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Abstract: The study sought to investigate the effect of job satisfaction on employees’ productivity in selected oil and gas servicing companies in Lagos State, Nigeria. Despite the perception of the oil sector is the mainstream of income to foreign reserve, and generating highly satisfying source of employment to the populace, a steady decline in the performance of the sector has been observed, leading to the collapse of various oil and gas servicing companies, massive retrenchment of workers, non-payment of salaries, inflation, high cost of living, and high exchange rate. A cross-sectional survey of 421 employees was carried out using a validated instrument and achieved an 83% response rate. The findings showed that job satisfaction has a positive and significant effect on employees’ productivity of the selected oil and gas firms in Lagos state, Nigeria. The study therefore recommends that oil and gas firms must continue to strive to keep workers satisfied through improved pay, better working conditions, job security in order to enhance employees' productivity.
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I. Introduction

There has been a growing increase in the production and supply of oil by the United States which makes it hard to comprehend why the Nation’s oil sector is dwindling in productivity. In 2017, U.S. exports of refined products rose, supporting the “energy dominance” goal of the country. A critical look at the African’s continent with Nigeria as the giant having the largest growing economy due to the long list of oil producing countries in the continent and being a home to 8 percent of the world’s proven crude reserves, after middle east, Latin America and North America, one will naturally expect Africa to take the lead in shaping the global oil and gas industry but this is far from reality. The Nigerian experience since the discovery of oil in 1956 in Oloibiri in present day Bayelsa state is also worthy of note. Nigeria has one of the largest oil and gas industry, and its importance to the development of the nation is reflected in the fact that it is the cash cow of the nation’s economy, being responsible for over 89% of export earnings and about 80% of federal government revenue, it also accounted for generating more than 14% of its GDP, and about 65% of government budgetary revenues, in addition, it has created employment opportunities with attractive income boosting the satisfaction workers derive from their job and facilitating the development of the nation’s infrastructure and other industries (CBN Policy, 2017; Nworu, 2017).

In Nigeria, an estimated $8 billion is spent annually on servicing the industry operations, and this figure is projected to hit $15 billion within the next few years (CBN Policy, 2017; NNPC Annual Statistical Bulletin for 2014). Recent Studies (Adeoye, 2006; NNPC 2014) have shown that despite the massive amount of money expended in servicing the industry, there has been a steady decline of the sector in the country which is affecting the economy and has led to the collapse of various oil and gas servicing companies, massive retrenchment of workers in the private sectors, non-payment of salaries, inflation, high cost of living, less money going into the foreign reserve, and high exchange rate which has also affected the level of satisfaction employees derive from their job. A recent article published in April 2019 by Chatham House reveals that oil production remains lower than it was 15 years back as state owned refineries are operating at only a fraction of their capacity and Nigeria has struggled to remain competitive in the global market. Compounding matters, a price cap a de facto subsidy on petrol continues to drain public coffers as well as affects the finances of the state oil company and NNPC which invariably is seen to be causing a switch from the oil sector to another sector.

Ogunyemi, Akinlaja, Adesoye, Akindele, Azeez and Omolade (2015) attributed the decline in the performance of the oil and gas sector to the level of productivity of employees in the sector. Hamid, Maheen, Cheem and Yaseen (2017) also affirmed that employee productivity plays a crucial role in
organisational performance and has a direct effect on the economy of any nation. According to Buberwa (2015), when an employee feels satisfied with his/her job, he/she is motivated to put in more effort to perform better, which results in an increase in the overall performance of the organisation. When employees are not happy with their jobs, several areas of their work, including their productivity is affected (McFarlin, 2017). Fenton, Pinilla, Sing, Sadhra, and Carmichael (2014) reports that the satisfaction oil and gas workers get from their job is declining by the day as the pay, quality of work, leadership, safety, work-life balance, the job itself, relationship with co-workers and work environment is different from what it used to be and has continuously shown a downward trend from what it used to be a decade ago which invariably has affected the productivity level of employees. The question that bothers the mind is could the declining productivity be attributed to the dissatisfaction of employees on their job. It is against this back drop that this study sought to examine how job satisfaction affects the employees’ productivity of the selected oil and gas companies in Lagos State, Nigeria. The paper is structured in the following order introduction, literature review, materials and method, presentation of results and discussion of findings, conclusions and recommendations.

II. Literature Review

Diverse literature was reviewed to make a more robust understanding of the concepts and empirical works reviewed in this study.

Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction is a key determinant to increased productivity by employees at the workplace (Buberwa, 2015; McFarlin, 2017) It is a measure of workers' contentedness with their job and can be measured cognitively, affectively and behaviourally. Several scholars (Eragula, 2017; Hyz 2015; Awan & Asghar, 2014) have attempted defining job satisfaction and understanding its effect on performance. These authors see job satisfaction as an emotional reaction to a job that results from the incumbent’s comparison of actual outcomes with those that are expected. It was also clearly buttressed that what satisfies an employee may be a source of dissatisfier to another employee and what satisfies an employee today may not at another time. Similarly, Armstrong (2006), defined job satisfaction as the attitudes and feelings people have about their work. Job satisfaction also indicates how content an individual is towards his or her work. Although job satisfaction is usually described as an affective response, it is usually measured as an evaluative assessment of job attitudes compared to an individual’s internal or external standard (Fadlah, 2015).

More recently, Eragula (2017) affirmed that job satisfaction is a multidimensional psychological response to one’s job; which has evaluative, emotional and attitudinal components. Positive and favorable attitudes towards the job indicate job satisfaction, Negative and unfavorable attitude indicate dissatisfaction (Owusu, 2014). In addition to developing attitudes about their jobs as a whole, people can also develop an attitude towards various facets of their job for instance the kind of work they do, their co-workers, supervisors or subordinates and their pay (Awan & Asghar, 2014). Job satisfaction is a complex concept that means different things to different people and measuring it can be quite relative and difficult. It is usually linked with motivation, but it is not the same as motivation. Job satisfaction is more of an internal (attitude) state. It could be associated with a personal feeling of achievement which can be quantitative or qualitative (Hyz, 2015). Based on the confines of this work, job satisfaction is seen as a situation where a job is able to meet an employee’s expectation in terms of working environment, the pay quality and so on, which will show in his attitude towards work such as his attention to his job role, attention to details and ability to meet deadlines.

There are three methods by which Job satisfaction can be measured, single question measurement, a global measurement and facet measurement (Mitchell, Levine & Pozzebon, 2013). Under the single question measurement, only one question is asked as an indication of how satisfied an employee is at work. This type of measurement is commonly used in large surveys and requires respondents to answer on a scale. Under the global measurement, several questions or statements are provided relating to different aspects of the job and the results are combined to provide an overall score, as this method seeks to obtain a single score
representing the overall job satisfaction an employee has. In the Facet measurement method, there are various questions for the different areas/aspects of a job and one score is provided to represent each area covered (Mitchell et. al., 2013). Considering how job satisfaction impacts every employee and organisation across the globe, it is not surprising how much attention it has received in the research world. However, care has to be taken, as there are several ill-fitting definitions, measurements and theories which can harm our understanding of job satisfaction (Astrauskaite, Vaitkevicius, & Perminas, 2011).

It is generally accepted that Job satisfaction has to do with the way employees feel towards their job. However, while some researchers believe that all aspects of an employee’s job lead to motivation which results in job satisfaction, others believe that all aspects of an employee’s job in various proportions leads to motivation, some researchers believe that certain aspects of an employee’s work can lead to job satisfaction which affects the performance of an employee directly. From the above, job satisfaction is a measure of how contented an employee is with their job, it is the degree to which an employee likes his/her job and all aspects of it.

**Employee Productivity**

Employee productivity often referred to as workforce productivity is an assessment of the efficiency of workers in an organization (Atat, 2019). It could be perceived as value produced from inputs harnessed from work effectively carried out by employees in an organisation (Rouse, 2014). Ayesha (2017) defined productivity from an economist's point as the number of goods and services that an employee creates at any given time. Atat (2019) also defined employee productivity as the sum total of all value added to an organisation at a particular period based on resources or input made available, which is affected by various factors such as the level of commitment and engagement as well as the job satisfaction level of the employee. Yet, productivity may be evaluated based on the output of an employee within a specific time period. Usually, the productivity of a worker could be assessed relative to an established average from employees doing similar work (Lipman, 2013). Consideration for the productivity of the employee has become imperative, as much of the success of any organisation relies upon the value added by its workforce (Lipman, 2013).

De Silva and Thilakasiri (2014) posit that employee productivity is a measure employed at an individual-level based on the assumption that the overall productivity can be broken down into smaller units and ultimately to the individual employee in order to be used for instance for the purpose of benefit allocation or sanctions. According to Childs (2009), although many organisations have created performance measurement cultures, most of the efforts are often focused on reducing staff strength rather than improving. This approach could lead to an unhealthy working environment agog with negative, punitive, slash and burn approach and a feeling of “us against them” within the organization. This war-zone perception tends to have damaging consequences on the morale of the employees and even their performance, as such rather than inspiring improved productivity and customer service, a reverse trend is experienced (Child, 2009). Lipman (2013) explained that employee productivity is influenced by valued support which is perceived from varying views: equipment when existing is outdated or inefficient; emotional support in the face of (occasionally) unfair criticism; flexible support for a reasonable level of work-life balance.

For the employees, management support in times of need won’t be forgotten as it builds employee goodwill and loyalty (Atat, 2019). Also, management gains nothing when it withholds praise and recognition when it is warranted, as it has been confirmed that recognition is oftentimes a more powerful motivator than cash reward (Childs, 2009). Hence, developing and maintaining a consistent management approach that engenders esprit de corps is a key link in the productivity process (De Silva & Thilakasiri, 2014). The results of the study by Rahiman and Kodikal (2017), supports the connection between employee attitudes and employee productivity as employee performance was influenced by various dimensions of employee attitude: job satisfaction, job commitment, job involvement and perceived organisational support. Another study by Rolland and De-fruyt (2003) observed that personality which is supportive of the affective event theory remains significant in engendering improved performance and productivity.
Job Satisfaction and Employee Productivity

The affective event theory (Weiss & Cropanzano, 1996) anchored the discourse which revealed the influence of job satisfaction on employee productivity. The theory does not only explain the interaction between employee attitudes such as job satisfaction, but also stresses the need for sensitive comprehension of emotions, views and responses of the employees. The theory suggests that behaviours exhibited by employees’ could be attributed to their moods, and perceptions. Hence, the feeling of appreciation and recognition felt by an employee is more likely to urge an attitude of increased commitment to the organization. Furthermore, impliedly the commitment is attributable to the perceived level of job satisfaction and organisational support, which influences an incremental output of the performance by the employees. However, a reverse situation occurs where an employee feels otherwise treated, thereby impacting on the employee’s performance.

Several scholarly investigations have been carried out studies on how employee productivity is affected by the satisfaction such employees derive from their job across various sectors and countries. The work of Fadlalah (2015) showed that job satisfaction had a significant impact on employee performance in the faculty of science and humanity studies of the university surveyed, as most faculty members showed high satisfaction levels with their jobs and strongly agree that with better work conditions, pay, promotion and work relationships, there is higher job satisfaction and better performance as staff show willingness to accept more responsibilities within the college. Similarly, Awan and Asghar (2014) carried out a study on ten banks in Muzaffargarh District in Pakistan found that employees performed better when they were satisfied with the different aspects of their job. The research suggested that there was a direct relationship between job satisfaction and employee productivity, and most employees performed better when they had higher levels of satisfaction on the job. This discovery also aligns with the work of Singh and Jain (2013) carried out in the drug industry and discovered a level of job satisfaction influenced the level of performance of an employee. Dimensions measured for job satisfaction included leadership, level of pay, perceived fairness of reward, social relationship, quality of working conditions, and the type of job. In the same vein, Hyz (2015) carried out a study on job satisfaction and productivity of Greek banking staff, the results concluded that job satisfaction is correlated with efficiency and commitment and is pivotal to employees’ work attitude which influences employee’s productivity as a service provider. Attributes such as remuneration, work conditions and hours, supervision style, company policies, job design, and demographic characteristics were all instrumental in determining the level of job satisfaction of an employee.

In a recent study carried out by Abuhashesh, Al-Dmour, and Masa’deh (2019) in the Jordanian industrial sector on contributing factors to job satisfaction and employees productivity enhancement, only salaries and position at work were significant indicators of job satisfaction as influencers of productivity. Other factors such as better work conditions, promotion, work relationships, reward fairness, leadership, the leader-follower relationship remained secondary considerations to the employees. However the study of Ezeamama (2019) carried out amongst employees in the University of Anambra State, Nigeria to investigate the relationship between job satisfaction and employee productivity showed a contrasting result to other studies (Abuhashesh, Al-Dmour, & Masa’deh, 2019; Awan & Asghar, 2014; Fadlalah, 2015; Hyz, 2015; Singh & Jain, 2013). The findings of the study showed that a very weak positive and insignificant relationship exists between job satisfaction and employee productivity which led the researcher to conclude that job satisfaction is not a contributor to the employee productivity in the public sector of Nigeria as opposed to other studies done in Nigeria by Anuar (2011), Adekola (2012) and Mbah and Ikemefuna (2012) who discovered that job satisfaction increases employee performance, reduces turnover rate and enhances employee commitment which invariably improves productivity. The discourse as to how job satisfaction enhances employees’ productivity has generated several academic and industrial debates as scholars have opposing views and findings on the issue even within the same environment which is part of the reason necessitating this study.

III. Material And Methods

Cross sectional survey research design was used for the study due to appropriateness for comparing different variables at the same time and its unique relevance in the description of events (Asikhia, 2018; Rahiman &
Kodikal, 2017). The study was targeted at a population of 2030 workers in the four selected oil and gas servicing companies in Lagos State, Nigeria. The four oil and gas servicing companies were selected based on their continuous and uninterrupted operations in the last 10 years, as well as their known capability for training and servicing of offshore and onshore platforms. The staff numbers originated from the audit and HR unit of the selected organisations as at December, 2018 financial year-end. With the aid of Rao-software sample size calculator, a sample size of 421 determined, after making provision for the attrition rate. The proportionate stratified sampling technique was used in the selection of the sample size as shown in the Table 1:

Table 1: Population and Sample Size selection.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/n</th>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Total population size per company</th>
<th>Proportionate Sample Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>PACE Limited</td>
<td>693</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Falck Safety Services</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>West Atlantic Energy Ltd</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Prime Atlantic Global Instrument Ltd</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2030</td>
<td>421</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Audit and HR unit of the selected organisations (Dec, 2018); Researcher’s computation (2018)

A standardized research instrument for this study was adapted (Mitchell, Levine & Pozzebon, 2013; Perrin, 2016) and the reliability and validity were confirmed, after a pilot study was carried out as evidenced in Table 2. The results revealed that both constructs met the threshold criteria for each of the tests carried out.

Table 2: Reliability and Validity Results of the Adapted Research Instrument

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Cronbach Alpha</th>
<th>Average Extracted</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Composite Reliability</th>
<th>KMO &amp; Bartlett Test of Sphericity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>0.932</td>
<td>0.716</td>
<td>0.932</td>
<td>0.978 (0.000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Productivity</td>
<td>0.921</td>
<td>0.688</td>
<td>0.914</td>
<td>0.885 (0.000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision Threshold for confirmation</td>
<td>0.700</td>
<td>0.500</td>
<td>0.700</td>
<td>0.600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Researcher’s field survey (2019)

The study was carried out to confirm the proposition that was based on the following specified model:

\[ Y = f(X) \]

\[ EmP = f(JS) \text{ functional relationship} \]

\[ Y_i = \alpha_0 + \beta_1 X_i + \epsilon_i \text{ model equation} \]

\[ EmP_i = \alpha_0 + \beta_1 JS_i + \epsilon_i \text{ model equation} \]

Where:

- \( Y \) (EmP) = Employee Productivity
- \( X \) (JS) = Job satisfaction

The apriori expectation of the study is that job satisfaction should show a significant positive effect on employees’ productivity at \( p < 0.05 \).

IV. Result Presentation, Analysis and Discussion

A total of four hundred and twenty-one (421) copies of the questionnaire were administered, three hundred and fifty-one (351) were rightly filled, returned and considered usable, which represents an 83% response rate with distribution across the respective companies are as shown in Table 3.

Table 3: Questionnaire distribution among selected companies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/n</th>
<th>Selected Oil &amp; Gas Servicing Company</th>
<th>Number of Questionnaires Administered</th>
<th>Number of Questionnaires Retrieved</th>
<th>Percentage Retrieved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>PACE Limited</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>31.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Falck Safety Services</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>27.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>West Atlantic Energy Ltd</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Prime Atlantic Global Instrument Ltd</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>421</td>
<td>351</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey, 2019
The descriptive statistics on the responses to question items under Job Satisfaction are as presented in Table 4.

**Table 4: Descriptive Statistics on Job Satisfaction**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Items on Job Satisfaction</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion opportunities</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fringe Benefits</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job security</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work environment</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.97</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.98</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey, 2019

Of the 351 respondents, a mean of 3.99 shows that respondents’ rate of satisfaction with pay in the organisation is moderately high with a standard deviation of 1.17. Also, in an attempt to give an opinion about promotion opportunities, a mean of 3.58 revealed that promotion opportunities in the organisations are moderately high with a standard deviation of 1.29. Furthermore, respondents’ responses on fringe benefits showed a mean of 3.61 which implies that respondents’ rate of satisfaction with fringe benefit is moderately high with a standard deviation of 1.26. A mean value of 4.30 for the question on job security shows that respondents’ rate of satisfaction with job security is moderately high with a standard deviation of 1.10. Finally, respondents’ responses to the work environment clearly reveal respondents’ rate of satisfaction with the work environment is moderately high with a mean value of 4.36 and a standard deviation of 1.10. A grand mean of 3.97 indicates that on average, respondents’ rate of satisfaction with all the items that measured job satisfaction is moderately high (shown by the high scale responses) and a standard deviation of 0.98 revealing the level of convergence around the mean.

**Table 5: Descriptive Statistics on Employee Productivity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Items on Employee Productivity</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meeting set targets</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting set deadlines</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error count on the job</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive customer feedback</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of work based on management feedback</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GRAND</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.95</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.80</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey, 2019

Table 5 shows the descriptive statistics on the responses to question items under employee productivity. From the 351 respondents, a mean of 4.44 revealed that respondents’ ability to meet set targets is moderately high with a standard deviation of 1.13. Also, on meeting set deadlines, a mean of 4.40 shows that on average, the respondent’s ability to meet set deadlines is moderately high with a standard deviation of 1.14. Likewise, responses gathered from respondents on error count on the job show a mean of 2.63 which implies that respondents’ error count on the job is moderately low with a standard deviation of 1.21. A mean of 4.11 was observed as regards the level of positive customer feedback for the respondents’ confirming a moderately high disposition, with a standard deviation of 1.20. Lastly, the respondents converged at a mean of 4.17 and implying that on average, respondents’ rate of management feedback is moderately high, with a standard deviation of 1.15. In all, a grand mean of 3.95 shows that respondents’ level of productivity is moderately high as regards all the items put together to assert employee productivity with a standard deviation of 0.80 showing a convergence towards the mean.

A careful analysis of the result displayed in Tables 3 and 4, reveals a similar trend of increase is observed in job satisfaction and employee productivity with their grand mean as 3.97 and 3.95 respectively. The result shows that there is high pay, promotion opportunities, fringe benefits, job security, work environment making it possible to determine job satisfaction in the selected oil and gas servicing companies in Lagos.
State Nigeria. Also, it further shows that meeting set targets, meeting set deadlines, error count on the job, positive customer feedback, quality of work based on management feedback are high in these selected oil and gas servicing companies. These findings show that there is a likelihood of job satisfaction affecting employee productivity.

The inferential statistics were carried on the collected data, using simple linear regression analysis, to confirm the hypothesis of the study which states thus:

**H₀:** Job satisfaction has no significant effect on employee productivity in selected oil and gas servicing companies in Lagos State, Nigeria.

The results are as revealed in Table 6:

**Table 6: Simple Regression revealed the effect of Job Satisfaction on Employee Productivity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model One</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (Constant)</td>
<td>2.552</td>
<td>0.162</td>
<td></td>
<td>15.803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>0.352</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td>0.431</td>
<td>8.291</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Employee Productivity
b. R = 0.431               R² = 0.186         F(1, 349)   = 79.50   P<0.05

Source: Researcher’s Study, 2019

The result as stated in table 5 shows that job satisfaction has a positive and significant effect on employee productivity in selected oil and gas servicing companies in Lagos State, Nigeria. (β = .352, t = 8.291, p<0.05) which satisfies the apriori expectation. The R value of 0.431 supports this result as it reveals that job satisfaction has a weak but positive relationship with employee productivity. Also, a variation of 18.6% that occurs in employee productivity is attributed to job satisfaction of the selected oil and gas servicing companies in Lagos State, Nigeria at R² = 0.186, while the remaining 81.4% changes that occur are accounted for by other variables not considered in the model. The simple regression model is thus expressed as:

\[ EmP_i = 2.552 + 0.352JS_i + \epsilon_i \]

Where:

- EmP = Employee Productivity
- JS = Job Satisfaction

The regression model shows that when job satisfaction is held at constant zero, employee productivity would be 2.552 implying that irrespective of the level of satisfaction experienced by employees, there will still be a level of productivity as shown by the positive constant value. The results of the simple regression analysis indicate that when job satisfaction is improved by one unit employee’s productivity will be positively affected by an increase of 0.352unit.

**Discussion**

The result suggests that job satisfaction is an important determinant of employee’s productivity of the selected oil and gas servicing companies in Lagos State, Nigeria. The F[1,349]-statistics shows the fitness of the model as the value which is (F(1, 349) =79.50  P<0.05) suggests that the job satisfaction significantly explained variations in employee productivity. The result also shows a high level of statistical significance which leads to the rejection of the null hypothesis (H₀) which states Job satisfaction has no significant effect on employee productivity in selected oil and gas servicing companies in Lagos State, Nigeria. This result of this study is supported by several previous research carried out by different scholars such as Abuhashesh, Al-Dmour, and Masa’deh (2019), Adekola (2012), Anuar (2011), Awan and Asghar (2014), Fadalalh (2015), Hyz (2015), Khan, Nawaz, Aleem and Hamed (2012), Mbah and Ikemefuna (2012), Singh and Jain (2013) on the subject matter. Though the findings of Ezeamama (2019) negated the findings of this study showing job satisfaction having a very weak and insignificant relationship with employees’ performance this could be attributed to the study area, cultural dispositions or methodological approach. The area of coverage for Ezeamama’s (2019) study was a public university with very weak motivation to foster satisfaction to start with let alone engendering optimal performance.
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V. Conclusion
The study investigated the effect of job satisfaction on employees’ productivity of selected oil and gas servicing companies in Lagos State, Nigeria. The results of the surveyed analysis showed that job satisfaction significantly affects employees’ productivity giving credence to several scholarly works carried out on the subject matter. The study concludes that job satisfaction is a major determinant for employees’ productivity and as such managers of oil and gas servicing companies in Lagos state and others along the same value chain should seek to provide enabling environment in terms of pay, working conditions, job security, promotion opportunities as to enhance a greater level of fulfillment and satisfaction on the job which invariably will boost workers’ productivity. The study recommends that management of oil and gas servicing companies should focus on improving promotion opportunities, benefits, work environments and ensuring job security of employees in their organisations to improve employee’s level of performance. For the advancement of this study, further researches should adopt an experimental or longitudinal research design (i.e. creating scenarios for each of the variables of job satisfiers). This would help in drawing a better conclusion as the environment can be controlled and future researchers would be able to observe any differences in employee productivity as it relates to different satisfiers.
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