their role in achieving the goals of this study is studied.

2. Research literature

2.1. Job satisfaction

Job satisfaction is one of the most important aspects of people's attitudes that due to the large impact on organizational behavior are very important. Job satisfaction is one of the major issues in organizations and the management of any organization is looking to increase its employees' job satisfaction. Today the managers must act in a way that people in the organization are satisfied with their job to be able to do the things according to the organization's desire (Zare, 2009).
Shertz (1992) considers job satisfaction as loving the tasks required of the job, conditions a job is done in and reward they receive for it. When there is an equality and balance between a person inputs and outputs and also s/he feels equality in comparison with others s/he can be satisfied with her/his job. Inputs include variables such as education affairs, his experience, personal qualities, skills and specific awareness and outputs include factors such as salary, feeling the job value, benefits, gratitude and etc (Kalinberg, 1977).

2.2. Factors affecting job satisfaction

Kelly (1979) studied the five aspects of the job, including:
1- Nature of the work: how the job provides interesting tasks, opportunities to learn and possibility of accepting responsibility for a person.
2- Opportunities for promotion: advancement opportunities and chances in the organizational hierarchy.
3- Payments: bonus and advantages that a person receives and how a person considers his salary fair in comparison with other employees.
4- Monitoring and control: the ability of the supervisor to provide support and technical assistance.

In Robbins’ opinion, most of the factors that lead to job satisfaction include:
Challenging headwork: people prefer works to have the opportunity to use their skills and abilities.
Fair rewards: Employees are seeking modern, bright and fair promotion policies.
Workplace conditions: Personal comfort, safety and security and other facilities to do the work including adequate and appropriate work tools.
Cooperation: work provides social relationships for more workers. Having a supportive peer group and friends will increase job satisfaction.

Given that the main aim of each organization is to achieve optimum efficiency, in this regard, the organization should provide circumstances to employees considering their mental health that the operator of each operates with satisfaction and without fear and uses all his potential, behavioral cognitive ability, and to achieve this goal the sense of productivity should be considered. In other words, organizations need reliable manners through the use of reliable methods of testing and selection of staff, selecting effective ways of teaching staff and the use of appropriate methods to assess staff, knowing good practices in their motivation, improving internal and external communication systems of organization, founding and maintaining the Mental Health Systems in the organization including efforts to reduce stress work, raise productivity and efficiency beliefs and encouraging employees to participate in programs to provide incentives to increase the productivity of individuals, groups and organizations significantly (Izadi, 2007).

Promoting productivity is one of the factors affecting organizations improvement that in this regard, several factors can play a role. Considering the importance of the human factor in organizations is a matter of high priority. Knowing factors affecting employee efficiency can help administrators to increase staff productivity and finally organizational efficiency by managing these factors (Taheri, 2001).

Job training programs, educational programs separated from work, job enrichment and developing scope of work, quality of work life and ... are examples of efficiency human ware skills. Using these techniques directly affects efficiency and by influencing the realm and software factors (modifying some procedures) and sometimes hardware (changing the working tools) would increase productivity. The most direct impact on improving productivity is done through affecting the human ware realm factors of organizations. It should be noted that, in practice, generally hardware changes that can be done to improve productivity require software or human ware changes (Geblin, 1986).

A lot of competition among organizations has led the managers and supervisors of these organizations to welcome each opportunity that leads to their progress. In the past 25 years there has been a tremendous emphasis on productivity so it has been tried to remove most of restrictions for employees in order to achieve greater efficiency.

In this respect staff job satisfaction and to getting them more interested in their job and fulfilling organizational goals is important specifically. If their causes for lack of job satisfaction are specified, to improve the working conditions as well as satisfying them more, there can be given a more substantial effort. Because when a man is satisfied with his job unconsciously he does his responsibility more carefully and so he will be happy. Companies and managers are evaluated on the basis of profitability. So the ways to increase productivity is always of interest to everyone. The productivity increase is important because by reducing productivity, the level of people's lives, decreases; furthermore, if this trend continues, the current generation's life will be worse than the previous generation. In short we can say that, considering the quality of work life and productivity normally means emphasize the ways by which the organization will be changed to increase employees’ productivity and job satisfaction, to increase involvement in work and improve their performance and reduce stress, turnover and absenteeism.

One of the surest signs of decay of an organization is low employment of its employees. In its most sinister forms, little job satisfaction originates groups without permission, absence, reducing work and replacing staff. Job dissatisfaction can lead to some complaints, poor performance, poor commodity, disciplinary problems, and other problems (Mousavi, 2009). The importance and the need to assess the efficiency of employees in the organization are due to the fact that the human resource factor has a major role in achieving the organization's goals.
3. Theories of job satisfaction

3.1. Maslow's hierarchy of needs theory

This theory was presented by Abraham Maslow (1978). According to this theory, one of the main reasons to join people to the organization is that many of their needs will be satisfied in the organization. So he assumed that there are five categories within every human being including:

1. Physiological needs which include hunger, thirst, shelter and other physical needs.
2. Security that includes security and privacy against physical and emotional threats.
3. Social needs which includes, affection, devotion and friendship.
4. Respect, that is divided to two parts, external, internal; internal respect includes self-respect, autonomy and progress and external respect includes occupational status, reputation and attention.
5. Self-actualization: in which a person tries to be what he has its talent; it includes such things as growth and achieve in things that person has the talent to achieving them potentially and he is Self-actualized (Kate and New Estarem, 1676)

Using the hierarchy of needs theory, for descriptions people at work it can be said when the security and salaries and benefits are low for staff, their attention is more focused on that aspect of the job that it can satisfy their much lower need (hunger, safety -). But when the situation gets better, supervisor behavior and their relationship with persons under their supervision is more important and finally, when working environment has a full recovery, the role of the supervisor becomes pale and again the nature of work is important. But at this stage satisfying the person needs to individual self-actualization leads to importance of work not basic needs fulfilling.

If the biological needs of the employees in an organization, such as an adequate salary, lounge, air conditioning and heat supply have been fulfilled, security needs of employees can be improved through the continuing work, to establish a complaints system, establish appropriate insurance systems and pension. Most of emotional needs of employees are satisfied through family ties and membership in groups inside and outside environment. For example, the friendly relationship of staff at work is the basis of their social interaction and can play an important role in satisfying staff social needs. The organization manager can satisfy this need by fostering a sense of dependence between the employees. Simultaneously management must be careful that family problems and lack of group acceptance not to affect its performance negatively (Rio, 1966).

3.2. Equity theory

The idea of equality states that Adams (1965) has derived the theory from social comparison principle. Organization members and staff don't work in a vacuum. They are always comparing themselves with others. In equity theory it is said that the person deals with calculating the input data and output data. If it concludes that the proportion belongs to him equals people proportion who compare themselves with him, then he has job satisfaction and required motivation to that job, then he feels inequality and concludes that the organization has not treated fairly with him. This feeling created tension for him and stimulate him to work less. The stronger feeling makes his motivation stronger to reduce organizations’ activities. Therefore, based on equity theory, the source of motivation is feelings of tension that the perception experienced through perceptions of inequality. One of the results of feeling inequality that is created due to low pay in people is that their dissatisfaction with their jobs increases, thus the number of absences and turnover are increased.

3.3. Alderfer theory (ERG)

Professor Lekiton Alderfer studied Maslow's theory rejection to relate it more closely with the empirical research. He called this (A.R.G) theory. In fact this theory is restored from Maslow's theory. Alderfer theory has three levels: biological, dependence and growth.

Each need consists of two parts:
1-Goal that directs needs.
2-Processes that satisfies needs.

Alderfer divided Maslow's quintet into two groups and showed that:
1-At any time, more than one need may be active.
2-If one of high-level needs fails to be satisfied, desire to satisfy the lower level needs will be escalated (Kuntz et al., 2002).

3.4. Expectation theory

One of the most accepted theory is expectation theory by Victor Verdom that is about motivation, in principle, in expectation theory it argues that the tendency to behave or act in a certain direction depends on the expectation that its outcome is determined and the outcome is of interest the agent.

It is composed of three variables:
1-The importance: the importance placed on the potential outcome or reward that comes with the job. In this process satisfied requirements are considered.
2-The relationship between performance and reward: amount, or range of person belief, based on the fact that a certain level of job would have accepted outcome or reward.
3-The relationship between effort and performance: in the individual's perspective, it is the amount of effort or endeavor that is likely to come to a certain performance.

The motivation for doing a job (trying) depends on his beliefs, that to what extent doing and succession in job may be possible and if that person
achieve high objective (performance) will he receive the appropriate reward? And if this award is planned to be given by an organization can it meet individual objectives and satisfy him?

Therefore the expectation theory lies in understanding individual targets and identifying the relationship between effort and performance, the performance and reward and ultimately between the reward and supplying the person target (Howard Beck, 1995).

3.5. Ginzberg theory

Ginzberg and colleagues (1951) have considered the job satisfaction from various views and they refer to two types of job satisfaction.

1-Inner satisfaction: that comes from two types of sources. Firstly joy that a man will have by work activities secondly the pleasure is resulted from seeing the progress or doing some social responsibilities and the emergence of the human person abilities.

2-Extrinsic satisfaction: That is related to the conditions of employment and work environment and is changing every moment. Extrinsic satisfaction factors include: work environment, wages and bonuses and the relationship between worker and employer.

3.6. X and Y theory

This theory was proposed by Douglas Mc Gregor. In this theory Mac Gregor by pointing dual nature of man, states that Managers’ behavior towards his subordinates is formed based on a series of assumptions. In X theory, that has a negative view of human some hypotheses are there such as they are mostly lazy creatures and in every opportunity they try to shirk their responsibility, they don’t have creativity and initiative and strict control is required for them. In Y theory that has a positive vision to the human, such assumptions are discussed: most of them are interested in doing their job, they are responsible at their works and they develop necessary creativity and initiatives at their jobs. Managers who use X theory to guide their staff usually consider money as the most important trigger factor in staff and in their opinion satisfying their physiological and safety needs is adequate. Managers who use Y theory to guide their staff usually believe in motivate staff at the social level, respect and self-seeking, giving them adequate opportunity to have their way and by exercising self-control practices, properly perform the duties (Locke, 1996).

4. Ways to improve productivity

In situations where the use of certain inputs, the quality or quantity of output is improved, productivity increases as well as to produce the same output, thereby reducing the amount of resources used, there will be productivity growth. So the key factors in improving the efficiency include inputs and outputs. The most important data includes the manpower data, capital, technology and energy. Employing people in the right place, causing work motivation, increasing technical, educational knowledge level, experience and proper work planning, increase manpower efficiency and productivity growth. The use of appropriate technology, appropriateness in designing and choosing machinery, timely service, accurate repair and maintenance of machinery and investigation and control for energy are effective in efficiency improvements.

Rational use of capital, reducing the additional costs involved in producing the proper planning in consuming asset and timely developing, increasing the quantity and quality of output, reducing waste of production, saving time and labor management policy lead to increase productivity and efficiency (Vumak and James, 1985).

5. Research hypothesis

5.1. The main hypothesis

There is a significant relationship between job satisfaction and organizational efficiency.

5.2. Sub-hypothesis

1-There is a significant relationship between nature of work and organizational efficiency.
2-There is a significant relationship between supervisor and organizational efficiency.
3- There is a significant relationship between co-workers and organizational efficiency.
4-There is a significant relationship between system upgrading and organizational efficiency.
5-There is a significant relationship between salary and organizational efficiency.

6. Research method

The present study theoretically and practically is an applied study seeking to resolve an issue or problem and in terms of the type it is a descriptive research aimed at describing the situation or phenomenon under investigation.

The population includes 40 employees working in human resources management and finance and accounting departments of Pegah Fars milk. In this study, simple random sampling is used for sampling. About 15 percent of the statistical community has been selected as the sample size and operation of these samples was taken. In the present study Smith, Kendall and Halin job satisfaction questionnaire and Hersey and Blanchard and Goldsmith productivity questionnaire were used that was prepared in 1994 including 32 questions (Moghimi, 2007)

To identify the relationship between the independent variable and the dependent variable,
the Pearson correlation coefficient was used and to rank each of the independent variables in research in terms of importance and impact on the dependent variable, Friedman ANOVA test was used.

7. Analysis of the data

7.1. The first sub-hypothesis

There is no significant relationship between the nature of work and organizational efficiency. H0: $\rho = 0$

There is a significant relationship between the nature of work and organizational efficiency. H1: $\rho \neq 0$

Table 1: Results of Pearson correlation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pearson test</th>
<th>Nature of work</th>
<th>Correlation coefficient Sign</th>
<th>Supervisor</th>
<th>Organizational efficiency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.438</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>Correlation coefficient Sign</td>
<td>0.438</td>
<td>0.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td>Correlation coefficient Sign</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.438</td>
<td>Correlation coefficient Sign</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>Correlation coefficient Sign</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td>Correlation coefficient Sign</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By doing the test at 95% confidence level, the Sig = 0.008 was obtained; because Sig<0.05, therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected and the opposite hypothesis will be accepted. In respondents' views, there is no significant relationship between nature of work and organizational efficiency, and since the Pearson correlation coefficient is 0.438 for the test, the type of relationship is direct. Thus, the first sub hypothesis of present study is confirmed at 95% confidence level.

7.2. The second sub-hypothesis

There is no significant relationship between supervisor and organizational efficiency, H0: $\rho = 0$

There is a significant relationship between supervisor and organizational efficiency, H0: $\rho \neq 0$

Table 2: Results of Pearson correlation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pearson test</th>
<th>Supervisor</th>
<th>Correlation coefficient Sign</th>
<th>Supervisor</th>
<th>Organizational efficiency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.297</td>
<td>0.084</td>
<td>Correlation coefficient Sign</td>
<td>0.297</td>
<td>0.084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td>Correlation coefficient Sign</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.297</td>
<td>Correlation coefficient Sign</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.084</td>
<td>Correlation coefficient Sign</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td>Correlation coefficient Sign</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By doing the test at 95% confidence level, the Sig = 0.084 was obtained; because Sig>0.05, therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted and the other hypothesis will be rejected. In respondents' views, there is no significant relationship between supervisor and organizational efficiency, and since the Pearson correlation coefficient is 0.084 for the test, the type of relationship is direct. Thus, the first sub hypothesis of present study is not confirmed at 95% confidence level.

7.3. The third sub-hypothesis

There is no significant relationship between colleagues and organizational efficiency, H0: $\rho = 0$

There is a significant relationship between colleagues and organizational efficiency, H0: $\rho \neq 0$

Table 3: Results of Pearson correlation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pearson test</th>
<th>Colleagues</th>
<th>Correlation coefficient Sign</th>
<th>Colleagues</th>
<th>Organizational efficiency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.187</td>
<td>0.282</td>
<td>Correlation coefficient Sign</td>
<td>0.187</td>
<td>0.282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td>Correlation coefficient Sign</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.187</td>
<td>Correlation coefficient Sign</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.282</td>
<td>Correlation coefficient Sign</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td>Correlation coefficient Sign</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By doing the test at 95% confidence level, the Sig = 0.084 was obtained; because Sig>0.05, therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted and the other hypothesis will be rejected. In respondents' views, there is no significant relationship between colleagues and organizational efficiency, and since the Pearson correlation coefficient is 0.087 for the test, the type of relationship is direct. Thus, the first sub hypothesis of present study is not confirmed at 95% confidence level.

7.4. The forth sub-hypothesis
There is no significant relationship between system upgrading and organizational efficiency, H0: ρ = 0

There is a significant relationship between system upgrading and organizational efficiency, H0: ρ ≠ 0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4: Results of Pearson correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>organizational efficiency</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By doing the test at 95% confidence level, the Sig = 0.000 was obtained; because Sig<0.05 therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected and the opposite hypothesis will be accepted. In respondents’ views, there is a significant relationship between system upgrading and organizational efficiency, and since the Pearson correlation coefficient is 0.641 for the test, the type of relationship is direct. Thus, the first sub-hypothesis of present study is confirmed at 95% confidence level.

7.5. The fifth sub-hypothesis

There is no significant relationship between salary and organizational efficiency, H0: ρ = 0

There is a significant relationship between salary and organizational efficiency, H0: ρ ≠ 0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5: Results of Pearson correlation for the fifth sub-hypothesis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>organizational efficiency</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By doing the test at 95% confidence level, the Sig = 0.110 was obtained; because Sig>0.05 therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected and the opposite hypothesis will be accepted. In respondents’ views, there is no significant relationship between salary and organizational efficiency, emotional self-awareness and empowerment of employees and since the Pearson correlation coefficient is 0.275 for the test, the type of relationship is direct. Thus, the fifth sub-hypothesis of present study is not confirmed at 95% confidence level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6: Results of Pearson correlation for the main hypothesis of the research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>job satisfaction</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By doing the test at 95% confidence level, the Sig = 0.004 was obtained; because Sig<0.05 therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected and the opposite hypothesis will be accepted. In respondents’ views, there is a significant relationship between job satisfaction and organizational efficiency, and since the Pearson correlation coefficient is 0.472 for the test, the type of relationship is direct. Thus, the first sub-hypothesis of present study is confirmed at 95% confidence level.

8. Conclusions and recommendations

1-In the first hypothesis by doing the test at 95% confidence level, the Sig = 0.008 was obtained; because Sig<0.05 therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected and the opposite hypothesis will be accepted. In respondents’ views, there is a significant relationship between nature of work and organizational efficiency, and since the Pearson correlation coefficient is 0.438 for the test, the type of relationship is direct. Thus, the first sub-hypothesis of present study is confirmed at 95% confidence level.

2-In second hypothesis by doing the test at 95% confidence level, the Sig = 0.084 was obtained;
because $\text{Sig}>0.05$, therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted and the opposite hypothesis will be rejected. In respondents' views, there is no significant relationship between supervisor and organizational efficiency, and since the Pearson correlation coefficient is 0.275 for the test, the type of relationship is direct. Thus, the first sub-hypothesis of present study is not confirmed at 95% confidence level.

3-In the third hypothesis by doing the test at 95% confidence level, the $\text{Sig} = 0.282$ was obtained; because $\text{Sig}>0.05$, therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted and the other hypothesis will be rejected. In respondents' views, there is no significant relationship between colleagues and organizational efficiency, and since the Pearson correlation coefficient is 0.187 for the test, the type of relationship is direct. Thus, the first sub-hypothesis of present study is confirmed at 95% confidence level.

4-In the fourth hypothesis by doing the test at 95% confidence level, the $\text{Sig} = 0.000$ was obtained; because $\text{Sig}<0.05$ therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected and the opposite hypothesis will be accepted. In respondents' views, there is a significant relationship between system upgrading and organizational efficiency, and since the Pearson correlation coefficient is 0.641 for the test, the type of relationship is direct. Thus, the first sub-hypothesis of present study is confirmed at 95% confidence level.

5-In the fifth hypothesis by doing the test at 95% confidence level, the $\text{Sig} = 0.110$ was obtained; because $\text{Sig}>0.05$ therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected and the opposite hypothesis will be accepted. In respondents' views, there is no significant relationship between salary and organizational efficiency, and since the Pearson correlation coefficient is 0.472 for the test, the type of relationship is direct. Thus, the first sub-hypothesis of present study is confirmed at 95% confidence level.

By doing the test at 95% confidence level, the $\text{Sig} = 0.004$ was obtained; because $\text{Sig}=0.05$ therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected and the opposite hypothesis will be accepted. In respondents' views, there is a significant relationship between job satisfaction and organizational efficiency, and since the Pearson correlation coefficient is 0.472 for the test, the type of relationship is direct. Thus, the first sub-hypothesis of present study is confirmed at 95% confidence level.
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