

Incidence of Job Satisfaction in the Servers' Performance of the Financial Management Department of ULEAM University

Denny Fortty Barberán
alexander.fortty@uleam.edu.ec
Universidad Laica Eloy Alfaro de Manabí, Ecuador

María Inés Zambrano Zambrano
mariazambrano@utm.edu.ec
Universidad Técnica de Manabí, Ecuador

Matilde Flores-Urbáez
matilde.flores@utm.edu.ec
Universidad Técnica de Manabí, Ecuador

ABSTRACT

The objective of this research is to determine the incidence of job satisfaction in the performance of the servers of the Financial Department of the Secular Eloy Alfaro de Manabí University, in Ecuador. A questionnaire was applied to a sample of 19 servers of the aforementioned institution to determine their level of job satisfaction. The results revealed that the respondents did not assign positive values to the following dimensions of job satisfaction: structure, salary, working conditions, welfare conditions and leadership. They assigned positive values to the content dimensions of the work; values and customs and interpersonal relationships. The results indicated that 63.17% was placed in the Very Good Category according to the final assessment scale established in the Public Service Law; and 31% in the Excellent Category. It is concluded that despite not being satisfied with the structure, salary, working conditions, welfare conditions and leadership, the work performance of the sample of servers of the Financial Department of the university mentioned above is between very good and excellent, which indicates that job dissatisfaction for this group of individuals does not have a negative impact on their job performance.

Keywords: job satisfaction, job performance, Secular University Eloy Alfaro de Manabí. Universidad Laica Eloy Alfaro de Manabí.

INTRODUCTION

In the literature consulted on the subject that concerns us, there are a great number of researches related to the study of job satisfaction (Alonso, 2008). Those researches deal with personal characteristics (age, schooling, number of economic dependents); the position held (activity, hierarchical level, salary, benefits) and the organizations (leadership, teamwork, structure, support). Chiang, Salazar and Núñez (2007) have identified significant associations between a large number of factors of organizational climate and job satisfaction such as internal communication, recognition, interpersonal relationships, quality of work, decision making, objectives of the institution, commitment, adaptation to change, delegation of activities and functions, external coordination and efficiency of productivity.

Job satisfaction is defined as the degree to which employees like their work (Fritzsche and Parrish, 2005), there is still little consensus about whether it involves exclusively emotional or cognitive processes (Brief and Weiss, 2002). Job satisfaction is an attitudinal dimension that occupies a central place in the consideration of the experience of man at work (Aldag and Brief, 1978). In spite of this, many institutions do not worry about job stability, participation, autonomy, safety conditions or growth opportunities for employees. Such situation harms the organization because it negatively affects the work performance of people, their productivity and efficiency in the use of resources.

This research was carried out taking into account the relevance of job satisfaction in the performance of servers in higher education institutions. The main objective is to determine the incidence of job satisfaction in the performance of the financial management servers of the Secular University Eloy Alfaro de Manabí, in Ecuador.

Job satisfaction

Definitions

We present below a summary table with some definitions of job satisfaction with their respective approaches according to the dimension they emphasize.

Table 1
Work satisfaction. Definitions

Author	Concept	Approach
Chiavenato (1986)	General attitude of the individual towards his/her work	Behavioral.
Muñoz Adánez (1990)	Positive feeling that a subject experiences when performing a job in an organization in which he/she feels comfortable and for which he/she perceives psycho-socio-economic compensation according to his/her expectations.	Psycho-socio-economic.
Davis and Newstrom (1991)	Set of favorable or unfavorable feelings with which the employee perceives his/her work that are manifested in certain work attitudes.	Feelings
Koontz and Weihrich (1993))	Welfare that is experienced at work when a desire is satisfied; relating it also to the motivation to work.	Welfare
Gibson Ivancevich and Donnely (1996)	Result of the perceptions about the work based on factors related to the environment in which it develops such as: management style, policies and procedures, satisfaction of the work groups, affiliation, working conditions and profit margin.	Organizational aspects

Mason and Griffin (2002)	Shared attitude of the group towards its task and towards the associated work environment.	Organizational aspects
Wright and Davis (2003)	Interaction between employees and their work environment, where consistency is sought between what employees want from their work and what they feel they receive.	Congruence of labor expectations
Morillo (2006)	Perspective that workers have about their work expressed through the degree of agreement between the expectations of people as regards: work, rewards that this offers, interpersonal relationships and managerial style.	Congruence of labor expectations
Andresen, Domsch y Cascorbi (2007)	Positive emotional state resulting from work experience that is achieved by satisfying certain individual work requirements.	Pleasure-emotion
Wright and Bonett (2007)	The most common and oldest form of operationalization of happiness in the workplace.	Happiness

Source: self-made

For the purposes of this research, we will rely on the definition of Muñoz Adánez (1990) because it encompasses different intrinsic aspects in labor processes (economic, psychological and social) that must be considered to guarantee job satisfaction in any organization, regardless of its nature.

Importance of job satisfaction

Job satisfaction associates the attitude that the individual or groups have towards their work, the factors related to this and even their life. Attitude has a direct impact on job satisfaction; it is closely related to specific aspects of worker's performance and influences the positive cause-effect relationship between the work environment and his/her performance. Job satisfaction is a multidimensional construct that depends on the individual characteristics of the subject, on the specificities of the work he or she performs and it is composed of a set of specific satisfactions that determine overall satisfaction (Loategui, 1990, cited by Romeiro, 2015).

Job satisfaction is a feeling of well-being towards work that can encompass all related aspects such as a system of activities and factors that interact with each other, and not as a single activity that literally runs in the workplace, which can be compensated and conditioned by others. In this case, a person can be comfortable as regards salary, interpersonal relationships, challenges offered by the position, hierarchical level, possibilities to develop skills in the position that occupies, physical work environment, work environment, possibilities to innovate and update his/her knowledge, among others.

Galaz (2002) emphasizes that psychological aspects such as affective and cognitive reactions awaken levels of satisfaction and dissatisfaction at work within an organization. In his study, areas of the organization that require attention were detected and he considers that satisfied workers are better able to adapt to changes than those not satisfied. Salinas, Laguna and Mendoza (1994) point out that money is not the only motivator, and that the attitudes of employees related to job satisfaction and organizational commitment are of interest for the field of organizational behavior and human resources management practice.

The level of satisfaction of people with their work in an organization is reverted in the reputation of this, both internally and externally; and the differences between organizational units in job satisfaction are seen as worrying symptoms of potential deficiencies (Anaya and Suárez, 2007).

Dimensions of job satisfaction

The work of Zayas Agüero, Báez Santana, Zayas Feria and Hernández Lobaina (2015) was taken as a basis to define the dimensions of job satisfaction. The mentioned work was based in turn on Álvarez (2005, cited by Zayas Agüero et al., 2015), Zayas et al. (2014, cited by Zayas Agüero et al., 2015) and Álvarez (2005, cited by Zayas Agüero et al, 2015).

The essential dimensions of job satisfaction in this study are:

- **Structure:** It is the way in which the actions of the organizations are divided, organized and coordinated. It includes administrative control, hierarchical levels and relationship between them, division of functions and tasks, chains of command, among others.
- **Content of the work:** the content of work is perceived as the skills, independence, significance, importance, definition, autonomy, organization and creativity of the work.
- **Regulations, values and customs:** set of assumptions, beliefs, culture, values and norms shared by the members of the organization; it creates the human environment in which the employees perform their work. Within the culture, they influence what happens in the organization and creates the seal of it. The indicators of culture are: communication patterns, systems, procedures, statements of philosophies, histories and goals.
- **Salary and stimulation:** includes compensation and compensation associated with payment systems, promotion, possibilities for improvement and performance evaluation. The wage stimulation is judged by recognition, sufficiency, correspondence and balance between moral and material stimuli, organization and perception of the stimulation system.
- **Working conditions:** includes the order, materials and means necessary to carry out the work; and they also include the ergonomic conditions such as hygiene, safety and aesthetics.
- **Welfare conditions:** refers to personal and professional development, working hours, transportation, food, health services, recreational, cultural and sports activities.

Essential dimensions linked to socio-psychological aspects

- **Interpersonal relations and communication:** a process of social interaction in which two or more people intervene to exchange ideas, feelings, judgments, information, opinions or work instructions. It also includes relations between people, people-directors, between managers, possibilities of social interaction, concern for the problems of the people, conflict resolution, belonging and orientation.
- **Leadership and decision-making:** influence by which an individual or group can get the members of an organization to collaborate voluntarily and enthusiastically to achieve the proposed objectives. Leadership makes it possible to transform the potential of the group into reality. Listening and participation, satisfaction with the methods and style of decision making are part of the leadership. This aspect also refers to the conscious selection, by managers, of alternatives to produce sustainable and sustainable results. Decision making is associated with leadership, communication, participation and teamwork.

Labor performance

Definitions

Table 2
Work Performance. Definitions

Author	Definitions	Approach
Milkovich and Boudreau (1994)	Degree in which the employee meets the work requirements.	Compliance requirements
Stoner et al (1994)	How the members of the organization work effectively to achieve common goals, subject to the basic rules established previously.	Fulfillment of goals
Chiavenato (2000a)	Behavior of the worker in the pursuit of the objectives set; it constitutes the individual strategy to achieve the objectives. It is determined by attitudinal factors of the person such as: discipline, cooperative attitude, initiative, responsibility, safety ability, discretion, personal presentation, interest, creativity, ability to perform and operational factors such as knowledge of work, quality, quantity, accuracy, work in team and leadership.	Behavior and attitudes
Chiavenato (2000b)	Ways as organizations aspire to work with their members to achieve through them the organizational objectives, while each one achieves its individual objectives.	Compliance with organizational objectives
Palaci (2005)	Value that is expected to contribute to the organization of the different behavioral episodes that an individual carries out, which will contribute to organizational efficiency.	Behavior
Robbins and Coulter (2014)	Process to determine how successful an organization has been (or an individual or a process) in the achievement of its activities and work objectives.	Achievement of goals.

Source: self-made

In the development of this research, we will rely on the definition of Stoner et al (1994) (see definition in Table 2), which focuses on the effective fulfillment of common goals, based on a previously established normative framework. This allows employees to have a clear picture of the guidelines associated with the performance the organization expects from them.

Factors that determine work performance

Palaci (2005, p.237) proposes the existence of elements that affect work performance; those elements are related and generate a low or high performance: monetary and non-monetary rewards, satisfaction in relation to the assigned tasks, skills, aptitudes (competencies) to perform the assigned tasks, training and constant development of employees, motivational and behavioral factors of the individual, organizational climate, organizational culture and employee expectations.

According to the same author, there are three aspects that affect work performance:

- Performance of tasks: compliance with obligations and responsibilities that contribute to the production of goods or services and the performance of administrative tasks.
- Civics: actions that affect the psychological environment of the organization such as helping others, treating colleagues with respect, constructive criticism and expressing positive things about the workplace.

- Lack of ethics: actions that negatively affect the organization, including theft, damage to company property, aggressive behavior with colleagues and frequent absence from work.

Milkovich and Boudrem (1994) consider other individual characteristics as: skills, abilities, needs and qualities that interact with the nature of work and the organization to produce behaviors that generate changes in organizations. Queipo and Useche (2002) claim that job performance depends on skills, motivation, group work, worker training, supervision and situational factors of each person as well as the perception that the person has of his/her role at work. Robbins (2004) points out the setting of goals as one of the fundamental principles of performance psychology because it helps the person to focus his/her efforts more on goals when they are difficult than when they are not.

Importance of performance evaluation

García (2001) associates performance with those actions or behaviors observed in employees that are relevant to the objectives of the organization, and that can be measured in terms of individual competencies and their level of contribution to the company. Chiavenato (2015) states that a performance evaluation program benefits the worker, the boss and the organization:

- Benefits for the boss: to have an objective measurement system, to provide measures in order to improve the performance standard of its employees and to communicate with them to make them understand that performance evaluation is an objective system.
- Benefits for the worker: to know the aspects of the workers that the organization values, to know the expectations of their leader in terms of their performance, to know both the measures that the leader takes to improve their performance (training programs, development, etc.) as those that the worker performs on his/her own (training, correction of errors, work attention, among others); and to perform critical self-assessment in terms of development and personal control.
- Benefits for the organization: to evaluate its human potential in the short, medium and long term; to define the contribution of each employee, to identify employees who need to rotate or improve in certain areas, to identify staff for promotions or transfers, to formulate human resources policies that give opportunities to employees (promotions, growth and personal development), to stimulate productivity and improve human relations.

Regulations for evaluating job performance in Ecuador


Article 229 of the Constitution of the Republic of Ecuador (National Constituent Assembly, 2008) defines the public server as any person who works, provides services or exercises a position, function or dignity within the public sector. Their rights are inalienable. The Law will define the governing body in terms of human resources and remuneration for the entire public sector and regulate the entry, promotion, promotion, incentives, disciplinary regime, stability, remuneration system and cessation of functions of its servers.

In 2010, the Organic Law of Public Service (Ley Orgánica de Servicio Público) (LOSEP) was issued, which establishes the governing body on human resources and remuneration for the entire public sector to the Ministry of Labor Relations, as of November 26, 2014. In the chapter 6 of the performance evaluation subsystem, article 76 defines performance evaluation as:

The set of rules, techniques, methods, protocols and procedures that are harmonized, fair, transparent, impartial and free from arbitrariness that is systematically oriented to evaluate under objective parameters in accordance with the functions, responsibilities and profiles of the position. The evaluation is based on quantitative and qualitative management indicators, aimed at promoting the achievement of institutional aims and purposes, the development of public servers and the continuous improvement of the quality of the public service provided by all entities, institutions, agencies or legal entities indicated in article 3 of this Law.

This same legal instrument establishes, among other things, the planning of the evaluation, the scale of rating, the objectives of the evaluation, and the effects of the evaluation. In 2018 the Ministry of Labor in Ministerial Agreement MDT-2018-041 issued the Technical Standard of the Performance Evaluation Subsystem and the instrument designed for that purpose by the regulator is the following (Figure 1):

Figure 1
Section of the form MRL-EVAL-01- Modified

 MINISTERIO DEL TRABAJO		FORM MRL-EVAL-01 - MODIFIED			
FORM FOR THE EVALUATION OF PERFORMANCE BY COMPETENCES TO BE USED BY THE IMMEDIATE CHIEF					
SERVER DATA:					
Surname and server names (evaluated):					
Name of the position held					
Degree of Education or Profession:					
Surname and name of immediate supervisor or chief (evaluator):					
Evaluation period (dd / mm / yyyy):		From:		To:	
EVALUATION OF JOB ACTIVITIES					
Job management indicators:		No. of Activities:		Factor:	60%
Description of activities	Indicator	Target of the period evaluated (number)	Performed	% compliance	Level of compliance
In addition to the fulfillment of the totality of goals and objectives, was the server anticipated and fulfilled with objectives and goals foreseen for the following evaluation period?			Apply + 4 %		
				Total Essential Activities:	
KNOWLEDGE	Nº of KNOWLEDGE	0	FACTOR:	8%	LEVEL OF KNOWLEDGE
				Total knowledge	
				0%	

TECHNICAL COMPETENCES OF THE JOB		No. OF COMPETENCES	FACTOR:	8%
Skills	Relevance	Observable behavior		Level of development
Total Technical Job Skills				0%
UNIVERSAL COMPETENCES		No. OF COMPETENCES	FACTOR:	8%
THESE FIELDS ARE COMPULSORY				
Skills	Relevance	Observable behavior		Frequency of application
Continuous learning				
Knowledge of the organizational environment				
Human relations				
Attitude to change				
Results orientation				
Service orientation				
Total universal competences:				0%
TEAMWORK, INITIATIVE AND LEADERSHIP			Factor: 16%	
DESCRIPTION	RELEVANCE	OBSERVABLE BEHAVIOR		Application Frequency
TEAMWORK				
INITIATIVE				
Fill the field of leadership, only for those who have subordinate servers under their management responsibility.				
LIDERAZGO				
Total teamwork, initiative and leadership:				0%
Observations of the immediate supervisor (if any):				
Citizen complaints (to be used by Human Resources units). Information from the evaluation form 02				
Name of the person who complains	Description	Application Number	Apply discount to performance evaluation	% de reduction
TOTAL:				
EVALUATION RESULT				
EVALUATION FACTORS				Rating achieved (%)
Job management indicators				

Knowledge	0,0
Technical competencies of the Job	0,0
Universal competences	0,0
Teamwork, Initiative and leadership	0,0
Evaluation of the citizen (-)	0,0
Total performance evaluation:	
EVALUATOR	
Date (dd / mm / yyyy):	
I CERTIFY: That I have evaluated the server according to the procedure of the Performance Evaluation standard.	
Signature Evaluator or immediate Chief	

Source: Ministry of Labor of Ecuador

Labor Satisfaction

The entities of the public sector according to the regulations for the evaluation of performance through the administrative unit of human talent (UATH) must have the following normative and technical instruments. (Ministry of Labor, 2018):

- Portfolio of products and services updated of each unit or internal process, derived from the organic statute and approved institutional planning. The portfolio of products and services will be derived from the institutional structures, internal regulations or other regulations in which the functionality of the internal units is established until the institution elaborates its management instruments.
- Annual goals by product or service of each unit or internal process established in the institutional planning, as an input to the methodology of the human talent templates determined in the Technical Standard of the Human Talent Planning Subsystem.
- Manual of provisional positions or profiles approved.

Evaluators and those who are evaluated intervene in the performance evaluation process. The first corresponds to the immediate superior leader acting during the period; and the second refers to public servers of State Institutions. Article 20 of the LOSEP (2010) and Ministerial Agreement MDT-2018-041 state the following final rating scale for the evaluation of performance.

- **Excellent:** high performance; exceeds goals and programmed goals, rating equal to or greater than 95%.
- **Very good:** expected performance; meets goals and programmed goals, rating between 90% and 94.99%.
- **Good:** acceptable performance; maintains acceptable productivity level, rating between 80% and 89.99%.
- **Sufficient:** performance below expectations; results below the acceptable minimum of productivity, rating between 70% and 79.99%.
- **Poor:** very low performance than expected; productivity does not cover the requirements of the position and internal processes, qualification equal to or lower than 69.99%.

The server that is not satisfied with his/her performance rating may submit a written request for reconsideration and/or requalification to the UATH institutional within a period of 5 days counted from the notification of the result of the qualification. For this purpose, the required courts will be formed until the next working day, expressly assigning the respective cases in the conformation minutes and making all the documents presented available to them. The UATH must ensure that the members of the court have not intervened in the performance evaluation, because it will invalidate the operative acts issued by these bodies. The reconsideration and/or reclassification court will admit the request presented by the server and may not exceed eight (8) days from the knowledge of it until the issuance of the report that will be final and not open to appeal.

The institutional UATH, on the basis of the consolidated report of the results of the performance evaluation, will elaborate the plan of improvement of the institutional performance, from the perspectives of the management of the units or processes and the development of competencies of the servers in accordance with the other subsystems of human talent. The results of the performance evaluation will necessarily result in the continuous improvement of the institutional management and administration of the other subsystems of human talent.

METHODOLOGICAL FRAMEWORK

The research is exploratory and descriptive. A Likert scale questionnaire was applied to a sample of 19 servers of the Financial Department of the Secular Eloy Alfaro de Manabí University (ULEAM) in Ecuador, to determine their level of job satisfaction. For the calculation of the sample, the formula referred to by Sierra Bravo (1993) for finite populations was applied.

So:

$$n = \frac{4 * N * p * q}{E^2 * (N - 1) + 4 * p * q}$$

Where:

n: sample size

N: size of the population

p: probability of success = 50%

q: error probability = 50%

E²: Error selected by the researcher = 17%

4: constant

After applying the formula, **the result was n = 19.**

Additionally, a diagnosis was made of the performance evaluations of the surveyed servers whose results are presented in the following section.

RESULTS

Work Satisfaction

The results of the application of the questionnaires to the 19 servers of the Financial Management of ULEAM, (Dirección Financiera de la ULEAM) are presented below according to the dimensions proposed by Zayas Agüero et al. (2015).

Table 3
Dimension 1: Organizational Structure
n = 19

Scale of the response category	Response Category	Item	
		In your department, the hierarchical levels are well defined.	
		F	%
5	Completely agree	3	15,8
4	Agree	4	21,1
3	Neither agree nor disagree	7	36,8
2	Disagree	4	21,1
1	Completely disagree	1	5,3
	Mean	3,21	
	Mode	3	
	Standard deviation	1,134	

Source: Self- made

Table 3 shows that the mean of **Definition of Hierarchical Levels Indicator** with a value of 3.21, approximately 3, corresponds to the category (**neither agree nor disagree**). The standard deviation of 1,134 reveals that the majority of responses were between categories 4 (**Agree**) and 2 (**Disagree**). Mode with a value of 3 points out that for this indicator the most selected answer was (**neither agrees nor disagrees**). Taking mode as a reference, we can say that the **Organizational Structure Dimension** is moderately valued by the respondents.

Based on the approaches of Zayas Agüero *et al.* (2015), it means that most of the respondents are (**neither in agreement nor in disagreement**) in how the ULEAM Financial Management carries out the organization, the coordination and division of the actions, the administrative control, the definition of hierarchical levels and the relationship between them.

Table 4 shows that the average of **Skills Required for Job Performance Indicator** with a value of 4.16, approximately 4, corresponds to the category (**Agree**). The standard deviation of 0.688 indicates that most of the responses fall between categories 5 (**Completely agree**) and 3 (**neither agree nor disagree**). Mode, with a value of 4, indicates that the most selected answer was (**Agree**). Taking mode as a reference, we can say that this indicator is well valued by the surveyed servers.

As for the mean of the **Work Content Dimension** clearly defined with a value of 3.53, approximately 4, corresponds to the category (**Agree**). The standard deviation of 1.073 indicates that most of the responses fall between categories 5 (**Completely agree**) and 2 (**Disagree**).

Mode with a value of 4 indicates that the most selected answer was (**Agree**). Taking mode as a reference, we can say that this indicator is also well valued by the respondents.

Table 4
Dimension 2: Work Content
n = 19

Scale of the response category	Response Category	Items			
		Your work requires different types of skills to perform it.		The content of your work is clearly defined	
		F	%	F	%
5	Completely agree	5	26,3	3	15,8
4	Agree	13	68,4	9	47,4
3	Neither agree nor disagree	0	0,0	2	10,5
2	Disagree	1	5,3	5	26,3
1	Completely disagree	5	0,0		
	Mean	4,16		3,53	
	Mode	4		4	
	Standard Deviation	0,688		1,073	

Source: Self- made

The foregoing indicates that according to the perception of the servers of the Financial Management of the ULEAM, the **Work Content Dimension** proposed by Zayas Agüero et al (2015), associated with skills, independence, significance, importance, definition, autonomy, organization and creativity at work are intrinsic to such dimension.

Table 5
Dimension 3: Normative, Values and Customs
n = 19

Scale of the response category	Response Category	Items			
		The rules of your department are socialized.		You share the same values with your co-workers.	
		F	%	F	%
5	Completely agree	7	36,8	3	15,8
4	Agree	11	57,9	8	42,1
3	Neither agree nor disagree	0	0,0	5	26,3
2	Disagree	1	5,3	3	15,8
1	Completely disagree	0	0,0	0	0,0
	Mean	4,26		3,58	
	Mode	4		4	
	Standard Deviation	0,733		0,961	

Source: Self- made

Table 5 shows that the mean of the **Socialization of Standards Indicator**, with a value of 4.26, approximately 4, corresponds to the category (**Agree**). The standard deviation of 0.733 indicates that most of the answers fall between categories 5 (**Completely agree**) and 4 (**Agree**). Mode with a value of 4 indicates that the most selected answer was (**Agree**). Taking mode as a reference, we can say that this indicator is well valued by the surveyed servers.

The mean of the **Shared Values Indicator** with a value of 3.58, approximately 4, corresponds to the category (**Agree**). The standard deviation of 0.961 indicates that most of the responses fall between categories 5 (**Completely agree**) and 3 (**Neither agree nor disagree**). Mode with a value of 4 indicates that the most selected answer was (**Agree**). Taking mode as a reference, we can say that this indicator is also well valued by the respondents.

The foregoing shows that the “**Normative, Values and Customs Dimension**” is positively perceived by the surveyed servers. This indicates that in the opinion of the respondents, in the Financial Management of ULEAM, as pointed out by Zayas Agüero et al (2015), beliefs, culture, values and norms are shared in the human environment where servers perform their work. Particularly, in relation to culture, it is assumed that communication patterns, philosophies, histories, goals, among others are shared.

Table 6
Dimension 4: Salary and Stimulation
n = 19

Scale of the response category	Response Category	Items			
		You have possibilities of professional improvement in the institution.		You are satisfied with the non-salary benefits you receive.	
		F	%	F	%
5	Completely agree	0	0,0	0	0
4	Agree	4	21,1	3	15,8
3	Neither agree nor disagree	10	52,6	10	52,6
2	Disagree	5	26,3	6	31,6
1	Completely disagree	0	0,0	0	0,0
	Mean		2,95		2,84
	Mode		3		3
	Standard Deviation		0,705		0,688

Source: Self- made

Table 6 shows that the average of the **Possibilities of Professional Improvement Indicator** with a value of 2.95, approximately 3, corresponds to the category (**Neither agree nor disagree**). The standard deviation of 0.705 indicates that most of the responses fall between categories 4 (**Agree**) and 2 (**Disagree**). Mode with a value of 3 indicates that the most selected answer was (**Neither agree nor disagree**). Taking mode as a reference, we can say that this indicator is moderately valued by the surveyed servers.

The mean of the **Satisfaction with Non-wage Benefits Indicator** with a value of 2.84, approximately 3, corresponds to the category (**Neither agree nor disagree**). The standard

deviation of 0.688 indicates that most of the responses fall between categories 4 (**Agree**) and 2 (**Neither agree nor disagree**). Mode with a value of 3 indicates that the most selected answer was (**Neither agree nor disagree**). Taking mode as a reference, we can say that this indicator is moderately valued by the surveyed servers.

The results reveal that the **Salary and Stimulation Dimension**, moderately valued, refers to the fact that the ULEAM Financial Management servers that participated in the study did not perceive positively what is related to remuneration, compensations, promotions and possibilities of improvement. According to their opinion, wage stimulation is not established, as pointed out by Zayas Agüero *et al.* (2015), that is, by recognition and balance between moral and material stimuli, among others.

Table 7
Dimension 5: Working Conditions
n = 19

Scale of the response category	Response Category	Items			
		Your workplace is safe		Your workplace is clean and tidy	
		F	%	F	%
5	Completely agree	1	5,26	5	26,3
4	Agree	4	21,05	11	57,9
3	Neither agree nor disagree	8	42,11	2	10,5
2	Disagree	5	26,3	0	0,0
1	Completely disagree	1	5,26	1	5,3
	Mean	2,95		4,00	
	Mode	3		4	
	Standard Deviation	0,970		0,943	

Source: Self- made

Table 7 shows that the mean of **Safety in the Workplace Indicator**, with a value of 2.95, approximately 3, corresponds to the category (**Neither agree nor disagree**). The standard deviation of 0.979 indicates that most of the responses fall between categories 4 (**Agree**) and 2 (**Disagree**). Mode with a value of 3 indicates that for this indicator the most selected answer was (**Neither agree nor disagree**). Taking mode as a reference, we can say that this indicator is moderately valued by the surveyed servers.

The mean of **Order and cleanliness Indicator** in the workplace with a value of 4, corresponds to the category (**Agree**). The standard deviation of 0.943 indicates that most of the responses fall between categories 3 (**neither agree nor disagree**) and 5 (**Completely agree**). Mode with a value of 4 indicates that for this indicator the most selected answer was (**Agree**). Taking mode as a reference, we can say that this indicator is well valued by the surveyed servers.

We consider that the **Working Conditions Dimension** was moderately valued since one indicator was well valued, but the other was not. This indicates that the working conditions proposed by Zayas Agüero *et al.* (2015) related to the order, materials and means necessary to carry out the work and ergonomic conditions such as hygiene and safety are not optimal for the ULEAM Financial Management servers.

Table
Dimension 6: Welfare Conditions
n = 19

Scale of the response category	Response Category	Items			
		In your work recreational activities are carried out		You are satisfied with your work schedule	
		F	%	F	%
5	Completely agree	0	0,0	3	15,8
4	Agree	2	10,5	6	31,6
3	Neither agree nor disagree	8	42,1	9	47,4
2	Disagree	6	31,6	1	5,3
1	Completely disagree	3	15,8	0	0,0
	Mean	2,47		3,58	
	Mode	3		3	
	Standard Deviation	0,905		0,838	

Source: Self- made

Table 8 shows that the mean of the **Recreational Activities Indicator**, with a value of 2.47, approximately 2, corresponds to the category (**Disagree**). The standard deviation of 0.905 indicates that most of the responses fall between categories 4 (**Agree**) and 2 (**Disagree**). Mode with a value of 3 indicates that the most selected answer was (**Neither agree nor disagree**). Taking mode as a reference, we can say that this indicator is moderately valued by the surveyed servers.

The mean of the **Satisfaction with Working Hours Indicator** with a value of 3.58, approximately 4, corresponds to the category (**Agree**). The standard deviation of 0.838 indicates that most of the responses fall between categories 4 (**Agree**) and 3 (**Neither agree nor disagree**). Mode with a value of 3 indicates that the most selected answer was (**Neither agree nor disagree**). Taking mode as a reference, we can say that this indicator is moderately valued by the surveyed servers.

According to the results, it can be stated that the **Welfare Conditions Dimension** is not positively valued by the servers of the Financial Management of the ULEAM. This refers to the fact that the work schedule, recreational, cultural and sports activities do not cope optimally in the Institution, which may mean that the university authorities do not give these aspects the due importance to improve the work satisfaction.

Table 9 shows that the mean of the **Good Interpersonal Relationships with the Immediate Boss Indicator** with a value of 3.95, approximately 4, corresponds to the category (**Agree**). The standard deviation of 0.848 indicates that most of the responses fall between categories 5 (**Completely agree**) and 3 (**Neither agree nor disagree**). Mode with a value of 4 indicates that the most selected answer was (**Agree**). Taking mode as a reference, we can say that the dimension Interpersonal relations and communication is well valued by the respondents.

Table 9
Dimension 7: interpersonal Relationships and Communication
n = 19

Scale of the response category	Response Category	Item	
		You have good interpersonal relationships with your immediate boss	
		F	%
5	Completely agree	5	26,3
4	Disagree	9	47,4
3	Neither agree nor disagree	4	21,1
2	Disagree	1	5,3
1	Completely disagree	0	0,0
Mean		3,95	
Mode		4	
Standard Deviation		0,848	

Source: Self- made

According to the results, it can be stated that the **Interpersonal Relationship and Communication Dimension** is valued positively by the servers of the Financial Management of ULEAM. This refers to the fact that what is related to the process of social interaction, opinions or work instructions, interpersonal relationships, particularly with the immediate boss, cope in an appropriate manner according to their perception.

Table 10
Dimension 8: Leadership and Decision Making.
n = 19

Scale of the response category	Response Category	Items	
		Your immediate boss allows you to participate in making important decisions	
		F	%
5	Completely agree	1	5,3
4	Disagree	8	42,1
3	Neither agree nor disagree	8	42,1
2	Disagree	1	5,3
1	Completely disagree	1	5,3
Mean		3,37	
Mode		3	
Standard Deviation		0,895	

Source: Self- made

Table 10 shows that the mean of the **Participation in Decision Making Indicator**, with a value of 3.37, approximately 3, corresponds to the category (**Neither agree nor disagree**). The standard deviation of 0.895 indicates that most of the responses fall between categories 4 (**Agree**) and 2 (**Disagree**). Mode with a value of 3 indicates that the most selected answer was

(**Neither agree nor disagree**). Taking mode as a reference, we can say that this indicator is moderately valued by the surveyed servers.

The results show that **Leadership and Decision-Making Dimension** was not completely valued by the servers of the Financial Management of the ULEAM, which means that for them the transformation of reality through leadership, listening, the style of decision-making and participation are not achieved optimally.

The results presented in the above tables are summarized in **table 11** below. Moderately valued dimensions were considered as weaknesses and those strongly valued as strengths.

Table 11
Dimensions of Job Satisfaction in the Financial Department of the Secular Eloy Alfaro de Manabí University. Strengths and weaknesses

Dimension of job satisfaction	Strength	Weakness
Structure		X
Nature and content of work	X	
Regulations, values and customs	X	
Salary and stimulation		X
Working conditions		X
Welfare conditions		X
Interpersonal Relationships	X	
Leadership and decision making		X

Source: Self- made

Job performance

The results of the performance evaluations made in 2017 to the 19 servers that made up the sample were tabulated considering the final qualification scale established both in article 20 of Ministerial Agreement No. MDT-2018-0041 of the Ministry of Labor and in the article 78 of the Public Service Organic Law (2010) (see table 12)

Table 12
Performance evaluations. Year 2017

Rating	Number of servers	%
Excellent (high performance, exceeds goals and programmed goals. Rating equal to or greater than 95%)	6	31,58
Very good (expected performance; meets goals and programmed goals. Rating between 90% and 94.99%)	12	63,17
Good (acceptable performance; maintains acceptable productivity level. Rating between 80% and 89.99%)	1	5,25
Sufficient (low performance as expected; results below the acceptable minimum of productivity. Rating between 70% and 79.99%)	0	0
Poor (very low performance as expected, productivity does not cover the requirements of the position and internal processes. Rating equal to or lower than 69.99%)	0	0
TOTAL	19	100

Source: Self- made

It is observed that 63% of the servers that made up the sample obtained performance evaluations located in the (**Very good**) category and 31% in the (**Excellent**) category.

Incidence of job satisfaction in the performance of the servers of the Financial Department of the Secular University Eloy Alfaro de Manabí, Ecuador.

Taking into consideration that most of the dimensions (5 of 8) (structure, salary and stimulation, working conditions, welfare conditions and leadership) that determine job satisfaction, according to the approaches of Zayas Agüero et al. (2015), were evaluated negatively by the servers that participated in the study, it can be said that they are not satisfied with their work.

However, when observing the high percentages in the performance evaluations (table 3), it can be affirmed that the job dissatisfaction that they might have, has not affected the performance of their work. This may be because they valued positively the content dimensions of work, regulations, values and interpersonal relationships, which are part of the socio-psychological aspects.

Particularly, the good assessment of the nature and content dimension of the work indicates that the individuals that made up the studied sample feel that mastering their work is important; they feel that they have the skills to carry it out, they have meaning in the institution and they can use creativity to perform it.

The positive assessment of the **Normative, Values and Content Dimension** shows that the servants share beliefs, culture, values and norms with their co-workers; and that they also have a shared organizational culture associated with communication patterns, philosophy, histories and goals. **The Interpersonal Relationship and Communication Dimension** also valued positively indicates that the servers that were surveyed perceive that they can exchange ideas, feelings, information, opinions and work instructions with their peers.

CONCLUSIONS

In this research, the dimensions of job satisfaction that respondents identified as the main constraints to their job satisfaction were determined. The high value in dimensions such as work content, regulations, values, interpersonal relationships and communication does not mean that these dimensions work optimally. In fact, they did not obtain the highest valuation; however, we consider that having a considerably high valuation has been the reason why the performance evaluations are qualified mostly between Excellent and Very good in spite of having low values in the structure dimensions, wages, working conditions, welfare conditions and leadership; all of them directly associated with the institution.

We consider that the high value given by the respondents, particularly to the Nature and content of work dimension, associated with skills, independence, importance, autonomy, organization and creativity at work, is another reason why performance evaluations are rated among Excellent and Very good in spite of the adverse organizational conditions that the University offers them. The socio-psychological aspects are determinants in the workplace, that is, interpersonal relationships, affective bonds between co-workers and good interpersonal relationships with the immediate boss. It is essential to bear in mind that when material conditions at work are not appropriate, even when the psychosocial aspects are strong, the organization runs a high risk that its personnel will be demotivated to the point that it negatively affects their performance

and that even dissociate from the organization, taking with it their knowledge and experiences related to work, a situation that intellectually decapitalizes the organization.

Therefore, it is important that there is a balance between the psychosocial environment and the material conditions that the organization must offer. Finally, we can affirm, according to the results of the study, that in the case of the servers of the Financial Department of the Secular Eloy Alfaro de Manabí University, job dissatisfaction does not have a negative effect on job performance.

REFERENCES

Aldag, R. y Brief, A. (1978). Examination of alternative models of job satisfaction. *Human relations*, 31(1), pp 91-98.

Alonso, M. (2008). Estudio comparativo de la satisfacción laboral en el personal de administración. *Revista de Psicología del Trabajo y de las Organizaciones*, 2, pp 45-63.

Anaya, D. y Suárez, J. (2007). Satisfacción laboral de los profesores de educación infantil, primaria y secundaria. Un estudio de ámbito nacional. *Revista de Educación*. Septiembre/Diciembre, N° 344, pp. 217-243. Available on the website: http://www.revistaeducacion.mec.es/re344_09html

Andresen, M.; Domsch, M. y Cascorbi, A. (2007). Trabajando horas inusuales y su relación con la satisfacción en el trabajo: un estudio de los pilotos marítimos europeos. *Diario de trabajo investigador*, 28, pp 714-734.

Asamblea Nacional Constituyente (2008). Constitución de la República del Ecuador.

Brief, A. y Weiss, H. (2002). Organizational behavior: Affect in the workplace. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 53(1), pp 279-307. Available on the website: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11752487>

Chiang, V.; Salazar, B. y Nuñez, P. (2007). Clima organizacional y satisfacción laboral en un establecimiento de salud mental: Hospital Tipo I. *Theoría*, 16 (2), pp 61-76.

Chiavenato, I. (1986). Administración de recursos humanos. México: McGraw-Hill.

Chiavenato, I. (2000a). Introducción a la teoría general de la administración. México: McGraw-Hill.

Chiavenato, I. (2000b). Administración de Recursos Humanos. Bogotá: McGraw Hill.

Chiavenato, I. (2015). Administración de recursos humanos. El capital humano en las organizaciones. México: McGraw-Hill.

Davis, K. y Newstrom, J. (1999). *Comportamiento Humano en el Trabajo*. México: Editorial McGraw-Hill.

Fritzsche, B. y Parrish, T. (2005). Theories and research on job satisfaction. En: Brown, S. y Lent, R. (Eds.) *Career development and counseling: Putting theory and research to work*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

Galaz Fonte, J. (2002). La satisfacción en el trabajo de académicos en una universidad pública estatal. *Perfiles Educativos*. Vol. 24, N° 96, pp 47-72. Available on the website: <http://www.scielo.org.mx/pdf/peredu/v24n96/v24n96a4.pdf>

García, M. (2001). La importancia de la evaluación del desempeño. *Proyecciones*. Año 2, N° 9, febrero-marzo.

Gibson, J.; Ivancevich, J. y Donnelly, J. (1996). *Las organizaciones: comportamiento, estructura, procesos*. México: McGraw-Hill.

Koontz, H. y Weihrich, H. (1993). *Administración*. México: McGraw- Hill.

Mason, C. y Griffin, M. (2002). Group task Satisfaction: Applying the Construct of Job Satisfaction to Groups. *Small Group Research*, 33, pp. 271-312.

Milkovich, G. y Boudreau, J. (1994). *Dirección y administración de recursos humanos. Un enfoque de estrategia*. 6ta edición. México: Addison-Wesley Iberoamericana. Available on the website: https://books.google.com.pe/books/about/Direccion_y_Administracion_de_Recursos_H.htm?hl=es&id=n-xBAAAACAAJ&redir_esc=y

Ministerio del Trabajo del Ecuador (2010). *Ley Orgánica de Servicio Público*. Available on the website: <https://www.educacionsuperior.gob.ec/wp-content/uploads/downloads/2014/09/LOSEP.pdf>

Ministerio del Trabajo del Ecuador (2018). Acuerdo Ministerial 0041. Norma Técnica del Subsistema de Evaluación del Desempeño. Available on the website: www.trabajo.gob.ec/wp-content/uploads/2018/04/MDT-2018-0041.pdf

Muñoz, A. (1990). *Satisfacción e insatisfacción en el trabajo*. Tesis doctoral inédita, Facultad de Psicología, Universidad Complutense de Madrid.

Palaci, F. (2005). *Psicología de la Organización*. Madrid, España: Pearson Prentice Hall.

Queipo, B. y Useche, M. (2002). El desempeño laboral en el departamento de mantenimiento del ambulatorio La Victoria. *Revista de Ciencias Sociales* Vol. VIII. Available on the website: <http://www.redalyc.org/pdf/280/28080308.pdf>

Robbins, S. (2004). *Comportamiento Organizacional*. 7ma. Edición. México: Prentice Hall.

Robbins, S. y Coulter, M. (2014). *Administración*. México: Addison-Wesley.

Romeiro, S. (2015). Bienestar psicológico y laboral en los docentes: un estudio empírico correlacional. *Arandu-UTIC. Revista Científica Internacional de la Universidad Tecnológica Intercontinental*, 2(1), pp 123-148. Available on the website: <http://www.utic.edu.py/revista.ojs/index.php/revista/article/view/36>

Salinas, C.; Laguna, J. y Mendoza, M. (1994). La satisfacción laboral y su papel en la evaluación de la calidad de la atención médica. *Revista Salud Pública de México*. Vol. 36, No. 1, pp. 22-29. Available on the website: <http://www.redalyc.org/pdf/106/10636105.pdf>

Stoner, J.; Freeman, E. y Gilbert, D. (1994). *Administración*. 6ta Edición. México: Prentice Hall Hispanoamérica.

Wright, B. y Davis, B. (2003). Job satisfaction in the public sector the role of the work environment. *The American Review of Public Administration*, 33(1), pp 70-90.

Wright, T. y Bonett, D. (2007). Job satisfaction and psychological well-being as nonadditive predictors of workplace turnover. *Journal of Management*, 33, pp 141-160.

Zayas, P.; Báez, R.; Zayas, J. y Hernández, M. (2015). Causas de la satisfacción laboral en una organización comercializadora mayorista. *Revista de la Facultad de Ciencias Económicas*, Vol. XXIII (2), diciembre, pp 35-51. Available on the website: www.scielo.org.co/pdf/rfce/v23n2/v23n2a04.pdf

Artículo recibido: 01/02/2018

Artículo aceptado: 16/04/2019