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Abstract

The purpose of this research is to evaluate the relation between the security atmosphere and organizational confidence and Job security of Kerman province. The sampling is done by the simple random method and the sample volume is evaluated by the Cochran formula equal to 78 individuals. The required data for the present research has been gathered by the use of questionnaires that their validity is tested. To determine the validity and stability of the questionnaire, the Cronbach's coefficient is applied that the stability coefficient for the questionnaire of security atmosphere is equal to 0.88. For the Job satisfaction or Miyeh Tosa 1967, and 0.99 for organizational confidence questionnaire in 2003 is calculated equal to 0.85. In this research the structural relation model is used. To evaluate data and perform hypothesis test and other analysis of this research the LISREL statistical software is applied. The results showed that there is meaningful relation between the organizational confidence and Job satisfaction.
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Introduction

Confidence in an organization is the key element because it creates cooperation. Cooperation in organizations has been considered as important. Theorists believe that confidence leads to cooperation between people, groups and organizations. Today, organizations try to find new ways to develop cooperation between people and groups and implementation of their effects. Hence the group more than any other time pays attention to the confidence in its strengthening and realization. Today theorists of commercial management and confidential process in commercial environment are described as the strategic decision making and cooperation and organizational behavior (Gareth & Janis, 1998). Confidence is defined as the belief in others to achieve our targets we are dependent on others. Charlton said that leaders rely on their staffs to perform their task and managers should have the same action equal to their statement (Martin, 2002).

One of the factors which are influential in organizational confidence is the organization security atmosphere because the machineries and production systems are produced according to the cultural and environmental requirement and they should be used according to their specification and then they are imported to the country and applied. From one hand, the consumer is obedient to other countries products that do not assist the national technology production and form the other hand due to lack of accordance in tools and machineries and producing systems with consuming society, various disorders and problems resulted for that society (Sharie, 2006).

Job satisfaction is a multi-dimensional concept that it is related to the social, physical and mental factors. A unique factor does not lead to Job satisfaction and to the combination of different factors is likely to lead to satisfaction about one’s occupation and enjoying it. The worker when confirmed in his job and gets comfortable working conditions is likely to express his Job satisfaction in different ways (Fernech, 1992).

It is obvious that job satisfaction is significant for the client and staffs and for the society as well. If you are encouraged by your staffs and supervisors, you will enjoy your working condition, if your job is challenging and your attempts are compensated, not only you will have job satisfaction, rather this view is transferred to the family and it improves your private life quality (Huffman et al., 2000).

Accordingly, we pose this question: what kind of relation does it exist between these variables? This article tried to determine the relation between the security atmosphere and job satisfaction.

Research literature

The security atmosphere

The working force and appropriate skilled workers in every organization are considered as precious property. The working management and the development of organic safety are increasingly mixed with management. The ergonomic term is made of two terms of ergo that
means working and gnomic that means regulation. This term is used for the first time in 1857 in the polish magazine (Attaie, 1999).

Ergonomic is the science that studies the life of humans and their correspondences with products, equipments and facilities and methods and working environment, regardless of engineering science that generally emphasizes the techniques and designing equipments for people (Sanders et al., 1999).

The ergonomic international institution has defined this science as the science of human correspondences between human and environmental factors and also the application of proper techniques, theories and methods for people in their total performances (Halali, 2009).

Ergonomic science is a multidimensional science that operates in four main fields, 1- engineering psychology, 2- working physiology, 3- Job bio-mechanic, 4- anthropometry

Ergonomic or the human factors engineering is a combined science that tries to design the tools, systems, working environment and occupations according to the physical, mental and human interests.

This science is formed by the purpose of implementation increasing, attention to the safety and security and human resources. Also this science tries to appropriate the environment to humans instead of human adjustment to environment. In this direction, the international working organization has defined ergonomics as the appropriateness of job and working conditions for humans (Sharie, 2006).

The best definition is that ergonomics is realized as the scientific order that studies the relation between human with other elements on a producing systems. The approved theories consider the tangible principles and research methods in resources improvement. (Charbel, 2011).

What we understand from definitions is that the relation between humans, environment, occupations and equipment in ergonomic tries to present optimized method to perform this correspondences. On the other hand, humans being the holders of mental, physiological specifications and capabilities and special anatomic limitations, should be in correspondence with designing and engineering, the ergonomic knowledge and bestow it with a special identity and multiple relations with other sciences (Moedie and Chubineh, 2006).

Because safety is a multidimensional factor, it is considered as the security important outcome. The security atmosphere measurement could present the complete image about the security condition and organization security culture in definite time (Vinodkuman and Bhasi, 2009). According to the safety and security importance, clients were under pressure from society, staffs, groups and workers in order to accept more responsibility about the security and staffs resources. These pressures lead the government to proceed to make covering regulations for security and safety to solve fundamental problems that hinders the production process. Also this problem is worsened by the ineffective attempts of some governments, institutions and companies (Easton, 2004).
Social organizational ergonomic is confirming individual organizing and occupations to achieve the maximum efficiency in a definite collection. In this direction, the experts present their suggestions through the models studying and working hours, staffs ordering in teams and groups of a system and similar factors to make required changes. Finally, the systemic ergonomic is the most successful and solid method of designing and analysis. It takes the authority of physical realization of branches of ergonomic knowledge. Of course, in recent years, other sub branches as legal, entertainment, rehabilitation and etc. are defined in the ergonomic knowledge basis and it has changed as the basis of wider researches performance (Keykha Moqhadam, 2008).

\textbf{Job satisfaction}

There are different theories about the job satisfaction. The job satisfaction theory is divided into three views of requirements, expectation and value view. The requirement view defines satisfaction as the function of satisfaction of individuals’ needs that include the physical and psychological needs. The requirements are assumed as the human visual needs that are similar in all humans (Azcemp, 1993). Two factors of Job satisfaction are interdependent, first to realize how much of individual requirements are provided through the job performance and second how many of needs remained none-provided. The result of these factors determines the individual satisfaction. But the satisfaction view determines the individual progress through the complete adaptation of hopes and expectations while the visual dissatisfaction is the reason of failure in achieving the expectation (Ibid, 149). The value view believes that the job satisfaction is determined by this phenomenon that whether the job provides the possibility to the individual to keep his private values. (Nemecek & Grandjean, 1973). Lovsun and Shen divided their theories in two categories of models of tiny and greats. The tiny models theory includes related theories and realization theories and mainly is in relation with issues that individual takes them to the working environment (Human, 2002).

Some of the theories about the job satisfaction determination concentrated only on the individual special significance. These groups of theories which are put in the great model categorizations include simple process started having high importance (Humen, 2002). Many different factors are effective on the human forces job satisfaction. In this article, factors which are the topic of the study include the development, leadership and supervision, coworkers’ relations, wages and benefits.

Usually, among factors which are important in the job satisfaction, the great value is given to the development. The satisfaction about the development pays attention to the staffs’ satisfaction measurement about the dominant regulation on development and the way of operating the policies. The satisfaction could be considered as the reaction of development amplitude, their importance and their fascination. Generally, when the individual is employed in an organization the improvement is changed to the motivating encouragement and the way of most requirements compensations and organizational power is provided. He dominance in decision making is also increased (Cherry, 1978). The leadership and supervision represent the satisfaction that the individual obtains in relation with his direct supervisor. The researches summary showed that the supervision as an important job dimension is declared.
although from the staffs view, its significatio
n is less than some other variables as the relation
with coworkers (Azkemp, 1993). From the management school view, the human relation is
the best type of management. But, generally, the relation between these two variables is
approved in most of researches and it shows that as more the supervision is staff centered and
considerable, the job satisfaction will be more and supervisors who are in both dimensions of
supervision (staff centered and job centered). The maximum satisfaction is obtained from the
same source.

Many of researchers regard the relation with coworkers as the most important factor in
the determination of satisfaction and dissatisfaction in occupation (Ibid, 157). Mazerlou
believes that individuals get a belonging sense, love and enjoy group work because they are
allowed to make meaningful relations with others and support others or they are supported
(Zimring, 1981).

Approximately, the payment to all job groups is one of the most important working
conditions. Although the care related to this item is not adequate, the results of some studies
showed that in some of the groups, the main factor wages is not considered as the main factor
in job satisfaction (Azcamp, 1994). So, money has different meanings for different groups.
Possibly, this factor has more importance for those people who could not provide satisfaction
through other ways (Zimring, 1981). According to Herzberg, the wage is the healthy factor
that if it is low, it could make dissatisfaction but when it is high it leads to job dissatisfaction.
The wage and salary could be a model for progress and the source of realization and understanding because staffs assume their salary as the capability to perform a task to cooperate in organization (Arnold & Feleman, 1986).

Organizational trust

One of the most important requirements in organization is providing confidence
between workers and managers. The presence of high levels of confidence in organization
leads to low costs and other control mechanism and staffs will control themselves and they
will have internal motivation. Accordingly, the organizational effectiveness and evaluation
cost reduction are evaluated and controlled. Therefore, the necessity to realize the factors that
make confidence is sensible (Hassan Zadeh, 2004).

As a definition, confidence is typically considered as the expectations or beliefs that
people like to show to others through a predictable method and not only for their benefits
direction (Bicher, 1986).

Based on this definition, one of the problems and difficulties of organizations is the
lack of trust between managers and staffs. In our organizations, especially governmental
organizations, there is considerable gap between the staffs and managers, due to this gap,
decisions usually are faced with operational problems because staffs show harshness in
decision operation and therefore managers do not have confidence about them and do not
participate in decision making process. These issues combined lead to making distrustful
atmosphere and the result of distrust is producing behaviors as rumoring, discrepancies,
evading which take high energy from the organization and increases costs. In such
organizations, talking about discussions as self-management and self-controlling,
cooperation, disagreement occurrence and quality general management and etc. are useless and most of the attempts for increase of implementation will not achieve proper result (Chavoshi, 2007).

Confidence in organization literature and management

Three wide perspectives exist in the confidence literature. First, there is the organizational internal confidence that means as an internal organizational phenomenon like the confidence between the staffs and supervisors or manager or between coworkers (our emphasis in this study is on the confidence type). Second, it focuses on the trust between organizations. Third, there is confidence between the organizations and customers that is described as the marketing concept (Daitez and Hartoug, 2006). They believed that four aspects of competency, honesty, predictability and willingness are the most important elements in confidence. Mayer et al in (1995) also described three factors of validity, competency and benevolence as the main dimensions of confidence,

1- Validity: that means an individual or organization will perform whatever it has promised to do completely. 2-competency: it referred to the other individuals' capabilities that according to which we can perform our duties based on the skills and knowledge, 3- benevolence that means the kind motivations and kindness about other group and attention to other resources honestly (Miyer et al., 1955).

Effective factors in making organizational confidence and consequences

Making confidence in an organization requires a strategy to increase the confidence level between all staffs and mangers. Researchers have attempted to determine the confidence basis in organization. In a research that is performed by the Kelly and Carnet in (1992), they realized that variables which are related to occupations such as cooperation in decision making, independency, reflection, supervision supporting behavior and communications could considerably describe the confidence to management.

Yılmaz Vatlı in (2009) categorized the effective factors which are influential in making organizational confidence. Organizational factors include successful evaluation of justly rewarding systems and supporting values, habits and behaviors. Also Neyhan in (2000) has declared the staffs' cooperation indecision making and empowering them as the essential factors to increase confidence in organization. Generally, many different factors have role in making confidence and making them important factor to improve the liability and performance of organization in realization of individual and organizational purposes.

In reverse, researchers have counted different outcomes for organizational confidence for example Neyhan (2000) assumed that he result of confidence increases efficiency in organization and strengthens the organizational liability. Jean in (2009) considered the effect of organizational confidence including the proper tendencies of knowledge sharing, job satisfaction and citizenship behavior and organizations liability. Also, according to the Mishra and Mourisi statement in (1990), the organizational confidence leads to facilitate the open communication in organization, information division, job satisfaction, organizational liability and performance increase. Yılmaz Vatlı in (2009) also mentioned that the
organizational confidence had positive effect on the organizational liability and performance increasing. Yilmaz vatali (2009) also declared that the organizational confidence had positive effect on the organizational liability and citizenship behavior and also improvement of social communications. According to the Alven statement (2005), the organizational confidence is effective on the cooperation, communication and sharing the knowledge and flexibility and liability in organization.
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**Figure 1: research conceptual model**

**Hypotheses**

1- There is meaningful relation between the security atmosphere and Job satisfaction
2- There is meaningful relation between the Job satisfaction and organizational confidence
3- There is meaningful relation between the organization confidence and security atmosphere

**The research methodology**

The present research is practical. It regards the statistical society specifications in special time and location that have been studied. Researchers are trying to expand the obtained results by the use of practical methods in other similar units. Gathering information for testing hypothesis is done through questionnaires. This research is of the correlated matrix and co-variation analysis in which the structural equation modeling is used. The statistical society, in this research, includes all social security management departments in Kerman province. The sampling method is random and by the use of Cochrane formula, the sample volume is estimated for 77 individuals. To determine the stability and validity of questionnaire, the alpha coefficient is used. So, the stability coefficient for security atmosphere questionnaire is equal to 0.88. For job satisfaction questionnaire, Minehsuta (1967), the coefficient is calculated at 0.99 and for ruder confidence questionnaire of organizational confidence in 2003. It has been calculated at 0.85. In this research, the structural relation model is used for data analysis. To evaluate the data and perform hypothesis test and other analyses of this research, the lisrel statistical software is used. Therefore, in recent research after drawing analytical model based on the data by path diagram program by performing the Perils program, the measured model obtained in this model by the use of B coefficients, and using t test the hypotheses are tested. Also, the fitness scales are calculated automatically by the Perlis program performance for intended model.
Data analysis

First the key of scales are calculated for zero hypotheses testing. The results show the zero hypothesis rejection. It declares that model does not exist in the society

Table 1: research model fitness scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fitness scales</th>
<th>Standard volumes</th>
<th>Assessed rates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Degrees of Freedom</td>
<td>463</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
<td>It is not proper criterion due to dependency to the sample volume</td>
<td>1095.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMSEA</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFI</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNFI</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFI</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMR</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GFI</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGFI</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As it is observed in table 1, the adaptation rate scales or fitness appropriateness are all in acceptable level.

Two below graphs show the Lisrel software external general models that simultaneously includes the structural model and measuring model that is evaluated in detail in the next step.
Figure 2: the basic model by the path coefficients

Chi-Square=2394.74, df=557, P-value=0.00000, RMSEA=0.135
Hypotheses testing
First hypothesis

1. There is meaningful relation between the job satisfaction and security atmosphere.
H₀: There is no meaningful relation between the job satisfaction and security atmosphere.
H₁: There is meaningful relation between the Job satisfaction and security atmosphere.

Table 2: the results of standard coefficients and t variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Evaluated coefficients</th>
<th>Predicted variables</th>
<th>Predicting variable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.46</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Security atmosphere</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to table 2: the path coefficient rate between the security atmosphere and Job satisfaction is equal to 1.39 and T rate is 5.46>1.96. According to the T test by critical rate of 0.05 is at assurance level of 95% and the zero hypothesis is rejected and as the result the first hypothesis is approved and by 95% assurance. We can say that there is meaningful relation between the security atmosphere and Job satisfaction.
Second hypothesis

2-There is meaningful relation between the job satisfaction and organizational confidence.

H<sub>0</sub>: There is no meaningful relation between the job satisfaction and organizational confidence.

H<sub>1</sub>: There is meaningful relation between the job satisfaction and organizational confidence.

Table 3: standard coefficient results and T variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable t</th>
<th>Evaluated coefficients</th>
<th>Predicted variables</th>
<th>Predicting variable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
<td>Organizational confidence</td>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to table 3: the path coefficient rate between the organizational confidence and Job satisfaction is equal to -0.22 and T rate is -2.09<1.96. According to the T test, critical rat of 0.05 is at assurance level of 95% and the zero hypotheses are not rejected and as the result the first hypothesis is not approved and by 95% assurance. We can say that there is no meaningful relation between the organizational confidence and Job satisfaction.

Third hypothesis:

H<sub>0</sub>: There is no meaningful relation between the organizational confidence and security atmosphere.

H<sub>1</sub>: There is no meaningful relation between the organizational confidence and security atmosphere.

Table 4: the standard coefficient results and T variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable t</th>
<th>Evaluated coefficients</th>
<th>Predicted variables</th>
<th>Predicting variable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>Organizational confidence</td>
<td>Security atmosphere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to table 4: the path coefficient rate between the organizational confidence and job satisfaction is equal to 0.87 and T rate is -3.15>1.96. According to the T test, critical rat of 0.05 is at assurance level of 95% and the zero hypothesis is rejected and as the result the first hypothesis is approved and by 95% assurance. We can say that there is meaningful relation between the organizational confidence and security atmosphere.
Conclusion

The result of first hypothesis showed that the security atmosphere path coefficient and job satisfaction are equal to 1.39 and the related T rate is 5.46>1.96 that according to the T test with critical rate of 0.05 at assurance level of 95% is rejected. As a result the first claim of researcher is approved by 95% assurance. We can say that there is positive relation between two variables. In studies, it has been identified that the security atmosphere in an organization is the result of values and views and realizations and attempts and individuals and group behavior models determine the methods and efficiency and security management liability and their health which leads staffs Job satisfaction.

The result of second hypothesis showed that the organizational confidence path coefficient and job satisfaction are equal to -0.22 and the related T rate is -2.9<1.96 that according to the T test with critical rate of 0.05 at assurance level of 95% is not rejected. As the result the first claim of researcher is not approved and by 95% assurance. We can say that there is no meaningful relation between two variables of job satisfaction and organizational confidence.

The result of third hypothesis showed that the security atmosphere path coefficient and organizational confidence is equal to 0.87 and the related T rate is 3.15>1.96 that according to the T test with critical rate of 0.05 at assurance level of 95%, zero hypothesis is rejected. As a result, the first claim of the researcher is approved and by 95% assurance. We can say that there is positive relation between two variables of security atmosphere and organizational confidence. The security atmosphere leads to organizational confidence between staffs by providing proper working conditions and maintaining security for them.
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