

ORIGINAL
Research article

Job satisfaction of employees of companies in the agricultural sector*

Satisfacción laboral de los colaboradores de empresas del sector agropecuario

Received: May 15, 2023 - Evaluated: August 17, 2023 - Accepted: November 30, 2023

Juan Manuel Andrade-Navia**

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9644-0040>

Angela Conde-Charry**

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0005-4012-5785>

Angélica Gómez-Fierro****

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0003-7851-0449>

Elena Montealegre-Romero*****

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0004-5292-7841>

Fernando Fierro-Celis*****

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1593-6226>

To cite this Article

Andrade-Navia, J. M., Conde-Charry, A., Gómez-Fierro, A., Montealegre-Romero, E., & Fierro-Celis, F. (2023). Job satisfaction of employees of companies in the agricultural sector. *Revista Gestión y Desarrollo Libre*, 8(17), 1-17. <https://doi.org/10.18041/2539-3669/gestionlibre.17.2024.11048>

Editor: PhD. Rolando Eslava-Zapata

Abstract

This article evaluates the level of job satisfaction of employees of unconventional companies in the agricultural sector in a peripheral region of Colombia. The research is quantitative and non-experimental with a descriptive scope, for which the S20/23 Job Satisfaction Questionnaire is adapted in its most structurally complete, reduced version of the questionnaire S4/82. The instrument consists of 23 items with a Likert-type scale from 1 to 7 points, adapted

* Original article. Research and innovation article. Research article. Research project linked to the PYMES Research Group of the Faculty of Economics and Administration and the specialization in Human Talent Management of the Universidad Surcolombiana.

** Master in Human Talent Management by the Universidad de Manizales, Colombia. PhD. Agroindustry by the Universidad Surcolombiana, Colombia. Professor at the Universidad Surcolombiana. Email: juanmanuel.andrade@usco.edu.co

*** Specialist in Human Talent Management by the Universidad Surcolombiana, Colombia. Email: u20211194071@usco.edu.co

**** Specialist in Human Talent Management by the Universidad Surcolombiana, Colombia. Email: u20211194008@usco.edu.co

***** Specialist in Human Talent Management by the Universidad Surcolombiana, Colombia. Email: u20211194058@usco.edu.co

***** Master in Administration by the Universidad de La Salle, Colombia. PhD. Management by the Universidad EAN, Colombia. Professor at the Universidad Surcolombiana, Colombia. Email: Fernando.fierro@usco.edu.co

and applied in the Colombian context. The population comprises 350 collaborators through the census sample in 12 non-conventional organizations of the agricultural sector in the South Colombian region, and the information is processed with the statistical software SPSS-26 and STATA. Regarding the reliability and validity of the results, a Cronbach's Alpha of 0.94 is obtained, and the relevance of the data is evaluated with the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) indicator of 0.725. In the results, it is found that the factor with the highest score is factor I. Satisfaction with supervision (6.06), factor IV. Intrinsic job satisfaction (5.87), factor II. Satisfaction with the physical environment (5.84), factor V. Satisfaction with participation (5.51), and finally, factor III. Satisfaction with the benefits received (5.33). In conclusion, organizations in the agricultural sector—non-conventional companies—require the implementation of differentiated strategies that involve salary and structural elements (supervision, participation, leadership, and benefits, among others) and allow increasing levels of job satisfaction.

Keywords: Job Satisfaction, Unconventional Organizations, Agricultural Sector

Resumen

El presente artículo evalúa el nivel de satisfacción laboral de los colaboradores de empresas no convencionales de sector agropecuario en una región periférica de Colombia. La investigación es de carácter cuantitativo y de tipo no experimental de alcance descriptivo, para lo cual se adapta el cuestionario de Satisfacción Laboral S20/23, en su versión reducida más completa estructuralmente del cuestionario S4/82. El instrumento consta de 23 ítems con escala tipo Likert de 1 a 7 puntos, adaptado y aplicado en el contexto colombiano. La población está conformada por 350 colaboradores mediante la muestra censal en 12 organizaciones no convencionales del sector agropecuario en la región Surcolombiana, y la información es tratada con los softwares estadísticos SPSS-26 y STATA. Frente a la confiabilidad y validez de los resultados, se obtiene un Alfa de Cronbach de 0.94 y se evalúa la pertinencia de los datos con el indicador Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) de 0.725. En los resultados, se encuentra que los factores con mayor puntuación son el factor I. Satisfacción con la supervisión (6.06), factor IV. Satisfacción intrínseca del trabajo (5.87), factor II. Satisfacción con el medio ambiente físico (5.84), factor V. Satisfacción con la participación (5.51) y finalmente el factor III. Satisfacción con las prestaciones recibidas (5.33). En conclusión, las organizaciones del sector agropecuarios – empresas no convencionales – requieren la implementación de estrategias diferenciadas que involucren elementos salariales y estructurales (supervisión, participación, liderazgo y beneficios, entre otros) y permitan incrementar los niveles de satisfacción laboral.

Palabras Clave: Satisfacción Laboral, Organizaciones No Convencionales, Sector Agropecuario

SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION. - RESOLUTION SCHEME. - I. Research problem. - II. Methodology. - III. Drafting plan. - 1. Job satisfaction. - 2. Job satisfaction measurement models - IV. Research results - 1. Reliability Analysis - 2. Confirmatory Factor Analysis - 3. Sociodemographic characteristics - 4. Descriptive Analysis - CONCLUSIONS. - REFERENCES.

Introduction

Organizations are created to satisfy a wide range of human needs, such as food, clothing, housing, transportation, education, and security (Shvarstein, 2003); for this reason, they adapt their product and their communication to the level of need that they believe they can cover and

satisfy; In this way, since its creation, objectives, and goals are outlined that can be achieved with true teamwork. Consequently, over the years, human talent has become the most relevant factor within organizations (Armenteros & Sánchez, 2015). On the other hand, when discussing organizations, many strategic factors influence their operation, such as productivity, development, sustainability, and innovation, which guarantee sustainable development; however, they are all linked to people's performance (Schultz, 2006). It achieves the objectives and goals set; it is essential to have an excellent human factor, considered the essential strategic resource, which is why it must promote its development and well-being.

Human resource management helps the human beings that make up the organization support achieving objectives. Due to the above, management must understand and manage the diversity of the personnel because human beings have differences in personality, feelings, and thought, which affect individual and group behavior. Likewise, the needs of the employees and the organization must be taken into account since they are two essential aspects that determine the success or failure of the organization (Dailey, 2012). Precisely when talking about the needs of employees, the interests that one has as a person and worker been brought up; and this is related to job satisfaction, that is, a job-satisfied employee has proportional performance and is reflected in productivity and the fulfillment of organizational objectives and goals (McGregor, 1994). Therefore, it is indispensable to highlight the importance of work as a determining factor of satisfaction in the position assigned to the collaborator. Indeed, Robbins and Judge (2009) affirm that employees choose jobs where they can demonstrate their abilities, diversity of tasks, freedom, and feedback on their performance are offered in such a way that any work challenge produces pleasure and satisfaction.

Otherwise, when dissatisfaction appears, there is a drop in organizational efficiency, which is evidenced by inappropriate behaviors such as absenteeism, distraction, negativism, negligence, aggressiveness, or resignation. The employee's frustration before dissatisfaction can trigger aggressive behavior towards their colleagues or bosses, sabotage of processes, and misuse of language, among others (Pérez, 1987). Due to the above, job satisfaction emerged as one of the most studied phenomena during the last decades of the last century (Judge et al., 2017), denoting a growing interest in the behaviors associated with said variables such as absenteeism, turnover, organizational commitment, and performance (Tsaousis et al., 2007; Harrison et al., 2006; Kammeyer-Mueller et al., 2005). Fritzsche & Parrish (2005) define job satisfaction as the taste that employees develop for their work; however, the scope of the term is still under discussion and is considered unfinished (Brief & Weiss, 2002; Dailey, 2012). Thompson & Phua (2012) consider two significant aspects of the study and approach to job satisfaction: cognitive and affective. Cognitive job satisfaction arises from a conscious evaluation of the characteristics of the job and comparison with a referent of interest to the employee (Moorman, 1993), while affective job satisfaction corresponds to the employee's positive emotional response to the job (Spector, 1997).

For Weinert (1985), the satisfaction and dissatisfaction levels are due to psychological aspects. Therefore, Weinert (1985) clarifies: "In this case, the reactions and feelings of the collaborator who works in the organization regarding his work situation are generally considered as attitudes. Their affective and cognitive aspects, as well as their attitudes towards work, the work environment, collaborators, superiors, and the organization, are the ones that arouse the greatest interest (job satisfaction as reactions, sensations, and feelings of a member of the organization regarding his work)" (p. 297-298). Peiró and Prieto (1996) point out that the central pillar of job satisfaction is attitudes towards working together with organizational commitment. It is an attitudinal variable that seems to affect commitment and, in turn, is closely

linked to other psychological variables (psychological well-being and satisfaction with life). In the same way, Mello (2004) considers work performance as the result of workers' knowledge of the content of their positions, tasks, and activities since it depends on a process of mediation or regulation between them and the company that leads to job satisfaction. , which generates tranquility, health, motivation, and a good emotional state for the worker and makes the worker focus on improving their position both in the organization and society.

Job satisfaction arises from doing an exciting job within the scope of an organization that is attractive and for which expectations receive a series of compensations (Yukl, 2008) and implies multiple health benefits for the physical and mental health of the worker and organizational performance. A satisfied human talent is critical for any organization since the lack of satisfaction leads to a significant loss of enthusiasm and motivation that, finally, becomes a determining factor in achieving the company's goals (Marin & Placencia, 2017). Bang et al. (2013) coincide in pointing out the positive correlations between job satisfaction and the affective organizational commitment of employees. In turn, Barnes et al. (2013) state that increased satisfaction increases the chances that employees will get involved in actions that benefit the organization. Thus, the role of human resources management in formulating strategies, plans, and measurements that must be made periodically of the degree of job satisfaction of its employees is transcendental (Bratton & Gold, 2012).

Spector (1997) synthesized the different proposals to understand the facets of job satisfaction in the following components: appreciation, communication, co-workers, complementary benefits, working conditions, nature of work, nature of the organization, the policies, and procedures of an organization, salary, personal growth, promotion opportunities, recognition, security, and supervision. Job satisfaction studies are abundant in companies and organizations from multiple sectors of the economy, with diverse interests, approaches, and approach methodologies (Pujol-Cols & Dabos, 2017). However, studies of non-conventional organizations in the agricultural or rural sector still need to be available. A preliminary review allowed us to identify some in Latin American countries such as Argentina (Martins & Sandoval, 2021), Mexico (Borbón et al., 2017), Colombia (Méndez, 2015), and Peru (Zafra et al., 2020). Likewise, in Europe, studies were reported in Germany (Herrera et al., 2022), Romania (Maican et al., 2021), and Norway (Hansen & Stræte, 2020), while in North America one was found in the United States (Witt et al., 2020). These particularities show a recent interest in this phenomenon in unconventional organizations in different parts of the world. Due to the preceding, this research focused on measuring the level of job satisfaction exhibited by employees of non-conventional organizations in the agricultural sector in a peripheral region of Colombia.

Resolution scheme

1. Research problem

What is the level of job satisfaction exhibited by the collaborators of non-conventional organizations in the agricultural sector in a peripheral region of Colombia?

2. Methodology

The research was quantitative since it is characterized by the measurement of phenomena, in this case, satisfaction, and the use of statistical tools to determine its behavior and evolution

with a high level of accuracy (Hernández et al., 2010). Therefore, this approach makes it possible to measure the study phenomenon, employees' job satisfaction, through the results obtained. Subsequently, through the interpretation of these, we know the level of incidence of each factor and finally propose strategies for monitoring the phenomenon under study. In this way, a type of non-experimental research of descriptive scope is adopted, where variables are not deliberately manipulated and seeks to specify the properties and characteristics of the phenomenon and to know the reasons or causes that cause it (Hernández et al., 2010).

In the present investigation, the data collection was carried out with the Job Satisfaction questionnaire S20/23, which was designed by Meliá & Peiró (1989; 1989a), in its most structurally complete reduced version of the S4/82 questionnaire; this in order to obtain valuable information, taking into account the factors to which employees are exposed in organizations, allowing to obtain a global measure of satisfaction and the description of the factors it contains. The original questionnaire was developed in Spain, so it was designed in Spanish, presenting a level of reliability on the Cronbach's Alpha scale of 0.92 and validity with the Aiken coefficient of 1.

On the other hand, Lourido & Rendón (2019) adapted and applied this questionnaire in the Colombian context to establish the degree of job satisfaction in employees linked under the contracting model. Adaptation was made to the questions which were submitted to a pilot test. The instrument consists of 23 items with a Likert-type scale of 7 items, ranging from 1, "very dissatisfied," to 7, "very satisfied," passing through the value four indicated as "indifferent," in which the content of the statement has not related to your job or employment context. The qualification according to the values of the responses is interpreted according to the following ranges: 1-3.99 as job dissatisfaction, 4 - 4.99 as indifferent, that is, neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, and 5-7 as job satisfaction. This instrument is made up of the following factors:

- Factor I. Satisfaction with supervision (items 13 to 18): How superiors judge the work done, supervision, proximity, frequency of supervision, support given by bosses, interpersonal relationships with bosses, and equality and fair treatment received by the company.
- Factor II. Satisfaction with the physical environment (items 6 to 10): Group 5 items refer to the physical environment and space in the workplace, as well as cleanliness, hygiene and health, temperature, ventilation, and lighting.
- Factor III. Satisfaction with the benefits received (items 4, 11, 12, 22, and 23): It gathers five items referring to how the company complies with the agreement, how the negotiation is given, the salary received, the promotion opportunities, and training.
- Factor IV. Intrinsic job satisfaction (items 1, 2, 3, and 5): Contains four items that refer to the satisfaction that the job itself gives, the opportunities that the job gives to do what one likes or for that stands out, and the objectives, goals, and production to be achieved.
- Factor V. Satisfaction with participation (items 19 to 21): Includes three items that refer to satisfaction with participation in the decisions of the work group, department or section, or the task itself.

The population and sample consisted of 350 employees from 12 non-conventional organizations in the agricultural sector in the South Colombian region. A type of non-probabilistic sampling was used, specifically census sampling because it was necessary to include the entire population to measure job satisfaction as it is an issue specific to the organization; therefore, covering all employees allows obtaining information truthful and

accurate, avoiding that by excluding them they think that their opinion is not considered (Hernández et al., 2010). The collection of information was carried out through the application of the physical instrument to the collaborators of the organizations (Monje, 2011). The development of the study was exhausted in three phases. The development of the investigation is described below:

- Phase I. Selection, adjustment, and application of the instrument. Once the instrument was selected and adjusted, a call was made to apply it physically to the collaborators of the organizations. In the session, the objective of the research and the importance of signing the informed consent for the use of the data collected were explained; later, the informed consent was filled out, and the questionnaire was applied.
- Phase II. Tabulation of the Instrument. Once the survey was completed and the information was collected, the results of the tests were validated, systematized in a database, and subsequently processed in the SPSS-26 and STATA software for their respective statistical analysis.
- Phase III. Conclusions and recommendations. The conclusions and recommendations were made once the results were obtained and later statistically analyzed.

3. Writing plan

3.1 Job satisfaction

Job satisfaction has been studied since the first half of the 20th century. Although the first studies did not contemplate the term in all its complexity, a considerable amount of research has been carried out that contemplates it as a variable related to performance where they are immersed in incentives, promotions, and working conditions. Subsequently, concepts such as satisfaction of needs and individual characteristics, among others, were included. For this reason, it is necessary to explain the different theories that have influenced and emerged from the investigations and clarify the factors that influence and ultimately impact it (Salazar, 2019).

Job satisfaction has been a topic of interest in research, which, according to Weinert (1985), is due to the multiple historical changes that have taken place in the organizational and business world and, therefore, the associated theories. Among the most relevant findings, the following stand out a) An inexorable link between productivity and employee satisfaction; b) The negative relationship of job satisfaction with lost hours; c) The influence of the organizational climate on job satisfaction; d) The growing interest of company management in topics such as the feelings, well-being, and attitudes of collaborators and their influence on them through management styles; e) Progressive interest in the knowledge of the mental and behavioral effects of employees in companies; and f) The influence of job satisfaction on employees' personal life satisfaction.

For Gibson & Donnely (1996), job satisfaction is the perception of individuals regarding their job functions and it is “the result of their perceptions about work, based on factors related to the environment in which it develops, such as management style, policies and procedures, satisfaction of work groups, affiliation of work groups, working conditions and profit margin” (p. 102). Although many dimensions have been associated with job satisfaction, five dimensions have crucial characteristics: Salary, the amount received and the feeling of fairness; Job content, the degree to which tasks are considered exciting and provide learning and responsibility-taking opportunities; Opportunities for advancement: the existence of

opportunities to advance; The boss: the ability of bosses to show interest in employees; Co-workers: the degree of camaraderie, competence, and support among collaborators.

In this logic, Robbins (2005, p. 181) considers that “the most important factors that lead to job satisfaction are: a challenging job from the mental point of view, equitable rewards, working conditions that constitute support, supportive colleagues and personality-position fit. On the other hand, the effect of job satisfaction on employee performance implies and entails satisfaction and productivity, satisfaction and absenteeism, and satisfaction and turnover. The factors listed above positively or negatively feedback the performance in the job, which leads to satisfaction, improving productivity and permanence in the position for the satisfaction of the worker’s personal needs”.

3.2 Job satisfaction measurement models

Some of the measurement models of the phenomenon of job satisfaction considered most relevant are discussed below.

Questionnaire Font-Roja

The Font-Roja questionnaire was designed by Aranaz & Mira (1988) and is one of the most used in Spain, mainly in the health and hospital sectors. It consists of 24 items on a Likert-type scale (from 1 to 5), grouped into nine dimensions: Job satisfaction, job-related stress, professional competence, pressure at work, professional promotion, interpersonal relationship with superiors, relationship with peers, extrinsic status characteristics, and work monotony. This questionnaire does not consider the dimension of satisfaction with the physical work environment; however, this does not mean that it loses its importance and veracity (Núñez et al., 2007).

Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ)

Developed by Weiss et al. (1967), it allows measuring job satisfaction from 3 dimensions: extrinsic, intrinsic, and general satisfaction. The short version contains 20 questions, while the extended version has 100 questions and measures 20 scales on aspects of work, which are activity, independence, variety, social position, supervision – human relations, supervision – technique, moral values, security, service social, authority, skill utilization, company policies, compensation, advancement, responsibility, creativity, working conditions, co-workers, recognition, and achievement (Cavalcante, 2004; Furnham, 2004).

Meliá and Peiró job satisfaction questionnaires

Meliá and Peiró (1989) conducted a series of investigations where they considered psychological and labor factors that affected satisfaction or dissatisfaction in organizations. These instruments were used in several investigations in different types of organizations, and they could make several presentations of the instrument to expand dimensions. Here is a summary of its different versions:

- S4/82: It is a diagnostic instrument for effectively and efficiently evaluating job satisfaction. It is made up of 82 items divided into six factors: (1) Satisfaction with supervision and participation in the organization, (2) Satisfaction with the physical work environment, (3) Satisfaction with material benefits and complementary rewards, (4) Intrinsic job satisfaction; (5) Satisfaction with remuneration and essential benefits;

and (6) Satisfaction with interpersonal relationships. It is considered as the original instrument.

- S20/23: It consists of 23 items, and its objective is a shorter questionnaire. It has a five-factor structure: (1) Satisfaction with supervision, (2) Satisfaction with the physical environment, (3) Satisfaction with the benefits received, (4) Intrinsic job satisfaction, and (5) Satisfaction with participation.
- S10/12: The shortest version was created to obtain a global measure of quick administration job satisfaction. It is made up of 12 items in three factors that allow evaluating (1) satisfaction with supervision, (2) with the physical work environment, and (3) with the benefits received.
- S21/26: It is a shorter satisfaction questionnaire comprising 26 items with a dichotomous response format. It contains six components: (1) satisfaction with supervision and participation in the organization; (2) satisfaction with pay and benefits; (3) intrinsic job satisfaction; (4) satisfaction with the physical work environment; (5) satisfaction with the quantity of production at work; and (6) satisfaction with the quality of production at work (Meliá et al., 1990).

4. Research results

4.1 Reliability analysis

The internal measurement instrument used to measure job satisfaction was a Likert-type scale that allowed knowing the perception of the collaborators. To know the reliability and internal consistency of the instrument with the 23 questions, the statistical indicator called Cronbach's Alpha was used, which yielded an excellent result of 0.94—considering the confidence interval (95.00% CI) between 0.90 and 0.96. This reliability is evidenced in table 1 with each of the variables. Therefore, none of the variables was eliminated.

Table 1. Correlation result – Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient

Variables	Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha
1. Your work gives you satisfaction	0.663	0.937
2. Your job offers you opportunities to do the things you excel at	0.770	0.935
3. Your job offers you opportunities to do the things you love	0.714	0.936
4. The salary you receive is commensurate with your duties and responsibilities	0.492	0.940
5. The objectives and goals that you must achieve are consistent with your job position	0.737	0.935
6. The cleanliness, hygiene and health conditions of your workplace are adequate for the performance of your duties	0.660	0.936
7. The company's physical facilities (offices, warehouses, corridors, etc.) are comfortable and in good condition	0.600	0.937
8. The lighting in your workplace is optimal	0.427	0.942
9. The ventilation of your workplace is adequate	0.603	0.938
10. The temperature conditions are suitable for your workplace	0.641	0.937
11. The company offers you training opportunities for your professional growth	0.746	0.935
12. The company offers promotion opportunities	0.629	0.937
13. The personal relationship with your immediate boss is cordial, friendly and respectful	0.478	0.939
14. The working relationship with your immediate boss is good	0.437	0.939
15. The proximity and frequency with which their work is supervised is adequate	0.710	0.936

16. Their bosses recognize their work positively	0.688	0.936
17. The “equal” and “fair” treatment you receive from the company is adequate	0.793	0.934
18. Receives support from his immediate boss in the development of his duties	0.343	0.940
19. The company allows you to make decisions regarding the performance of your duties autonomously	0.676	0.936
20. The company allows you to participate in the decisions that are made in your department or work area	0.661	0.936
21. The decisions made in your work team are considered	0.696	0.936
22. The company complies with what is agreed in the employment contract and with labor laws (salary payment, benefits, overtime, etc.)	0.624	0.937
23. You feel satisfied with the way in which negotiations with the company on labor issues take place	0.775	0.935

Source: own elaboration.

George & Mallery (2003) proposed decision criteria for the reliability of the instrument based on Cronbach's Alpha using the following cut-off points: Alpha > 0.90 Excellent; 0.80 < Alpha < 0.90 Good; 0.70 < Alpha < 0.80 Acceptable; 0.60 < Alpha < 0.70 Questionable; 0.50 < Alpha < 0.60 Poor; Alpha < 0.50 Unacceptable. Table 2 describes the Cronbach's Alpha coefficient levels according to George & Mallery (2003), of each of the dimensions of the construct for measuring employee satisfaction, indicating that the responses given to each of the Items are reliable, both for the internal measurement scale and for the factors proposed by Meliá & Peiró (1989) which is replicated in this research.

Table 2. Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient of the Factors

Factors	No. Items	Cronbach's Alpha	Alpha Criterion *	95% TI
FACTOR I - Satisfaction with supervision	6	0.848	Good	0.755 – 0.915
FACTOR II - Satisfaction with the physical environment	5	0.927	Excellent	0.880 – 0.959
FACTOR III - Satisfaction with the benefits received	5	0.852	Good	0.757 – 0.917
FACTOR IV - Intrinsic job satisfaction	4	0.869	Good	0.780 – 0.928
FACTOR V - Satisfaction with participation	3	0.761	Acceptable	0.581 – 0.871

* Recommendations for evaluating Alpha according to George and Mallery (2003)

Source: own elaboration.

4.2 Confirmatory Factor Analysis

The relevance of the data was evaluated using the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) sample adequacy statistic and Bartlett's test of sphericity to determine the feasibility of carrying out a factorial analysis, which for this study would be behavioral since the dimensions defined by Meliá & Peiró (1989; 1989a) are known. The results of both tests indicate that it is feasible to carry out a factorial analysis, given that the magnitude of the partial correlation coefficients between the variables is sufficient and that a KMO of 0.725 is found, a favorable indicator close to 1. Therefore, factor analysis can be performed with a significant relationship between the variables with the Bartlett test (table 3).

Table 3. KMO and Bartlett test

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy		.725
Bartlett's test of sphericity	Approx. Chi-square	828.508
	Df	253
Sig.		.000

Source: own elaboration.

These five factors analyzed explain 77.63% of the accumulated variance concerning the sample, as observed in table 4. Factor I is the one that has the highest incidence of job satisfaction with less variability in its data series that is, its spread.

Table 4. Percentage of variance and cumulative variance

Factor	% de varianza	% Var. acumulado
1	45.625	45.625
2	14.994	60.618
3	10.454	71.072
4	3.796	74.869
5	2.764	77.633

Extraction Method: Principal Axis Factorization

Source: own elaboration.

Therefore, the incidence between the factors can be contrasted with the correlation matrix (see Table 5). Here, it is evident that the items belonging to factor V do not correlate much with respect to the other factors.

Table 5. Factorial Correlation Matrix

Factor	1	2	3	4	5
1	1.000	0.359	0.373	0.591	0.146
2	0.359	1.000	0.129	0.249	0.162
3	0.373	0.129	1.000	0.183	0.051
4	0.591	0.249	0.183	1.000	0.001
5	0.146	0.162	0.051	0.001	1.000

Extraction Method: Principal Axis Factorization

Rotation method: Oblimin with Kaiser normalization

Source: own elaboration.

Given that the previous data does not allow a good reading of the information and that the V factor does not have much correlation with the other factors, a rotation is made to better identify the variables that belong to each factor using the matrix of patterns. This is achieved by means of the Kaiser-Meyer test that allows determining the factorial analysis with a significant relationship > 0.055 .

4.3 Sociodemographic characteristics

According to the results, 57.00% of the collaborators are men and 43.00% are women. Likewise, of the total male collaborators, 75.00% are in the age range between 18 and 35 years, while women within the same age range corresponded to 67.00%; in the age range of 36 to 45 years, men represented 15.00%, while women represented 27.00%; and, in the range of those over 45 years of age, men represented 10.00% while women 7.00%. Regarding seniority, 37.00% of its collaborators had less than one year of seniority, while 34.00% had been working

between 1 and 3 years. That is, 67.00% of the collaborators had less than three years of seniority. Regarding the level of training, 79.00% of people are doing or have done higher education studies (technical, technological, or professional), and 9.00% registered postgraduate training. In comparison, 21.00% indicated they finished or did secondary or high school studies.

4.4 Descriptive analysis

Valid study data was equal to sample data; therefore, missing data was not reported. Table 6 shows the results obtained, showing the mean, standard deviation, and variances of the items and factors. Likewise, the range described is the oscillation in the number of answers they gave considering the minimum (Min.) and maximum (Max.) values in each item.

Table 6. Incidence of factors on job satisfaction

	Average	SD	Variance	Range	Minimum	Maximum
FACTOR I - Satisfaction with supervision	6.06	0.75	0,94	6	1	7
13	6.49	0.74	0.55	3	4	7
14	6.46	0.82	0.67	3	4	7
15	5.80	1.18	1.40	5	2	7
16	5.80	1.21	1.46	5	2	7
17	5.57	1.36	1.84	6	1	7
18	6.23	0.88	0.77	4	3	7
FACTOR II - Satisfaction with the physical environment	5.84	1.16	1.86	6	1	7
6	6.09	1.17	1.38	5	2	7
7	5.66	1.26	1.59	5	2	7
8	5.80	1.76	3.11	6	1	7
9	5.60	1.59	2.54	6	1	7
10	6.03	1.12	1.26	4	3	7
FACTOR III - Satisfaction with the benefits received	5.33	1.15	1.87	6	1	7
4	4.63	1.54	2.36	6	1	7
11	5.46	1.71	2.90	6	1	7
12	5.00	1.53	2.35	6	1	7
22	5.97	1.29	1.68	5	2	7
23	5.57	1.04	1.08	4	3	7
FACTOR IV - Intrinsic job satisfaction	5.87	1.02	0.85	4	3	7
1	6.06	0.77	0.59	3	4	7
2	5.94	0.97	0.94	4	3	7
3	5.83	0.92	0.85	3	4	7
5	5.66	1.24	1.53	4	3	7
FACTOR V - Satisfaction with participation	5.51	1.04	1.21	6	1	7
19	5.57	1.29	1.66	6	1	7
20	5.26	1.20	1.43	5	2	7
21	5.71	0.93	0.86	3	4	7

Source: own elaboration.

According to the analysis of the five initial factors or dimensions proposed by Meliá & Peiró (1989), the collaborators are “somewhat satisfied” in the organizations; the general result with an average of 5.74 evidences the above. Table 6 shows the results of the means of each item by a factor, where the average shows job satisfaction in the collaborators, given that the factors obtained a result greater than 5 “somewhat satisfied,” placing them at the higher levels of the job satisfaction scale. It is found that the factors with the highest score in descending order, according to the mean average, are factor I. Satisfaction with supervision (6.06), factor IV. Intrinsic job satisfaction (5.87), factor II. Satisfaction with the physical environment (5.84), factor V. Satisfaction with participation (5.51), and finally, factor III. Satisfaction with the benefits received (5.33). It should be noted that the factors have different weights compared to the results due to the number of items in each one, as is the case of factor V, which contains three items. Given the above, the analysis was carried out by factor, highlighting the items with the highest and highest value lower level according to score.

Regarding factor I, item 13 was the most satisfactory, with a score of 6.49, which shows a cordial, friendly, and respectful relationship with the immediate boss. In contrast, item 17 is noted with a score of 5.57; this means that some satisfaction is perceived in the equal and fair treatment that the employee receives from the company. Factor II shows the highest score in item 6 with 6.90, where cleanliness, hygiene, and sanitation conditions are adequate for the performance of their duties with great satisfaction; however, item 9 was the one with the lowest score of 5.60, where the ventilation of the workplace is somewhat satisfactory.

In factor III, there is evidence of some satisfaction about compliance with what was agreed in the employment contract and labor laws since item 22 obtained a score of 5.97. Attention should be drawn to the realities of the agricultural sector in this regard, in which labor informality predominates. Contrary to the salary issue, it is identified that the collaborators perceive a degree of indifference in the salary received by their functions and responsibilities since the score of item 4 gave a result of 4.63, the elements must be identified within the organization that does not allow the employee to feel satisfied or dissatisfied.

Factor IV obtained a maximum score in item 1 of 6.06, which shows that collaborators intrinsically feel pretty satisfied with their work; on the other hand, they feel some satisfaction in achieving objectives and goals that must be achieved in their job since item 5 obtained a score of 5.66. In factor V, employees feel some satisfaction because the decisions of their work team are considered, as shown in item 22, with a score of 5.71. Similarly, they feel some satisfaction with the participation that organizations allow them to make decisions in their department or work area; it is reflected in item 20, which has a score of 5.26.

Conclusions

The purpose of the research was to evaluate the job satisfaction of employees of organizations in the agricultural sector in the South Colombian region using the S20/23 questionnaire. The result indicates that the instrument has a reliability measured with Cronbach's Alpha of 0.94, placing it in an excellent range according to the criteria of George & Mallery (2003). Likewise, the confirmatory factorial analysis allowed us to know that the load of the items based on the five factors or dimensions has a favorable distribution since an explanation of 77.63% was found in the five factors, being relevant that only 71.00% of the sample is found in the first three factors. This information indicates that the applied instrument has high reliability in its measurement and, therefore, in the data.

Among the factors, it was found that much satisfaction is perceived in factor I; however, factors II, III, IV, and V remain at the somewhat satisfied level, placing all the factors at the level of satisfaction according to the rating scale. It was identified that personal and work relationships are positive, benefiting the perception of satisfaction with supervision. In the same way, they positively affect satisfaction with participation since spaces are provided for decision-making within the work team or area.

It should be noted that item 1, related to the satisfaction that work produces, obtained a high score, which generates a positive perception in general; however, it is necessary to continue strengthening aspects that allow the perception of their work to improve. The item with the lowest score is related to salary, a preponderant aspect in the perception of job satisfaction, but it does not determine it by itself. Job satisfaction is a perception that depends on the experiences, expectations, and attitudes of the human being; therefore, within the agricultural sector organizations, strategies must be designed to help strengthen and maintain employee satisfaction over time.

References

- Aranaz, J., & Mira, J. (1988). Cuestionario Font Roja. Un instrumento de medida de la satisfacción en el medio hospitalario. *Todo Hospital*, 52, 63-6. <https://dialnet.unirioja.es/servlet/articulo?codigo=3561583>
- Armenteros, A. L., & Sánchez, Z. T. (2015). Generalidades del clima organizacional. *Medisur*, 13(3), 455-457. <http://www.redalyc.org/articulo.oa?id=180039699016>
- Bang, H., Ross, S. D., & Reio, T. G. (2013). From motivation to organizational commitment of volunteers in non-profit sport organizations: The role of job satisfaction. *Journal of Management Development*, 32(1), 96-112. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02621711311287044>
- Barnes, C. M., Ghumman, S., & Scott, B. A. (2013) Sleep and Organizational Citizenship Behavior: The Mediating Role of Job Satisfaction. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 18(1), 16-26. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0030349>
- Borbón, C. G., Arvizu, M., & García, J. A. (2017). Satisfacción laboral del trabajador: un estudio de caso en invernaderos sonorenses. *Revista Mexicana de Agronegocios*, 40(1), 513-524. <http://www.redalyc.org/articulo.oa?id=14152127001>
- Bratton, J., & Gold, J. (2012). *Human Resource Management: Theory and practice*. London: Palgrave Macmillan. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-137-00095-8>
- Brief, A. P., & Weiss, H. M. (2002). Organizational behavior: Affect in the workplace. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 53(1), 279-307. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.53.100901.135156>
- Cavalcante, J. J. (2004). *Satisfacción en el trabajo de los directores de escuelas secundarias públicas*. (tesis doctoral). España: Universidad Autónoma de Barcelona. <https://www.tdx.cat/bitstream/handle/10803/5042/jjcs1de1.pdf>

- Dailey, R. (2012). Los Fundamentos del Comportamiento Organizacional y su relación con la gestión. *En: R. Dailey, Comportamiento Organizacional (págs. 1-53)*. London: Heriot-Watt University.
- Fritzsche, B. A. & Parrish, T. J. (2005). Theories and research on job satisfaction. *En: Brown, S. D. y Lent, R. W. (Eds.) Career development and counseling: Putting theory and research to work (pp. 180-202)*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Furnham, A. (2004). *The Psychology of Behavior at Work*. London: Psychology Press.
- George, D, & Mallery, P. (2003). *SPSS for Windows step by step: A simple guide and reference 11.0 update*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Gibson, J., & Donnely, J. (1996). *Las Organizaciones: comportamiento, estructura, procesos*. Madrid: McGraw Hill.
- Hansen, B. G. & Stræte, E. P. (2020) Dairy farmers' job satisfaction and the influence of automatic milking systems. *NJAS: Wageningen Journal of Life Sciences*, 92(1), 1-13. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.njas.2020.100328>
- Harrison, D. A., Newman, D. A., & Roth, P. L. (2006). How important are job attitudes? Meta-analytic comparisons of integrative behavioral outcomes and time sequences. *Academy of Management Journal*, 49(2), 305-325. <https://doi.org/10.5465/AMJ.2006.20786077>
- Hernández, R., Fernández, C., & Baptista, P. (2010). *Metodología de la Investigación*. México: McGraw-Hill Interamericana de México.
- Herrera, B., Gerster-Bentaya, M., & Knierim, A. (2022) Measuring farmers' well-being: Influence of farm-level factors on satisfaction with work and quality of life. *Journal of Agricultural Economics*, 73(2), 452– 471. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1477-9552.12457>
- Judge, T. A., Weiss, H. M., Kammeyer-Mueller, J. D., & Hulin, C. L. (2017). Job attitudes, job satisfaction, and job affect: A century of continuity and of change. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 102(3), 356-374. <https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000181>
- Kammeyer-Mueller, J. D., Wanberg, C. R., Glomb, T. M. & Ahlburg, D. (2005). The role of temporal shifts in turnover processes: it's about time. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90(4), 644-658. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.90.4.644>
- Lourido, D. M., & Rendón, M. C. (2019). Estudio de satisfacción laboral en un modelo de contratación por cuentas en participación en Ladrillera Guayacanes. Colombia: Universidad Católica de Pereira. <https://repositorio.ucp.edu.co/handle/10785/5509?locale=es>
- Maican, S.S, Muntean, A.C., Pastiu, C.A., Stepien, S., Polcyn, J., Dobra, I.B., Dârja, M., & Moisa, C.O. (2021). Motivational Factors, Job Satisfaction, and Economic Performance in Romanian Small Farms. *Sustainability*, 13, 5832. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su13115832>

- Marin, H., & Placencia, M. (2017). Motivación y satisfacción laboral del personal de una organización de salud del sector privado. *Horizonte Médico*, 17(4) 42-52. <https://doi.org/10.24265/horizmed.2017.v17n4.08>
- Martins L., & Sandoval P. S. M. (2021). El trabajador rural y la satisfacción laboral en su entorno. Estudio de caso. Centro de la provincia de Santa Fe (Argentina). *FAVE - Ciencias Agrarias* 20(2), 45-58. http://www.scielo.org.ar/scielo.php?script=sci_abstract&pid=S1666-77192021000200045
- McGregor, D. (1994). *El lado humano de las organizaciones*. Bogotá: McGraw-Hill.
- Meliá, J., & Peiró, J. (1989). La medida de la satisfacción laboral en contextos organizacionales: El Cuestionario de Satisfacción S20/23. *Psicologemas*, 5(2), 59-74. https://www.uv.es/~meliajl/Research/Art_Satisf/ArtS20_23.PDF
- Meliá, J., & Peiró, J. (1989a). Cuestionario de satisfacción laboral S10/12: estructura factorial, fiabilidad y validez. *Revista de Psicología del Trabajo y de las Organizaciones*, 4(11), 179-187. https://www.uv.es/meliajl/Research/Art_Satisf/ArtS10_12.PDF
- Meliá, J. L., Pradilla, J. F., Martí, N., Sancerni, M. D., Oliver, A., & Tomás J. M. (1990). Estructura factorial, fiabilidad y validez del Cuestionario de Satisfacción S21/26: un instrumento con formato dicotómico orientado al trabajo profesional. *Revista de Psicología Universitas Tarraconensis*, 12(1/2), 25-39. https://www.uv.es/~meliajl/Research/Art_Satisf/ArtS21_26.PDF
- Mello, F. A. (2004). *Desarrollo organizacional: enfoque integral*. México DF: Limusa Norega Editores.
- Méndez, M. J. (2015). Satisfacción con el empleo de extensionista rural: un estudio cualitativo en Caldas, Colombia. *Revista Ceres*, 62(3), 241-250. <https://doi.org/10.1590/0034-737X201562030003>
- Monje, C. A. (2011). *Metodología de la investigación cuantitativa y cualitativa*. Neiva: Universidad Surcolombiana. <https://www.uv.mx/rmipe/files/2017/02/Guia-didactica-metodologia-de-la-investigacion.pdf>
- Moorman, R. H. (1993). The influence of cognitive and affective based job satisfaction measures on the relationship between satisfaction and organizational citizenship behavior. *Human Relations*, 46(6), 759-776. <https://doi.org/10.1177/001872679304600604>
- Núñez, E., Estévez, G. J., Hernández, P., & Marrero, C. D. (2007). Una propuesta destinada a complementar el cuestionario Font-Roja de satisfacción laboral. *Gaceta Sanitaria*, 21(2), 136-41. https://scielo.isciii.es/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S0213-91112007000200008

- Peiró, J., & Prieto, F. (1996). *Tratado de Psicología del Trabajo*. Madrid: Síntesis.
- Pérez, M. I. (1987). La satisfacción laboral. Escuela Social de Valencia.
- Pujol-Cols, L. J. & Dabos, G.E. (2017). Satisfacción laboral: una revisión de la literatura acerca de sus principales determinantes. *Estudios Gerenciales*, 34(146), 3-18. <https://doi.org/10.18046/j.estger.2018.146.2809>
- Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. (2009). *Comportamiento Organizacional*. México: Prentice Hall. https://frrq.cvg.utn.edu.ar/pluginfile.php/15550/mod_resource/content/0/ROBBINS%20comportamiento-organizacional-13a-ed-_nodrm.pdf
- Robbins, S. P., & Coulter, M. (2005). *Administración*. México: Prentice Hall Hispanoamericana.
- Salazar, L. (2019). Satisfacción laboral y desempeño. *Colección Académica de Ciencias Estratégicas*, 6(1), 47-67. <https://repository.upb.edu.co/handle/20.500.11912/9384>
- Schultz, T. W. (2006). *The Economic Importance of Human Capital in Modernization*. Chicago: University of South Dakota. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09645299300000003>
- Shvarstein, L. (2003). *La inteligencia Social de las organizaciones*. Buenos Aires: Editorial Paidós. <https://blogs.fcecon.unr.edu.ar/mba/wp-content/uploads/sites/9/2017/08/inteligencia-social-en-organizaciones-Schvarstein.pdf>
- Spector, P. E. (1997). *Job satisfaction: Application, assessment, causes, and consequences*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781452231549>
- Thompson, E. R., & Phua, F. T. (2012). A brief index of affective job satisfaction. *Group & Organization Management*, 37(3), 275-307. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1059601111434201>
- Tsaousis, I., Nikolaou, I., Serdaris, N., & Judge, T. A. (2007). Do the core selfevaluations moderate the relationship between subjective well-being and physical and psychological health? *Personality and Individual Differences*, 42(8), 1441-1452. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2006.10.025>
- Weinert, A. (1985). *Manual de la psicología de la organización: la conducta humana en las organizaciones*. Barcelona: Herder.
- Witt, C. D., Reed, D. B., Rayens, M. K., & Hunsucker, S. (2020). Predictors of Job Satisfaction in Female Farmers Aged 50 and Over: Implications for Occupational Health Nurses. *Workplace Health & Safety*, 68(11), 526-532. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2165079920931895>
- Yukl, G. (2008). *Liderazgo en las Organizaciones*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Zafra, J. H., Tenorio-Mucha, J., & Bazalar-Palacios, J. (2020). Asociación entre índice de ruralidad y satisfacción laboral en médicos y enfermeros de Perú. *Revista Cubana de Salud Pública*, 46(2), e1414. http://scielo.sld.cu/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S0864-34662020000200012.