Evaluation of the relationship between Job Safety and Employee Productivity in Public and Private Organizations in Kampala, Uganda.

[1]Eleanor Kirahora Barongo, [2]Tom Mulegi and [1]Mary Tunde Nalubega

[1]Department of Development Peace and Conflict studies, College of Humanities and Social Sciences, Kampala International University.
[2]Department of Public Administration, College of Humanities and Social Sciences, Kampala International University.

ABSTRACT

This research assessed the relationship between job safety and employee productivity in public and private organizations in Kampala, Uganda. The objective of this research was achieved through descriptive, cross sectional and correlative survey designs. A study population of 484 was earmarked, from which a sample population of 219 respondents was derived using Slovene's Formula. Data was collected primarily using self-administered questionnaires (SAQs) and structured interviews. An extensive review of literature contributed a significant amount of secondary data. Findings from this research revealed a positive relationship between job safety and employee performances in public and private organizations (r=0.677) with (sig.0.000<0.05). Also, findings from this research showed a correlation between the two study variables; as job safety increases, employees productivity also increases. The r-value indicates that 67.7% of employee performance is influenced by job safety, implying that the remaining 23.3% of change in employee productivity could be explained by other factors other than Job safety. The study recommended that different stakeholders including government and non-governmental organizations need to put in place mechanisms to ensure that employees are protected from work. The government should also put in place laws aiming at protecting workers against health issues associated with work related Hazards.
Keywords: Job, safety, employee, productivity, public and private.

INTRODUCTION

There is an increasing and compelling evidence that providing a healthy and safe working environment has the potential to increase labour productivity and in turn increase business profits. [1, 2, 3], also refer to the argument of some commentators that productivity gains are often at the expense of workers' health and safety. Businesses typically strive to become more productive and in doing so are driving their workers to work longer, harder and with higher utilization often in extremely hazardous conditions, and only implement health and safety measures to keep compensation costs down [4, 5, 6]. As noted by [7, 8, 9] observes that while exposure to risks associated with machinery and manual labour are being reduced, other risks related to the increase in labour productivity are on the rise. [10,11,12,13], also suggest efforts to increase productivity through occupational safety and health can have contradictory results and point out the gaps in literature that while there is evidence that occupational injuries and illnesses impact on productivity losses, it is not clear whether or not reducing injuries and illnesses will automatically influence productivity gains [14,15,16].

Findings of another study [17], demonstrate that health and safety measures have a positive impact not only on safety and health performance, but also on company productivity. However, identifying and quantifying these effects is not always straightforward. In addition, although experience shows that in many cases proof of profitability can be given, it might be rather difficult in a certain number of cases to develop solid evidence. The authors also state although the literature survey was fairly

limited, research findings support the existence of an important link between a good working environment and the performance of a company. Thus, the quality of a working environment has a strong influence on productivity and profitability. The study also suggests that poor OSH performance can lead to a competitive disadvantage impairing the firm's status among stakeholders [18]. This is a motivating factor to company management to invest in OSH. The findings of the literature survey [19] were also supported by the collection of case studies. By making the link between health and safety and the performance of the company, the case studies demonstrate that OSH should no longer be seen as purely a cost, but also as an instrument to improve the overall performance of a company, meaning that OSH should be an integral parameter in general management. Therefore, investment in OSH becomes profitable. Investment of 1 euro in well-being at work produces 3 - 7 euros return [18, 19]. [17],in their study of ethical climates and workplace safety behaviour found that egoistic behaviour relates positively to injuries and negatively to safety in the workplace. They also discovered that benevolence and principled attributes relate negatively to injuries but positively to safety enhancing behaviour in the workplace. This suggests that the life style of an individual significantly affects safety and health in the workplace. [14, 18], state that employers are responsible for taking every reasonable precaution to ensure the health and safety of their workers. Regulations relating to safety representatives also include obligations regarding the establishment and operation of safety committees at the workplace. The overall objective of a safety committee is the promotion of co-operation between employers and employees in investigating, developing and carrying out measures to ensure the health and safety of the employees at work.

[17], identifies key functions of safety committees. These include: Studying trends in accidents, with the view to making suggestions for corrective actions, examining safety reports and making proposals for avoiding accidents, examining and discussing reports from safety representatives, making proposals for new or revised safety procedures, acting as a link between the organization and the enforcement agency (the health and safety inspectorate) and monitoring and evaluating the organization's safety policies, and making proposals for changes, it necessary. Today, employees expect their employers to provide work environments that are safe, secure and healthy. However, many employers once viewed accidents and occupational diseases as unavoidable byproducts of work. This idea may still be prevalent in many industrial settings in underdeveloped countries. Fortunately in most developed nations, this idea has been replaced with the concept of using prevention and control to minimize or eliminate risks in workplaces. But in many underdeveloped countries significant health, safety concerns exist in workplaces [16].

[20], stated that at the heart of safety management is an organizational commitment to a comprehensive safety effort. This effort should be coordinated from the top level of management to include all members of the organization. It should also be reflected in managerial actions. Employers can prevent some accidents by having machines, equipment and work areas so that workers who daydream periodically or who perform potentially dangerous jobs cannot injure themselves or others. Providing safety equipment and guards on machinery, installing emergency switches, installing adequate ventilation, installing emergency switches, installing safety rails, keeping aisles clear, lighting, heating and air conditioning can all help make work environment safer. Designing jobs properly requires consideration of physical setting of a job. The way the work space surrounding a job is utilized can influence the worker's performance of the job itself. Several factors that affect safety have been identified; including size of work area, kinds of materials used, sensory conditions, distance between work areas, and interference from noise and traffic flow. Designing safety policies and rules and disciplining violators are important

components of safety efforts. Frequently reinforcing the need for safe behavior and supplying feedback on positive safety practices also are effective in improving worker safety. Such efforts must involve employees, supervisors and managers.

Objective of the research

To establish the relationship between job safety and employee productivity in public and private organizations in Kampala, Uganda.

Research Questions

Are there differences in Job Safety and Employees' Productivity in Public and Private Organizations in Kampala, Uganda?

Geographical Scope

This study was confined to the Makerere University, Mukwano Industry, and National Organization of Teachers Association.

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

This study employed the descriptive Cross sectional and correlative survey design. It was descriptive study which is non-experimental. It describes the characteristics of a particular individual, or of a group.

Research Population

The target population of this study consisted of 484 respondents from Mukwano Industry, Makerere University, National Organization of teachers associations.

Sample Size

To get the sample size of 219 respondents; Mukwano Industry, Makerere University staffs, and national organization of teachers association were got from these sample categories.

Table 1: shows the respondents of the study with the following categories: The Sloven's formula is used to determine the minimum sample size

Table 1: Respondents of the Study

Category of Employees	Accessible Population	Sample Size	Sampling Method
Mukwano Industry	120	54	Simple Random
Makerere University Administrators	220	100	Simple Random
National Association of teachers	144	64	Simple Random
Total	**484**	**219**	

Source: Researcher (2014)

Table 1: the above shows the criteria for selection of the respondents

$$n = \frac{N}{1+Ne^2}$$

Where: n = sample size, N = accessible population size, e = margin of error.

$$n = \frac{484}{1+(484)0.05^2} \qquad n = 219$$

Sampling Procedures

The sampling technique in this research was simple random sampling. This is because, it is free from bias and therefore likely to led to valid observation and generalizations. If the sample is selected well, it would be a representative of the entire population.

Research Instruments

Questionnaire

A standardized self-administered questionnaire on job safety and employee productivity in public and private organizations in selected organizations in Kampala was used to determine the level of job safety and employee productivity. The scoring system of this questionnaire is as follows: strongly agree (4); agree (3); disagree (2); strongly disagree (1). The

questionnaire was divided into three parts or section, where the first section contained items on demographic characteristics of respondents, second section contained items on determining the level of employee productivity. The researcher also used an interview guide to have a clear cut understanding of the variables.

Interviews

Interviews offered a rich source of data [8] interview guide was used to explore on the job safety and employees' productivity among public and private Organizations in Kampala. It gave a platform for illiterate respondents who were part of the target population to express their views. This instrument was selected because offered trust and understanding with respondents and data was collected using a Semi-structured interview guide which contained an open ended questions. The researcher was able to elicit information relating to their category of employment. In this case, Mukwano industry employees, Makerere University administrators and National Association of teachers enabled researcher to access non formal information and it provided to transit to formal to establish the different job safety and employee productivity among public and private organizations in Kampala. It helped the researcher to attain for information in the interview carried out.

Validity and Reliability of the Instruments Reliability

To test for reliability, Cronbach's Alpha was used. The researcher measured internal consistence by using Cronbach's Alpha. The results from the measure of reliability are shown in table 2 below.

Table 2: Reliability statistics of different constructs of the questionnaire

Constructs	Number of items	Cronbach's Alpha
Electronic Safety	4	0.721
Fire Safety	6	0.846
Hazardous materials	7	0.884
Sanitation	4	0.761
Tools and equipments	6	0.867
Time management	5	0.551
Leadership and motivation	8	0.819
Overall	**40**	**0.778**

Source: Researcher (2014)

Overall, the results indicate that the research tool was reliable in measuring the variable since the overall reliability was above 0.6.

Validity

It measures the extent to which a research instrument measures what it is intended to measure or the extent to which the research findings can be generalized to other populations. To test the validity of the instrument, the researcher used first inter-judge co-efficiency of validity. Three expert judges (in this case three lecturers of the researcher) made independent appraisal of the items in the questionnaire. Their results were used to establish the content validity Index (CVI) using the following formula;

Data Gathering Procedures
Before the administration of the questionnaires

1. An introduction letter was obtained from the College of Higher Degrees and Research for the researcher to solicit approval to conduct the study from respective Ministry of education, Makerere University, Organisation of national association of teachers.

2. When approved, the researcher secured a list of the respondents from Mukwano Industry, Makerere University, Organisation of national association of teachers and were selected through

random sampling from this list to arrive at the minimum sample size.

3. The respondents were explained to about the study and were requested to sign the Informed Consent Form.

4. The researcher produced more than enough questionnaires for distribution.

5. The researcher selected research assistants who assisted in the data collection. They were briefed and oriented in order to be consistent in administering the questionnaires.

During the administration of the questionnaires

1. The respondents were requested to answer completely and not to leave any part of the questionnaires unanswered.

2. The researcher and assistants emphasized retrieval of the

questionnaires within five days from the date of distribution.

3. On retrieval, all returned questionnaires were checked if all are answered

After the administration of the questionnaires

The data gathered were collated, encoded into the computer and statistically treated using the frequencies and Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS). The data processing was the presentation of every level taken to structure and analyze the collected data. This was both qualitative and quantitative methods necessary for different ways of analyzing questionnaires and interviews. Interviews offered a rich source of data [5], interview guide was used to explore on the job safety and employees' productivity among public and private Organizations in Kampala. It gave a platform for illiterate respondents who were part of the target population to express their views. This instrument was

selected because offered trust and understanding with respondents and data was collected using a Semi-structured interview guide which contained an open ended questions. The researcher was able to elicit information relating to their category of employment. In this case, Mukwano industry employees, Makerere University administrators and National Association of teachers enabled researcher to access non formal information and it provided to transit to formal to establish the different job safety and employee productivity among public and private organizations in Kampala. It helped the researcher to attain for information in the interview carried out.

Data Analysis

The mean and standard deviations were applied for job safety and employee productivity in organizations. Analysis of Variance was applied in establishing differences in Job safety measures as well as employee productivity in Private and Public Organizations. This was both qualitative and quantitative methods necessary for different ways of analyzing questionnaires and interviews. To determine the relationship between job safety and employee's productivity, the researcher used correlation and regression analysis. Pearson's correlation coefficient (r) was applied and later the

linear regression analysis was modeled between these variables. Thematic content analysis was used to expand and establish the relation between job safety and employee productivity in organization in Kampala. The researcher established a set of categories and then compiled the information that was found in specific categories. An item analysis was used to illustrate the strengths and weaknesses based on the indicators in terms of mean and rank. From these strengths and weaknesses, the recommendations were derived.

Ethical Considerations

To ensure confidentiality of the information provided by the respondents and to ascertain the practice of ethics in

this study, the following activities were implemented by the researcher:

1. The respondents were coded instead of reflecting the names

through a written request to the concerned officials in order to access data from them

2. The researcher requested the respondents to sign the informed consent form specifically, participants were informed about the aim and nature of the research

3. The researcher acknowledged the authors quoted in the study through citations and referencing.

4. Findings to the study were presented in a generalized manner to enhance privacy and confidentiality.

Limitations of the Study

In view of the following threats to validity, the researcher will claim an allowable 5% margin of error. Mitigating measures were taken to minimize if not to eradicate threats to validity of findings of the study as shown below; Extraneous variables which were beyond the researchers control such as respondents honesty, personal biases and uncontrolled setting of the study. Instrumentation: The research instruments are not standardized. Therefore a validity and reliability test was done to produce credible measurements of the research variables

.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Relationship between Job Safety and Employees' Productivity among Public and Private Organizations in Kampala, Uganda

The third objective of the study was to establish the relationship between Job Safety and Employees' Productivity among Public and Private Organizations in Kampala, Uganda. To achieve this objective, the researcher correlated the means and further carried out the bivariate regression analysis between Job Safety and Employees' Productivity among Public and Private Organizations in Kampala, Uganda. The results also were used in testing the hypothesis that there is no relationship between Job Safety and Employees' Productivity among Public and Private Organizations in Kampala, Uganda. It was tested at 0.05 level of significance. The researcher used Pearson Linear correlation coefficient (r) and the regression analysis was based on basic assumptions. The results from correlation and regression analysis are shown in tables 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7 below.

Table 3: Correlation Analysis between Job Safety and Employees' Productivity among Public and Private Organizations in Kampala, Uganda

Variable Correlated	r-value	Sig.	Interpretation	Decision on HO
Job Safety Vs Employees' Productivity	0.677	.000	Relationship exists	Rejected

Source: Primary Data (2022)

Results from table 3 are results from bivariate correlation analysis between the means of job safety and employee productivity among Public and Private Organizations in Kampala, Uganda. The results show that there is positive relationship between job safety and employee productivity among Public and Private Organizations in Kampala, Uganda (r = 0.677). Since (sig. 0.000 < 0.05), this leads to the rejection of the hypothesis that there is "no relationship between job safety and employee productivity among Public and Private Organizations in Kampala, Uganda" was rejected. The results show that as job safety Increases, also employee's productivity also increases.

Correlation Analysis between Job Safety constructs and Employee Productivity constructs in selected Public and Private Organisations in Kampala, Uganda

To further under the extent of relationship between job safety and employee productivity among Public and Private Organizations in Kampala, Uganda, the researcher further carried a correlation analysis between Job Safety constructs and Employee Productivity constructs in selected Public and Private Organizations in Kampala, Uganda. The results from the Pearson correlation analysis is shown in the table 4 below at 0.05 level of significance.

Table 4: Correlation Analysis between Job Safety constructs and Employee Productivity constructs in selected Public and Private Organizations in Kampala, Uganda

Constructs correlated	r-	Sig.	Interpretation	Decision on
Electronic Safety Vs Time Management	.259	.000	Significant relationship	Rejected
Fire Safety Vs Time Management	.267	.000	Significant relationship	Rejected
Hazardous Materials Vs Time Management	.194	.005	Significant relationship	Rejected
Sanitation Vs Time Management	.334	.000	Significant relationship	Rejected
Tool and equipment's Vs Time Management	.268	.000	Significant relationship	Rejected
Electronic Safety Vs Leadership and Motivation	.436	.000	Significant relationship	Rejected
Fire Safety Vs Leadership and Motivation	.586	.000	Significant relationship	Rejected
Hazardous Materials Vs Leadership and Motivation	.590	.000	Significant relationship	Rejected
Sanitation Vs Leadership and Motivation	.485	.000	Significant relationship	Rejected
Tool and equipment's Vs Leadership and Motivation	.593	.000	Significant relationship	Rejected

Source: Primary Data (2014)

The results indicate that the relationship between Electronic Safety and Time Management exist and is positive. (r = .259). Since (sig. = 0.000 < 0.05), this leads to the rejection of the hypothesis that there "no relationship between Electronic Safety and Time Management". The relationship between Fire Safety and Time Management also exist and is positive (r = .267). Since (sig. = 0.000 < 0.05), this leads to the rejection of the hypothesis that there "no relationship between Fire Safety and Time Management". The researcher also analyzed for the relationship between Hazardous Materials and Time Management. The results show that there is a positive relationship between Hazardous Materials and Time Management (r = .194). Since (sig. = 0.005 < 0.05), this leads to the rejection of the hypothesis that there "no relationship between existence of Hazardous Materials and Time Management". In terms of relationship between sanitation and time management, the results shows that there is a positive relationship with (r = .334). Since (sig. = 0.000 < 0.05), this leads to the rejection of the hypothesis that there "no relationship between Sanitation and Time Management". The relationship between Tool and equipment's and Time Management was also positive (r = .268), with (sig. = 0.000 < 0.05), this leads to the rejection of the hypothesis that there "no relationship between Tool and equipment's and Time Management".

The results further indicate that there is a significant positive relationship between Electronic Safety and Leadership and Motivation with (r = .436). Since (sig. = 0.000 < 0.05), this leads to the rejection of the hypothesis that there "no relationship between Electronic Safety and Leadership and Motivation". The results further show that there exist a relationship between Fire Safety and Leadership and Motivation with (r = 0.586) and since (sig. = 0.000 < 0.05), this leads to the rejection of the hypothesis that there "no relationship between fire Safety and Leadership and Motivation". Also, the results show that protection against Hazardous Materials and Leadership and Motivation have a positive relationship with (r = .586) and since (sig. = 0.000 < 0.05), this leads to

the rejection of the hypothesis that there "no relationship between protection against Hazardous Materials and Leadership and Motivation". Concerning the relationship between sanitation and leadership and motivation, the results show that there is a positive relationship (r = .485) and since (sig. = 0.000 < 0.05), this leads to the rejection of the hypothesis that there "no relationship between sanitation and Leadership and Motivation". In terms of relationship between tool and equipment's and Leadership and Motivation, there exists a positive relationship (r = .593) and since (sig. = 0.000 < 0.05), this leads to the rejection of the hypothesis that there "no relationship between tool and equipment's and Leadership and Motivation".

Correlation Analysis between constructs of Job Safety and Employee Productivity in selected Public and Private Organizations in Kampala, Uganda

The researcher also carried correlation analysis between constructs of Job Safety and Employee Productivity in selected Public and Private Organizations in Kampala, Uganda. The researcher wanted to find out whether the constructs of job safety are positively related to employee productivity and also understand the

extent of relationship between constructs of Job Safety and Employee Productivity in selected Public and Private Organizations in Kampala, Uganda. The results from correlation analysis are shown in table 5 below at 0.05 level of significance.

Table 5: Correlation Analysis between constructs of Job Safety and Employee Productivity in selected Public and Private Organizations in Kampala, Uganda

Variables correlated	r-	Sig.	Interpretation	Decision HO
Electric Safety Vs Employee Productivity	.465	.000	Positive relationship	Rejected
Fire Safety Vs Employee Productivity	.561	.000	Positive relationship	Rejected
Hazardous Materials Vs Employee Productivity	.549	.000	Positive relationship	Rejected
Sanitation Vs Employee Productivity	.531	.000	Positive relationship	Rejected
Tools and equipment's Vs Employee Productivity	.570	.000	Positive relationship	Rejected

Source: Primary Data (2014)

Results in table 5 show the results from Correlation Analysis between constructs of Job Safety and Employee Productivity in selected Public and Private Organizations in Kampala, Uganda. The

results shows that electronic safety has a positive relationship with employee productivity (r = .465) among Public and Private Organizations in Kampala, Uganda. This means that a higher

electronic safety moves with a high employee productivity. Since (sig. = .000 < 0.05), this leads to the rejection of hypothesis that there is no positive relationship between electronic safety and employee productivity. The results further indicate that fire safety has a positive relationship with employee productivity (r = .561). This means that as fire safety increases, employee productivity also increases. Since (sig. = 0.00 < 0.05), this leads to the rejection of hypothesis that there is no positive relationship between fire safety and employee productivity. The relationship between Hazardous Materials and

Employee Productivity is also positive (r = .549). This means that increased protection against hazardous materials increases employee productivity. Since (sig. = 0.000 < 0.05), this means that the question of whether there is a positive relationship between Hazardous Materials and Employee Productivity is accepted. The results further show that there is a positive relationship between sanitation and employee productivity with (r = .531). The results finally shows that there a positive relationship between tools and equipment and employee productivity (r = .570).

Regression Analysis between Job Safety and Employees' Productivity among Public and Private Organizations in Kampala, Uganda

The researcher also carried out, regression analysis between Job Safety and Employees' Productivity among Public and Private Organizations in Kampala, Uganda. The researcher carried out both bivariate regression analysis between Job Safety and Employees' Productivity among Public and Private Organizations in Kampala, Uganda, as

well as multiple regression analysis between job safety construct and employee productivity, all based on basic regression assumptions. The results from regression analysis are shown in tables 6 and 7 below. All hypotheses are tested on 0.05 level of significance.

Table 6: Bivariate Regression Analysis between Job Safety and Employees' Productivity among Public and Private Organizations in Kampala, Uganda

Variables regressed	Adj. r^2	F	Sig.	Interpretation	Decision on HO
Job Safety and Employees' Productivity	0.455	153.902	0.000	Relationship exists	Rejected
Coefficients	Beta	t-value	Sig.	Interpretation	Decision on HO
Constant	.860	5.479	.000	Relationship exists	Rejected
Job safety	.640	12.406	.000	Relationship exists	Reiected

Source: Primary Data (2014)
Legend:
y(Employee Productivity) =a+ b(Job Safety) y =. 860+.64-0(Job Safety)

Where y = employee productivity, a= constant, b = rate of change of employee productivity to change in job safety. Results in table 6 show that, since (F = 153.902) and (sig. = 0.000 < 0.05), this means that there is a relationship between job safety and employee productivity. This leads to the rejection of null hypothesis that there is no relationship between job safety and employee productivity among Public and Private Organizations in Kampala, Uganda. The results also show that the rate of employee productivity independent of job safety is 0.860. This means that at 0 (zero) rate of job safety; the rate of employee productivity is

0.860. The rate of change of employee productivity to change in job safety is 0.640. This means that a unit change in job safety leads to 0.640 change in employee productivity. The t-values of parameters (a and b) are (t = 5.479) and (t = 12.406) respectively and since these measures the hypothesis that a = 0 and b = 0, these hypotheses are rejected since their respective significance value is (sig. = 0.000). The results further shows that the variation employee productivity caused by variation in job safety is 45.5% (adjusted R2 = 0.455). Job safety only explains 45.5% changes in employee productivity.

Table 7: Multiple Regression Analysis between construct of Job Safety and Employee Productivity among Public and Private Organizations in Kampala, Uganda

Variables regressed	Adj. $\bar{R}^2$	F	Sig.	Interpretatio	Decision on HO
Job Safety constructs Vs Employee Productivity	.447	30.587	.000	Relationship exists	Rejected
Coefficients	**Beta**	**t**	**Sig.**	**Interpretatio**	**Decision on HO**
Constant	.881	5.399	.00		Rejected
Electronic safety	.097	1.689	.09		Accepted
Fire Safety	.163	2.942	.00		Rejected
Hazardous Materials	.079	1.227	.22		Accepted
Sanitation	.162	3.014	.00		Rejected
Tools and Equipments	.135	2.067	.04		Rejected

Source: Primary Data (2014)

Legend:

$Y = a + b(ES) + c(FS) + d(HM) + e(s) + f(TM)$

$y = ,88 + ,097(ES) + .16(FS) + .079(HM) + .16(S) + .14(TM)$

Where, y = employee productivity, a = constant, h = rate of change of employee productivity to change in electronic safety, c = rate of change of employee productivity to change in fire safety, d= rate of change of employee productivity to change in protection against hazardous materials, e = rate of change of employee productivity to change in sanitation, and f = rate of change of employee productivity to change in tools and equipment's. ES = electronic safety, FS= fire safety, HM= Hazardous Materials, S= Sanitation, and TE = Tools and equipment's.

The results from above shows that (F = 30.587) and since (sig. = .000 < 0.05), this shows that there is a relationship between Job Safety constructs and Employee Productivity. This leads to a conclusion that the null hypothesis is rejected. The rate of employee productivity independent of any of job safety constructs is .881. This means that in absence of electronic safety, fire safety, sanitation, tools and equipment's and protection against hazardous materials, employee productivity is .881. The rate of change of employee productivity to change in electronic safety is .097. This means that a unit change in electronic safety leads to just .097 change in employee productivity. The results further show that the rate of change of employee productivity to change in fire safety is .163. This means that a unit change in fire safety leads to .163 change in employee productivity. The rate of change of employee productivity to change in protection against hazardous materials is .079. This means that a unit change in protection from hazardous materials leads to .079 change in employee productivity. The rate of change in employee productivity to change in sanitation is .162, while the rate of change of employee productivity to change in tools and equipment's is .135. The results further show that the variation in employee productivity caused by variations in job safety construct is 44.7% (adjusted R^2 = .447).

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

The results show that there is positive relationship between job safety and employee productivity among Public and Private Organizations in Kampala, Uganda (r = 0.677). Since (sig. 0.000 < 0.05), this leads to the rejection of the hypothesis that there is "no relationship between job safety and employee productivity among Public and Private Organizations in Kampala, Uganda" was rejected. The results show that as job safety increases, also employees productivity also increases. The results from correlation Analysis between Job Safety constructs and Employee Productivity constructs in selected Public and Private Organizations in Kampala, Uganda shows that there is a positive

relationship between job safety construct (electronic safety, fire safety, sanitation, hazardous materials and tools and equipment) and employees' productivity constructs (time management and leadership and motivation). Correlation Analysis between constructs of Job Safety and Employee Productivity in selected Public and Private Organizations in Kampala, Uganda, the results shows that electronic safety, fire safety, hazardous materials and tools and equipment's have positive relationships with employee productivity (r = .465, r = .561, r = .549, r = .531 and r = .570) respectively.

The bivariate Regression Analysis between Job Safety and Employees' Productivity among Public and Private Organizations in Kampala, Uganda show that, since (F = 153.902) and (sig. = 0.000 < 0.05), this means that there is a relationship between job safety and employee productivity. This leads to the rejection of null hypothesis that there is no relationship between job safety and employee productivity among Public and Private Organizations in Kampala, Uganda. The results also show that the rate of employee productivity independent of job safety is 0.860. The rate of change of employee productivity to change in job safety is 0.640. The results further shows that the variation employee productivity caused by variation in job safety is 45.5% (adjusted R2 = 0.455). Job safety only explains 45.5% changes in employee productivity. Multiple Regression Analysis between construct of Job Safety and Employee Productivity among Public and Private Organizations in Kampala, Uganda show that (F = .447) and since (sig. = .000 < 0.05), this shows that there is a relationship between Job Safety constructs and Employee Productivity. The rate of employee productivity independent of any of job safety constructs is .881. The rate of change of employee productivity to change in electronic safety is .097. The results further show that the rate of change of employee productivity to change in fire safety is .163. The rate of change of employee productivity to change in protection against hazardous materials is .079. The rate of change in employee productivity to change in sanitation is .162, while the rate of change of employee productivity to change in tools and equipments is .135. The results further show that the variation in employee productivity caused by variations in job safety construct is 44.7% (adjusted R2 = .447).

CONCLUSION

The level of job safety and employee productivity among Public and Private Organizations in Kampala, Uganda was high. This means that private and public organizations in Uganda have high levels of job safety and employee productivity in terms of electronic and fire safety, sanitation, tools and equipment's and protection from hazardous materials. The overall highly ranked item was concerned with sanitation that is whether food is separated from hazardous materials. This means that food is always kept safe from such materials that may infect the food and thus harm workers. The results showed that there is a positive relationship between job safety and employee productivity among Public and Private Organisations in Kampala, Uganda. The results show that as job safety increases, also employees productivity also increases.

Recommendations

1. Different stakeholders (government, NGOs) in different organisations need to ensure that employees are protected from such health problems associated with work. The government should put in place laws aiming at protecting workers against health issues associated with their work.
2. Also, different organizations need work on how workers are appraised as the interview guide

showed that appraisal is still done but not so often. This may work as a motivation to work and thus improve productivity.
3. There exists a positive relationship between job safety and employee productivity and therefore if different organizations are to benefit from employees, there is a need to ensure proper safety measures in

terms of fire, electricity among others.

REFERENCES

1. Baer, M. and Frese, M., 2002: Innovation is not enough: Climates for Initiative and Psychological Safety, Process Innovation and Firm Perfomance Journal of Organizational Behaviour Wiley InterScience. Psychology and Marketing Vol 21(11) 961 - 986.
2. Belkic, K., P. Schnall, P. Landsbergis, and D. Baker. 2000. "The Workplace and Cardiovascular Health: Conclusions and Thoughts for a Future Agenda." Occupational Medicine: State of the Art Reviews 15(1):307-21.
3. Boyd,C.(2003). Human Resource Management and Occupational Health and SafetyLondon: Routledge.
4. Brandt-Rauf, P., W. N. Burton, and R. J. McCunney. 2001. "Health, Productivity, and Occupational Medicine." Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine 43(1):1-2.
5. Cambridge Advanced Learner's Dictionary.(2008) 3rded, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
6. David A.D and Stephen P.R.(1999):Human Resource Management,Concepts and Application, USA:Rogressive International Technologies
7. De Greef, M. and Van den Broek, K., Quality of the Working Environment and Productivity: Research Findings and Case Studies, European Agency for Safety and Health at Work, Belgium, 2004a.
8. Dyktor H. G. (1940). "Integration of Industrial Hygiene with Industrial Medicine," Industrial Medicine 9, no. 4, 193.
9. Eakin, J. M., M. Cava, and T. F. Smith. 2001. "From Theory to Practice: A Determinants Approach to Workplace Health Promotion in Small Businesses." Health Promotion Practice 2(2): 172-81.
10. Eva, D. and Oswald R. (1981). Health and Safety at Work, London: Pan Books. Golaszewski, T. 2001. "Shining Lights: Studies That Have Most Influenced the Understanding of Health Promotion's Financial Impact." American Journal of Health Promotion 15(5):332-40.
11. Guhathakurta, S. and Yates, J. (1993). "International labor productivity." Journal of Construction Engineering, 35(1), 15-25.
12. Heizer, J., and Render, B. (1990). Production and Operations Management "Strategic and Tactical Decisions." Prentice Hall, NJ.
13. Horner, R. M. W., and Talhouni, B. T. (1995). Effects of Accelerated Working, Delays, and Disruptionson Labor Productivity. Chartered Institute of Building, London.
14. Lipsey, R. G. 1996. Economic Growth, Technological Change, and Canadian Economic Policy. Ottawa: C.D. Howe Institute, Benefactors Lecture
15. Minter S. and Sutcliff V. (1998). "Fighting Two Wars," Occupational Hazards, 41- 42.
16. Stokols, D. 1992. "Establishing and Maintaining Healthy Environments." American Psychologist January: 6-22.
17. Thomas, H. R., Riley, D. R., and Sanvido, V. E. (1999). "Loss of labor productivity due to delivery methods and weather." Journal of Construction Engineering and Management, 125(1), 39-46.
18. Tom Mulegi,(2022). An Overview of Performance of Health Workers in Uganda. IDOSR Journal of Social Sciences 7(1):113-124
19. Yriänhelkkl, E. 2011. Well-being at work on the Finnish agenda. NES2011 - Wellbeing and Innovations Through Ergonomics. Oulu, Finland 18 – 21 September 2011. Book of Abstracts pp. 17-23.

20. Kirahora, B. E., Busingye, J. D., & Lubale, G. (2021). Education Attainment and Women Entrepreneurship in Uganda: A Perspective. *European Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, *1*(6), 64–69.