

# LABOR SATISFACTION AND PERFORMANCE AMONG EMPLOYEES OF THE “LLERMAT SÚPER POLLO” COMPANY

## SATISFACCIÓN Y DESEMPEÑO LABORAL DE LOS EMPLEADOS DE LA EMPRESA LLERMAT SÚPER POLLO

Patricia Hernández Medina

Patricia.hernandez@utc.edu.ec

Universidad Técnica de Cotopaxi

Isabel Alejandra Bastidas Herrera

isabel.bastidas2922@utc.edu.ec

Universidad Técnica de Cotopaxi

María Verónica Albarracín Orellana

maria.albarracin0955@utc.edu.ec

Universidad Técnica de Cotopaxi

### RESUMEN

Esta investigación tuvo objetivo determinar la relación entre Satisfacción y el Desempeño Laboral de los empleados de la empresa Llemart “Súper Pollo”. Para dar respuesta a esta necesidad se procedió aplicar tres cuestionarios que sirvieron para la recopilación de datos, los cuales fueron enfocados para la satisfacción laboral, desempeño laboral y auto-evaluación de desempeño. Se compararon los resultados de satisfacción y desempeño laboral por sucursal a través de un contraste de diferencia de medias, una estimación por mínimos cuadrados ordinarios para identificar la posible relación entre satisfacción y desempeño, y, por último, se realizó un análisis factorial para tratar de resumir todos los planteamientos en dimensiones. Como resultado se obtuvo en términos generales que la satisfacción laboral en la empresa es muy buena, mientras que en relación al desempeño laboral y autoevaluación de desempeño se pudo evidenciar que el resultado es de bueno a muy bueno, coincidiendo así las dos evaluaciones realizadas respectivamente. Se concluyó

ARTÍCULO CIENTÍFICO: Labor satisfaction and performance among employees of the “LLERMAT SÚPER POLLO” company.

Recibido: 1 de abril de 2021, Revisión aceptada: 17 de junio de 2021

que efectivamente no existe una relación significativa entre la satisfacción y desempeño laboral en los empleados de la empresa “Súper Pollo”, y se evidencian diferencias en los resultados por sucursal.

**Palabras clave:** Desempeño laboral, satisfacción laboral, autoevaluación, evaluación laboral

## ABSTRACT

This research aimed to determine the relationship between satisfaction and work performance among employees of the Llemart Súper Pollo company. In order to address this need, three questionnaires were used to collect data, which were focused on job satisfaction, job performance, and self-evaluation of performance. The results of job satisfaction and performance by location were compared through a contrast of means, an estimation using ordinary least squares to identify the possible relationship between satisfaction and performance, and finally, a factorial analysis to try to summarize all the approaches in dimensions. As a result, it was observed that in general terms, job satisfaction in the company was very good, while job performance and self-evaluation of performance ranged from good to very good, thus coinciding with the two evaluations carried out respectively. It was concluded that there is no significant relationship between job satisfaction and performance among the employees; however, there are differences according to location.

**Keywords:** Job performance, labor satisfaction, self-assessment, job evaluation.

## INTRODUCTION

Labor satisfaction and performance play an important role in companies. For this reason, workers often concentrate on performing their activities in a better way, as long as they feel comfortable with the treatment they receive from their employers; otherwise, workers become unproductive and perform their activities out of obligation, causing the organization to stagnate.

According to Davis and Newstrom (2003), “labor satisfaction represents an

interaction between employees and their work environment, where congruence is sought between what employees want from their work and what employees feel they receive” (p. 70). Labor satisfaction is explained on the basis of a series of models or theories, among which the motivation-hygiene theory, the pyramid of needs theory, and the dynamic model of labor satisfaction stand out.

In the first case, the motivation-hygiene theory, better known as the “two-factor theory”, establishes that people are

influenced by two factors. These factors are linked in turn to satisfaction, which is the result of the motivational factors, and dissatisfaction, which is the result of the hygienic or extrinsic factors.

The motivational (or intrinsic) factors associated with satisfaction are fulfillment, recognition, the work itself, responsibility, progress, and development; and the hygienic or extrinsic factors related to labor satisfaction are company policy, administration, supervision, interpersonal relations, and management style.

Secondly, the theory of the pyramid of needs (Maslow) deals with a hierarchy of needs and factors that motivate people. It fulfills a series of features on behalf of society, the main one being unsatisfied needs that influence people's behavior. As the collaborator manages to control these basic needs, other higher-level ones appear, which originate to a certain degree with the hierarchical differences of each individual in their respective areas of work.

Therefore, so long as workers can meet their most basic needs, which are located at the top of the pyramid, they will feel more at ease at work, and the satisfaction levels they derive from the activity will be higher.

Thirdly, the Dynamic model of labor satisfaction, as stated by Pérez

(2014), considers that labor satisfaction “should be interpreted as a product of the interaction process between the person and his or her work situation, where variables such as control or power to regulate this interaction play an important role” (p. 35).

Considering these theories or models and taking Rodriguez and Tupiza (2018) as a reference, the determinants of satisfaction “are four: job challenge, fair reward system, favorable working conditions, and supportive colleagues” (p. 33).

Employees give preference to jobs that give them the opportunity to use their own skills and abilities, carry out a variety of tasks, and provide adequate feedback on how they are performing their activities. Moderate challenge causes enjoyment and satisfaction, and this can increase labor satisfaction by giving people the confidence to perform their job well.

Furthermore, the system of promotion and salary policies that an organization has for its employees must be a fair one. It must not allow ambiguities and must be in accordance with employees' expectations so that they can feel satisfied and confident in the stability offered by the company.

Similarly, working conditions, which refer to the benefits that support

ARTÍCULO CIENTÍFICO: Labor satisfaction and performance among employees of the “LLERMAT SÚPER POLLO” company.

Recibido: 1 de abril de 2021, Revisión aceptada: 17 de junio de 2021

labor relations, must be in accordance with the importance of the services rendered and be granted impartially to the employees without discrimination based on race, nationality, sex, age, religion, political doctrine etc.

Employees are generally interested in the work environment and also in maintaining their personal well-being to improve the performance of their work. Several authors mentioned above have shown that employees naturally prefer environments that provide comfort and at the same time do not expose them to situations that can put them at risk, such as temperature, noise, light, and other environmental factors.

Finally, colleagues who provide support, generate an added value. Rodríguez and Tupiza (2018) state that for employees, “it is very important to have good interpersonal relationships with their co-workers and establish a connection network” (p. 35).

Job performance describes the execution of activities by the employees of an organization in order to obtain results that achieve proposed goals over a certain time period. This performance must be a set of tangible, observable, and measurable actions. As defined by Whetten and Cameron (2005), “performance is the product of skill multiplied by motivation.

Skill is the product of aptitude multiplied by training and resources, and motivation is the product of desire and commitment” (p. 300).

Thus, in general, most of the skills that an individual possesses are the product of prior and continuous learning and improvement; however, it is vital to bear in mind that training is a separate component of the skill since it represents an important mechanism for improving employee performance.

Motivation is also included among the determinants, which for Whetten and Cameron (2005) is “the desire and commitment of an employee to perform and is manifested in a work-related effort” (p. 300).

For Berón and Palma (2011), there are several factors that affect people’s performance, such as personal and environmental factors, working environment, work content, working conditions, alteration of the biological rhythm, and work overload.

The evaluation of this performance, according to Chiavenato (2009) “is a systematic assessment of the performance of each person in terms of the activities he/she performs, the goals and results to be achieved, the competencies he/she offers and his/her development potential” (p.

245).

For this purpose, according to Mondy and Noe (2005), there are different methods such as 360-degree feedback evaluation which includes: evaluation reagents from multiple levels within companies as well as from external sources; a rating scales method which rates employees according to defined factors; critical incident methods which is a performance evaluation technique that requires a written record of employees' work activities, be they favorable or unfavorable; an essay method in which the evaluator writes a brief narrative describing an employee's performance; a job standards method which compares each employee's performance to a predetermined standard or expected level of production; and a ranking method in which the evaluator ranks all employees according to their overall performance.

In addition, there are: the forced distribution methods that require the appraiser to assign individuals from a work team to a limited number of categories similar to a normal frequency distribution; the behavior-based rating scale (BARS) that combines elements of the traditional rating scale and critical incident methods; and the outcome-based system in which the manager and subordinate jointly agree on the objectives for the next appraisal

period (Mondy and Noe, 2005).

These are not the only existing methods for evaluating job performance. Castillo (2006) proposes the objective-based evaluation method, the forced choice method, the checklist method, the forced distribution method, the graphic scale method, and the behaviorally based scale method. Castillo (2006) proposes that the best methodology will be the one that "fits the needs of all organizations and all workers; one can try to approach the ideal by combining some of the known techniques to integrate an evaluation method that contains the maximum strength" (p. 311).

Regardless of the method used, the question that arises is whether there is a relationship between performance and satisfaction. According to Gibson, Ivancevich, Donnelly and Konopaske (2006), one of the most debated and controversial issues in the study of job satisfaction is its relationship with job performance. For years, many managers believed that a satisfied worker was a high-performing employee. But most research studies find no clear link between satisfaction and performance. Some workers are satisfied with their jobs and still perform poorly, and of course, there are also employees who are dissatisfied but perform excellently.

This has led to the emergence

ARTÍCULO CIENTÍFICO: Labor satisfaction and performance among employees of the "LLERMAT SÚPER POLLO" company.

Recibido: 1 de abril de 2021, Revisión aceptada: 17 de junio de 2021

of three views: “satisfaction causes performance; performance causes satisfaction; and reward intervenes, but there is no inherent relationship. The first two views are weakly supported by research” (Gibson, Ivancevich, Donnelly, & Konopaske, 2006, p. 110).

Chiang and San Martín (2017), for their part, in a study developed in the Municipality of Talcahuano within the area of human resources, saw the need to measure the variables of performance and labor satisfaction. Their main objective was to measure how labor performance influences the labor satisfaction of civil servants.

The empirical evidence found allowed for the identification of the existence of statistically significant correlations between both variables. The following positive correlations for female employees stood out: performance and satisfaction with relationship with the boss, and satisfaction with productivity performance.

In the case of Chilean markets, Chiang and Ojeda (2013) analyzed the relationship between labor satisfaction and productivity variables among a total population of 264 workers. The authors were able to conclude that satisfaction with the physical environment has a statistically significant relationship with daily and

monthly salaries, which has a significant impact on the working hours that the market workers dedicate to their tasks and the salary they receive.

Salluca (2010) developed a research project for public educational institutions to study the relationship between levels of labor satisfaction and teaching performance among teachers working in Callao. The results indicated that among the students, there is a relationship between the two variables, while for the teachers, according to their self-perception, the variables are totally independent of each other.

Overall, labor satisfaction and performance within an organization have become especially important. As a result, workers have put more emphasis on performing their activities in a better way. It is necessary for employees to feel comfortable in their working environment. For this reason, the Llermat Súper Pollo company prioritizes employee satisfaction and has applied strategies in its five locations, making it a pioneering business that offers a quality service and product.

Llermat Súper Pollo was founded by the Llerena Gálvez family with the objective of offering a fast food service with a unique style and quality in the city of Latacunga, which is the capital of the province of Cotopaxi, in the Ecuadorian Andes.

It began its mission with a small store, but soon became a leading chain in the food industry throughout the city, and also migrated to other cantons within the province of Cotopaxi. The company currently has 52 qualified and trained employees, who are directly involved in the business and work at its headquarters or one of its four branches. The headquarters are located in Latacunga (location 1); one branch is in the south of the city (location 2); the third (location 3) is in the city of Machachi; the fourth is in central Salcedo (location 4); and the fifth is in the south of Salcedo.

Given the importance of employees in the quality of products and services offered by this type of company, this research determined the level of satisfaction and performance among workers at Llermat Súper Pollo, as well as their possible relationship, in order to identify opportunities for improvement and strategies to strengthen the organization's human talent.

## **METHODOLOGY**

Given that the objective of the research was to find the possible relationship between labor satisfaction and performance, the starting point was to estimate the levels of both variables for all employees at the different locations of the company.

ARTÍCULO CIENTÍFICO: Labor satisfaction and performance among employees of the "LLERMAT SÚPER POLLO" company.

Recibido: 1 de abril de 2021, Revisión aceptada: 17 de junio de 2021

To meet this need, we utilized a job performance evaluation questionnaire proposed by Grande and Abascal (2005). This instrument was applied to the staff's immediate supervisors and to the employees themselves (self-assessment), and consisted of 33 items, divided into the following dimensions: results orientation, quality, interpersonal relations, initiative, and teamwork.

The answers are associated with options represented on a Likert-type scale from 1 to 5, where unacceptable work performance scores 1, fair scores 2, good scores 3, very good scores 4, and excellent scores 5.

Regarding the measurement of satisfaction, a questionnaire by Sampieri, Collado and Lucio (2010) was used. This instrument was applied to the company's personnel, and is made up of 58 items divided into the following dimensions: command methods, motivation, communication, influence, decision-making, planning, control, improvement, and satisfaction itself.

The responses are associated with a Likert-type scale from 1 to 5, depending on the degree of acceptance of the statements: strongly disagree is 1, somewhat disagree is 2, undecided is 3, somewhat agree is 4, and strongly agree is 5.

Once the measurement instruments were applied, the validity, reliability and consistency of the results obtained were analyzed through the estimation of Cronbach's Alpha, whereby, according to the literature, the value should be close to 1 in order to guarantee the validity; values higher than 0.70 are recommended.

Additionally, the results of satisfaction and performance by location were compared through a mean difference contrast (mean of the total results with respect to the location mean) for both variables, as were all of the dimensions in order to identify possible discrepancies between them.

Once the results of both variables and the values obtained for their dimensions were determined, we proceeded to estimate an ordinary least squares (OLS) model to identify the possible relationship between labor satisfaction and personnel performance.

Finally, a factor analysis was performed to try to organize all the approaches of both questionnaires into factors that try to group them, so that these factors explain the highest possible percentage of the data variance, validating whether or not the factors found correspond to what is stated in the literature. This factor analysis was carried out using the principal components method or the varimax

method, depending on the results obtained.

## Results

As stated, the study was based on the application of three instruments applied to the five locations. The first two were associated with measuring performance, both from the point of view of the employer and the employee (self-evaluation). The third was associated with the measurement of employee labor satisfaction.

To evaluate the consistency and validity of the instruments, Cronbach's Alpha was estimated, obtaining values of 0.9649 for the performance questionnaire and 0.9866 for the satisfaction questionnaire. Given that these values are above 0.70, it can be affirmed that the instruments present internal consistency and are statistically valid.

### *Results for labor performance*

From the results obtained in the factors analyzed to diagnose the job performance of the 52 respondents, it can be deduced that most of the workers are functioning at a good to very good performance level. Question 8 (that the employee "does not make mistakes in the performance of their duties") obtained the lowest mean score of 3.294, while question 15 related to knowledge of the activities in their area obtained the highest



score of 4.7843.

The results grouped by dimensions are shown in Table 1 and reveal that, although all dimensions are rated in the highest range, teamwork is the best evaluated with 4.48, and the

lowest is initiative with 4.06, related to the possibility for employees to develop activities on their own, and this is limited to the assigned responsibilities and the way they are developed, which are standardized processes in most cases.

**Table 1.**

*Labor performance results by dimensions*

Dimension	Mean	Standard Deviation
Results orientation	4.296919	0.7355926
Quality	4.191176	0.4933007
Interpersonal relations	4.294118	0.582333
Initiative	4.066667	0.7061634
Teamwork	4.486928	0.6682009

Concerning the factors analyzed in order to diagnose the self-assessment of job performance of the 52 respondents, it was determined that the workers generally consider their performance to be very good, except in question 9 related to the need for supervision, in which their mean score was 2.15. Meanwhile, the best score coincided with the evaluation of their bosses, which is associated with the knowledge of the activities being developed, obtaining a mean of 4.96.

the overall mean, a hypothesis test for differences in means was carried out, the results of which are presented in Table 2, starting with the dimensions of results orientation, quality of work and interpersonal relations.

In order to determine whether there are statistically significant differences in the results for each of the performance dimensions by location with respect to

ARTÍCULO CIENTÍFICO: Labor satisfaction and performance among employees of the “LLERMAT SÚPER POLLO” company.

Recibido: 1 de abril de 2021, Revisión aceptada: 17 de junio de 2021

**Table 2.**

*Differences in each dimension (results orientation, quality of work and interpersonal relations) by location with respect to the meanmean.*

	Results orientation		Quality of work		Interpersonal relations	
	Meanmean	Total meanmean	Meanmean	Total meanmean	Meanmean	Total meanmean
Location 1	4.2406 (0.1687)	4.2969 (0.7355)	4.2697 (0.1131)	4.1941 (0.4933)	4.2556 (0.1335)	4.2941 -0.5823
Location 2	3.9365 (0.2452)	4.2969 (0.7355)	3.8056 (0.1644)	4.1941 (0.4933)	** 4.2222 (0.1941)	4.2941 -0.5823
Location 3	4.0714 (0.260)	4.2969 (0.7355)	4.1250 (0.1744)	4.1941 (0.4933)	4.1786 (0.2058)	4.2941 -0.5823
Location 4	4.3673 (0.2779)	4.2969 (0.7355)	4.3750 (0.1864)	4.1941 (0.4933)	4.0408 (0.2200)	4.2941 -0.5823
Location 5	5.0000 (0.2600)	4.2969 (0.7355)	*** 4.3438 (0.174)	4.1941 (0.4933)	4.8036 (0.2058)	4.2941 -0.5823

Note: Significant at: 1% (\*\*\*), 5% (\*\*), 10% (\*). Values in parentheses represent standard errors.

The results show that there are differences between the means of each location and the overall meanmean, and these differences are statistically significant for locations 2 (at 10%) and 5 (at 1%). As can be seen, the best evaluation of the results orientation dimension is in location 5, which scored 5 points, while the lowest is recorded in location 2, with a value of 3.93. The mean mean value for the entire company is 4.29.

With regard to the second dimension, quality of work, although there are differences between the mean values for each location and the overall meanmean, these differences are statistically significant only for location 2 (at 5%), the overall mean being 4.19. When analyzing each of

the locations, values lower than the overall mean are recorded in locations 2 (3.80) and 3 (4.12), while the highest value is obtained in location 4 with 4.37.

In a similar analysis for the interpersonal relations dimension, the overall meanmean was 4.29, with differences between locations, but these are statistically significant only in location 5 (at 5%).

The differences are mostly negative, so that the location meanmeans are below the total, except in location 5, which is 4.80.

The fourth dimension, initiative, had an overall meanmean of 4.06, showing differences with respect to each of the locations, with location 2 reporting the

lowest value (3.82), while location 5 scored 4.5. Hence, there are differences, but the

only statistically significant one is that of location 5 (at 5%), as shown in Table 3.

**Table 3.**

*Differences in each dimension (initiative and teamwork) by location with respect to the meanmean*

	Initiative		MeanMean	Teamwork	
	MeanMean	Total Meanmean		Total Meanmean	
Location 1	3.8842 (0.1619)	4.0666 (0.7061)	4.4386 (0.1532)	4.4869 (0.6682)	
Location 2	3.8222 (0.2353)	4.0666 (0.7061)	4.0741 (0.2227)	4.4869 (0.6682)	**
Location 3	4.1000 (0.2496)	4.0666 (0.7061)	4.3542 (0.2362)	4.4869 (0.6682)	
Location 4	4.3429 (0.2668)	4.0666 (0.7061)	4.7143 (0.2525)	4.4869 (0.6682)	
Location 5	4.5000 (0.2496)	4.0666 (0.7061)	** 5.0000 (0.2362)	4.4869 (0.6682)	**

Note: Significant at: 1% (\*\*\*), 5% (\*\*), 10% (\*). Values in parentheses represent standard errors.

The locations with mean means higher than the overall value are 3, 4 and 5, while locations 1 and 2 had the lowest mean means of 3.88 and 3.82, respectively.

Finally, the teamwork dimension scored an overall mean mean of 4.48, but is statistically significant in locations 2 (at 5%) and 5 (at 5%), with higher values in locations 4 and 5, and lower values in locations 1, 2 and 3.

The best rated location in terms of teamwork is location 5, with the highest score (5), while teamwork in location 2 had the lowest rating with a score of 4.07.

In general terms, it can be noted that locations 4 and 5 scored better in the work performance dimensions, while location 2 as a whole reported the lowest values in the different performance dimensions.

#### *Labor Satisfaction Results*

The results allowed us to infer that labor satisfaction is on mean mean very good: all of the responses are on a scale of 4 to 5, thus there do not seem to be significant differences in the approaches evaluated, as detailed for each of the dimensions in Table 4.

**Table 4.***Labor satisfaction scores by dimensions*

<b>Dimension</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Standard deviation</b>
Command methods	4.67451	0.0836352
Motivation	4.59276	0.0847125
Communication	4.637255	0.0886483
Influence	4.681373	0.0957628
Decision-making	4.564706	0.0926653
Planning	4.661765	0.0848365
Control	4.568627	0.0985379
Improvement	4.573529	0.1069392
Satisfaction	4.691503	0.0859642

Again, all mean means are between 4 and 5, which means that satisfaction is very good, with the lowest value in the decision-making dimension (4.5647),

followed closely by control (4.5686), while the best value is for satisfaction itself (4.6915).

**Table 5.***Differences in each of the labor satisfaction dimensions by location with respect to the overall mean*

<b>Dimensión</b>	<b>Total Mean</b>	<b>Location 1</b>	<b>Location 2</b>	<b>Location 3</b>	<b>Location 4</b>	<b>Location 5</b>
		<b>Mean</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Mean</b>
Command	4.67451 (0.0836)	4.747368 *** (0.0191)	4.933333 *** (0.0278)	4.2 (0.0295)	4.742857 ** (0.0316)	4.625 * (0.0295)
Motivation	4.59276 (0.0847)	4.51417 *** (0.0194)	4.871795 *** (0.0282)	4.230769 *** (0.0299)	4.769231 *** (0.0320)	4.673077 *** (0.0299)
Influence	4.681373 (0.0957)	4.671053 (0.0219)	4.916667 *** (0.0319)	4.25 *** (0.0338)	4.964286 (0.0361)	4.625 (0.0338)
Communication	4.6372 (0.0886)	4.605263 (0.0203)	4.833333 *** (0.0295)	4.34375 *** (0.0313)	4.785714 *** (0.0334)	4.65625 * (0.3132)
Decision-making	4.564706 (0.0926)	4.484211 *** (0.0212)	4.866667 *** (0.0308)	4.3 *** (0.0327)	4.6 (0.0350)	4.65 *** (0.0327)
Planning	4.661765 (0.0844)	4.565789 *** (0.0193)	4.972222 *** (0.0281)	4.5 *** (0.0298)	4.714286 (0.0319)	4.65625 (0.0298)
Control	4.568627 (0.0985)	4.605263 (0.0226)	4.944444 *** (0.0328)	4.03125 *** (0.0348)	4.785714 *** (0.0372)	4.40625 *** (0.0348)
Improvement	4.573529 (0.1069)	4.578947 (0.0245)	4.944444 *** (0.0356)	4.0625 *** (0.0378)	4.571429 (0.0404)	4.65625 ** (0.0378)

Patricia Hernández Medina; Isabel Alejandra Bastidas Herrera; María Verónica Albarracín Orellana

Satisfaction	4.691503	4.631579 ***	4.977778 ***	4.425 ***	4.857143 ***	4.633333 *
	(0.0859)	(0.0197)	(0.0286)	(0.0303)	(0.03249)	(0.0303)

Note: Significant at: 1% (\*\*\*), 5% (\*\*), 10% (\*). Values in parentheses represent standard errors.

As was presented for labor performance, Table 5 shows the hypothesis testing of the difference in the means of each dimension (command, control, planning, improvement, decision-making, communication, motivation, and influence) and satisfaction with respect to the total mean for each of the locations.

With regard to the first dimension of command, the differences are positive in locations 1, 2 and 4, while in the rest the means are lower than the overall mean; in all cases, the differences are statistically significant, with the best rated location being location 2 and the worst location 3.

The second component is motivation, where there are differences in all locations and they are statistically significant. Employees in location 2 feel the most motivated, while the lowest motivation was recorded in location 3.

Influence is perceived to be statistically different only in locations 2 and 3, with the highest observed value being the mean in location 4 and the lowest in location 3.

With respect to communication, the differences evidenced in the means are statistically significant in all locations

except location 1, where location 2 reported the highest valuation, maintaining the trend of the worst valued as location 3.

This behavior in terms of evaluation is similar in satisfaction with respect to decision-making, planning, control, and improvement. In the first case, the differences found are significant except in location 4; in the second, all are significant except in locations 4 and 5; in the third, they are significant in all except location 1; and finally, in improvement, no significant differences were observed in locations 1 and 4.

Satisfaction seen as a specific dimension does not depart from the behavior observed in the rest of the dimensions: there are differences and all are statistically significant and the valuations relating to the highest and lowest scores correspond to locations 2 and 3 respectively.

#### *Relationship between performance and labor satisfaction*

After analyzing the behavior of both overall and dimensional means, as well as the differences by location, we proceeded to identify a possible relationship between labor satisfaction and performance.

ARTÍCULO CIENTÍFICO: Labor satisfaction and performance among employees of the “LLERMAT SÚPER POLLO” company.

Recibido: 1 de abril de 2021, Revisión aceptada: 17 de junio de 2021

Based on the correlation between the two variables, the results indicate that the correlation is negative, with a value of -0.1337, suggesting that as labor performance increases, satisfaction decreases and that this relationship is low.

When the correlation between the two variables is estimated by location, the results change. Specifically for location 1, the coefficient is -0.3548, maintaining an inverse relationship, but is greater than that recorded for the total data.

For location 2, the result was -0.2793; for location 3, it was close to zero (-0.0006) so the relationship is practically nonexistent. The same can be said for location 4, even though its score is positive (0.0566), which is in agreement with the literature. Finally, location 5 presented a positive and high correlation, with a coefficient of 0.7174, which seems to corroborate what studies by other authors propose.

Additionally, the correlation between the performance results and the self-evaluation results was analyzed, since there should be a high correlation that shows a harmony between the bosses' and employees' perception of the work performed by them. For the totality of values, the results show a low correlation

(-0.1430), which is maintained for location 3 (0.1289), but rises considerably in location 1 (0.4898), location 2 (0.4116), location 4 (0.7970) and location 5 (0.6916).

These results for locations 4 and 5 indicate a much higher and more positive value, demonstrating there is a greater awareness of the employees' performance in relation to the evaluation carried out by the managers. The same scenario is not evident in location 3, which, generally speaking, seems to display more distortions regarding the data obtained.

Although the correlation coefficients do not show a clear link between performance and satisfaction, we proceeded to estimate this relationship OLS, corroborating the previous results.

As shown in Table 6, both for all the observations and all the locations, the coefficient showing the relationship between performance and satisfaction is not significant at 10% or more for any of the estimates, except in location 5.

**Table 6.***Ordinary Least Squares estimate for job performance*

	General		Location 1		Location 2		Location 3		Location 4		Location 5	
	Coef.		Coef.		Coef.		Coef.		Coef.		Coef.	
Constant	4.85	***	5.4	***	13.91		4.16	***	4.00		4.24	***
	(0.62)		(0.84)		(12.92)		(1.01)		(2.83)		(0.04)	
Labor satisfaction	-0.12		-0.28		-2.03		-0.0003		0.075		4.24	***
	(0.14)		(0.18)		(2.64)		(0.23)		(0.59)		(0.19)	

Note: Significant at: 1% (\*\*\*), 5% (\*\*), 10% (\*). Values in parentheses represent standard errors.

Thus, labor satisfaction does not seem to affect the employees' job performance. Moreover, the sign is not as expected, since it is negative. In fact, when the mean satisfaction increases, it has a negative impact on the employees' performance.

In locations 1, 2 and 3, it can be observed that the relationship is not as expected and is surprisingly extremely low. At the same time, in location 4, we can see that although the mean evaluation is not significant, the sign is as expected, i.e., when the mean satisfaction increases, performance improves. Meanwhile, in location 5, not only is the sign as expected but the coefficient is also significant at 1%, which is why every time labor satisfaction increases, employee performance rises.

#### *Factor analysis for extraction of performance and labor satisfaction dimensions*

The factor analysis was based on

the estimation of the correlation matrix for performance and satisfaction as a first approach to the problem in order to identify the possible relationship between each of the approaches consulted.

In order to corroborate these possible relationships suggested by the correlation matrix, Barlett's test or a correlation test was estimated, whose value allows one to reject at 1% the null hypothesis of no correlation, therefore the approaches do have a relationship between them for both performance and satisfaction.

This result was reinforced by estimating the Kaiser, Meyer and Olkin test (KMO), which makes it possible to identify the goodness of a possible factor analysis, so that a value above 0.50 would be acceptable and above 0.75 would be very good.

In this case, the estimated value of the KMO was 0.625 for satisfaction, consequently the factor analysis is

ARTÍCULO CIENTÍFICO: Labor satisfaction and performance among employees of the "LLERMAT SÚPER POLLO" company.

Recibido: 1 de abril de 2021, Revisión aceptada: 17 de junio de 2021

considered acceptable in terms of the number of factors extracted and their significance; on the other hand, for performance it was 0.752, which is considered very good.

Once the possibility of being able to perform the factor analysis was identified, the variance explained by each factor was estimated to determine the number of factors according to the principal components method. Five factors

explaining more than 70% of the variance were considered (Kaiser's rule), which is what the literature proposes. In this case, they explained 74.51% of the variance.

Once the number of factors had been selected, we proceeded to identify the approaches associated with each factor according to the variance explained by each one, as shown in the following table using extraction by principal components.

**Table 7.**

*Extraction of factors for job performance*

Approach		Total variance explained
<b>Factor 1: PRODUCTIVITY</b>		
I2	Complies with planned activities	0.8933
I3	Plans the activities to be performed	0.7251
I5	Adequately rationalizes assigned resources	0.7177
I6	Accepts and commits to the objectives of the institution	0.8155
I11	Is respectful of others	0.7065
I12	Meets deadlines for the execution of activities	0.7909
I13	Complies with the responsibilities of the tasks entrusted to him/her	0.8546
I15	Knows the activities of his or her area of work very well	0.5482
I18	Avoids conflicts within the team	0.6525
I20	Participates in decision-making	0.7691
I21	Has the ability to positively influence colleagues	0.8006
I25	Is open to changes	0.8933
I26	Anticipates difficulties	0.7609
I27	Has the ability to solve problems	0.6057
I29	Easily identifies with team objectives	0.8043
I30	Communicates assertively with co-workers	0.7935
I31	Supports scheduled tasks	0.8329
<b>Factor 2: COMPLIANCE</b>		
I1	Completes work in a timely manner	0.363



I14	Complies with the rules of the institution	0.3939
I32	Accepts and commits to the tasks that are entrusted to him/her	0.4545
I33	His/her transmission of ideas is clear	0.2981
<b>Factor 3: INNOVATION</b>		
I4	Performs an adequate volume of work	0.3084
I23	Proposes new ideas to improve the institution's processes.	0.5658
I24	Provides innovative ideas for conflict resolution	0.3703
<b>Factor 4: PROFESSIONALISM</b>		
I7	Cares about achieving goals	0.2534
I9	Does not require frequent supervision	0.3347
I10	His/her behavior is very professional	-0.4774
I28	Shows aptitude to integrate into the team	-0.4133
<b>Factor 5: COMMITMENT</b>		
I8	Does not make mistakes in the performance of duties.	0.5373
I19	Is sensitive to the feelings and needs of others	-0.3553
I17	Provides adequate guidance to customers	0.3064
I16	Treats customers with kindness	0.3329

The factor analysis does not allow one to group data according to what the applied instrument states; however, according to the data collected, the questions can be grouped into 5 factors related to productivity (factor 1), compliance (factor 2), innovation (factor 3), professionalism (factor 4) and commitment (factor 5).

Performing a similar procedure for labor satisfaction by considering only 43 items associated with the dimensions, thus excluding the satisfaction dimension, the results reveal that the first six factors explain more than 80% of the common variance. As a consequence, the number of factors to be used to group the data is 6, as stated in the literature on factor

determination.

Thus, considering the six factors, the extraction of the approaches associated with each one was based on determining those with the greatest variance explained, as presented in Table 8.

ARTÍCULO CIENTÍFICO: Labor satisfaction and performance among employees of the "LLERMAT SÚPER POLLO" company.

Recibido: 1 de abril de 2021, Revisión aceptada: 17 de junio de 2021

**Table 8.***Extraction of labor satisfaction factors*

	Approach	Total variance explained
<b>Factor 1: LEADERSHIP</b>		
sp1	My boss gives his/her collaborators confidence for the work to be carried out without the need for continuous supervision.	0.8746
sp2	I consider my boss' level of demands to be fair.	0.8596
sp5	I can speak freely with my boss when I disagree with his/her opinions.	0.8713
sp6	I consider that a positive working environment influences my performance.	0.7142
sp10	I am treated well regardless of my position in the company.	0.8176
sp12	When I have problems at work, I can count on my colleagues.	0.8071
sp17	People are treated fairly irrespective of gender and age.	0.7194
sp18	People are treated fairly irrespective of position.	0.7454
sp19	People are treated fairly irrespective of their preference.	0.8601
sp20	My manager communicates clearly about goals, changes, achievements and expectations.	0.8076
sp21	My manager is open to receiving opinions and suggestions from his/her co-workers.	0.7579
sp23	My manager is experienced enough to handle his/her job adequately.	0.8092
sp25	I have confidence in the decisions my manager makes in his/her area.	0.8483
sp26	My boss transmits confidence to his/her collaborators.	0.8116
sp28	I have sufficient autonomy in my job position.	0.7806
sp29	I consider that I am allowed to take breaks depending on the effort required in my work.	0.8465
sp31	I feel that my opinion is taken into account when I am assigned tasks.	0.8199
sp32	The infrastructure of the institution contributes to generating a positive working environment.	0.819
sp36	I can behave spontaneously in my workplace.	0.7385
sp40	In my job, they are concerned about my professional growth.	0.8298
sp41	When I joined, I received the relevant induction to learn about the company's policies.	0.8535
sp42	I have opportunities to improve my skills and aptitudes, and update my knowledge and skills.	0.8406
sp43	My boss is interested in me as a person and not just as a productive entity.	0.7722
<b>Factor 2: MOTIVATION</b>		
sp8	I feel that I receive an adequate share of the benefits provided by the institution.	0.3775
sp16	My boss recognizes and values me for the work I do.	0.3804

Patricia Hernández Medina; Isabel Alejandra Bastidas Herrera; María Verónica Albarracín Orellana

sp14	My boss avoids favoritism at all costs.	0.3312
sp24	My boss distributes collaborators and assigns tasks according to requirements.	-0.4202
sp27	My boss involves people in the decisions that affect their activities or work.	0.3312
sp30	Suggestions and ideas contributed by each employee are accepted.	0.3922
sp33	I have the necessary equipment, tools, and means to perform my job well.	-0.4574
sp34	I feel identified with my work and the objectives pursued by the institution.	-0.5069
sp39	In my work, activities are frequently monitored and supervised.	-0.5585
<b>Factor 3: COMPENSATION</b>		
sp11	If I think about all the work and effort I have put in, the recognition I receive seems appropriate.	-0.3368
sp15	Promotions are set according to the merit of each employee.	0.3312
sp22	My boss holds regular meetings to inform me of new developments, processes and procedures.	0.5221
sp35	I have confidence in the rules, policies and protocols that govern this institution.	0.4889
<b>Factor 4: RELATIONSHIPS</b>		
sp13	Teamwork is encouraged at my workplace.	0.3228
sp37	Special events are celebrated at my workplace.	0.5486
sp38	In general, there is concern for the well-being of each employee	0.4148
<b>Factor 5: DECISION-MAKING</b>		
sp3	I consider that my boss is fair with his/her decisions.	0.4944
sp4	I have the necessary autonomy to perform my job adequately.	0.6291
<b>Factor 6: EQUITY</b>		
sp7	The salary I receive is proportionate to the work performed.	0.7043
sp9	There is equality between men and women when it comes to job positions.	0.3267

As in the case of job performance, the factor analysis does not allow one to group the data according to the proposed instrument; however, based on the results obtained, it was possible to identify six factors: management leadership, motivation, compensation, relationships, decision making, and equity.

In the first case, management leadership is the factor that involves the largest number of statements (23) and

therefore explains the highest percentage of variance. It consists of a set of arguments related to the possibility of improving the working environment based on the actions taken by management leadership. Motivation, the second factor, is made up of 9 statements linked to how well the employee feels about his or her activities, working environment, and co-workers.

Compensation, the salary received by the employee for the activities

ARTÍCULO CIENTÍFICO: Labor satisfaction and performance among employees of the “LLERMAT SÚPER POLLO” company.

Recibido: 1 de abril de 2021, Revisión aceptada: 17 de junio de 2021

performed, along with remuneration, pertains to the bosses' recognition for the work accomplished. The fourth factor refers to interpersonal relations among peers and with bosses. It depends on how the worker feels about the management of this environment, whether or not people work as a team and whether the boss encourages this interaction.

Decision-making by the bosses deals with the need for decisions that respect each employee's individual work and effort, while complying with the company's existing regulations. Finally, equity seeks to establish whether the working conditions are perceived as equitable by employees, both in terms of monetary remuneration or intangible aspects associated with gender equity and equal opportunities.

## CONCLUSIONS

The objective of this research was to identify the relationship between labor satisfaction and job performance among employees at Llermat Súper Pollo. In addition, we realized a comparative analysis by location, based on the application of three instruments associated with the evaluation of job performance, self-evaluation, and employee satisfaction.

As regards the employees' performance, it was observed that the workers have a good to very good

performance level, and, on the whole, their self-evaluation is very good, meaning that it coincides with their bosses' evaluation.

The highest performance evaluation was associated with the employees' knowledge surrounding the activities carried out, while the lowest was related to making mistakes.

Each of the dimensions proposed to evaluate performance: results, quality, interpersonal relations, initiative, and teamwork are in the upper range of 4 to 5, with initiative being the lowest and teamwork the highest. These results differ by location, with the highest evaluated in most factors being location 5, which shows statistically significant differences in relation to the mean in: results, interpersonal relations, initiative, and teamwork.

Location 2 was the worst-performing location, but differed significantly in the dimensions of results, quality, and teamwork. Management should identify the techniques practiced in location 5 (southern Salcedo), which generate higher performance than the rest, and implement them in location 2 (southern Latacunga) in order to address the weaknesses present.

With respect to labor satisfaction, an mean of very good was obtained, with no significant differences in the values

associated with any of the dimensions evaluated: command, motivation, communication, influence, decision making, planning, control, improvement, and satisfaction.

It is essential to note that the location with the highest labor satisfaction is in southern Latacunga (location 2), while the Machachi branch (location 3) has the lowest score.

In the relationship between the two variables studied for this population, the results indicate a negative correlation, so it could be preliminarily suggested that as labor satisfaction increases, performance decreases, and that the relationship is weak.

The estimation by OLS did not allow us to identify a relationship between the two variables; in fact, satisfaction is not significant in the explanation of performance and does not present the expected sign.

Finally, by means of a factor analysis, it was possible to group the data regarding both performance and labor satisfaction into dimensions; in the first case, five factors associated with productivity, compliance, innovation, professionalism, and commitment were extracted. In the second case, six dimensions were identified linked to fairness, decision-making, relationships, compensation, motivation,

and leadership.

Although it was not statistically proven that satisfaction influences the performance of workers at Llermat Súper Pollo, it was evident that regardless of the working environment or the degree of job satisfaction, the workers perform tasks to the best of their ability and to a high standard due to their need to keep their jobs.

## REFERENCES

- Armijo, M. (2011). *Planificación Estratégica e Indicadores de Desempeño en el Sector Público*. Santiago de Chile: Instituto Latinoamericano y del Caribe de Planificación Económica y Social, CEPAL.
- Berón, D. y Palma, F. (2011). *Factores que Influyen en el Rendimiento Laboral del Personal de Enfermería*. Tesis de grado de la Facultad de Ciencias Médicas de la Universidad Nacional de Cuyo.
- Castillo, J. (2006). *Administración de Personal, segunda edición*. Bogotá: Ecoe Ediciones.
- Chiang, M. y Ojeda, J. (2013). Estudio de la relación entre satisfacción laboral y el desempeño de los trabajadores de las ferias libres. *Contaduría y Administración*, 58 (2), 39-60.
- Chiang, M., y San Martín, N. (2017). Análisis de la Satisfacción y el Desempeño Laboral en los Funcionarios de la Municipalidad

ARTÍCULO CIENTÍFICO: Labor satisfaction and performance among employees of the "LLERMAT SÚPER POLLO" company.

Recibido: 1 de abril de 2021, Revisión aceptada: 17 de junio de 2021

- de Talcahuano. *Ciencia y Trabajo*, 17 (54), 159-165.
- Chiavenato. (2009). *Gestión del Talento Humano*. México D.F: MC Graw Hill.
- Davis, K., y Newstrom, J. (2003). *El Comportamiento Humano en el Trabajo*. Mexico: 2º edición. Editorial McGraw-Hill.
- Gibson, J., Ivancevich, J., Donnelly, J. y Konopaske, R. (2006). *Organizaciones*. Mexico: McGraw\_Hill.
- Grande, I., y Abascal, E. (2005). *Análisis de encuestas*. España: Esic Editorial.
- Mondy, W. y Noe, R. (2005). *Administración de Recursos Humanos 9na edición*. México: Pearson Educación .
- Pérez, L. (2014). *El Clima Organizacional y la Satisfacción como factores influyentes en el Desempeño Laboral*. Tesis de grado de la carrera de Psicología Industrial de la Universidad Central del Ecuador.
- Rodríguez, M., y Tupiza, S. (2018). *El Clima Organizacional y su influencia en la Satisfacción Laboral del personal*. Tesis de grado de la carrera de Psicología Industrial de la Universidad Central del Ecuador.
- Salluca, L. (2010). *Relación Entre Niveles de Satisfacción Laboral y Desempeño Docente en Instituciones Educativas del Cercado Callao*. Lima , Perú.
- Sampieri, R., Collado, C., y Lucio, P. (2010). *Metodología de la investigación*. México: McGRAW-HILL.
- Whetten, D. y Cameron, K. (2005). *Desarrollo de Habilidades Directivas. Sexta Edición*. Monterrey, México: Pearson Educación.