ISSN: 2310-340X | RNPS: 2349 | COODES Vol. 14 No. 2 e985 (May-August)
Peraza Rodríguez, G.; Vargas Fernández, T. "Procedure for improving job satisfaction in tobacco companies".
https://coodes.upr.edu.cu/index.php/coodes/article/view/985
2026

Original article

Procedure for improving job satisfaction in tobacco companies

Procedimiento para la mejora de la satisfacción laboral en empresas tabacaleras

Procedimento para melhorar a satisfação no trabalho em empresas de tabaco

Geidy Peraza Rodríguez[1] 0009-0006-5185-7161 informatica@tabacopalma.co.cu

Tania Vargas Fernández[2] 0000-0003-4285-682X tvargas@upr.edu.cu

[1] Tobacco Collection and Processing Company La Palma. Pinar del Río, Cuba.

[2] University of Pinar del Río "Hermanos Saíz Montes de Oca". Cuba.

Received: 25/04/2026

Accepted: 11/06/2026

ABSTRACT

Job satisfaction is a critical variable in organizational behavior that directly impacts productivity and business performance. At the La Palma Tobacco Collection and Processing Company, deficiencies were identified in its management, such as the absence of a formal job satisfaction management system, authoritarian leadership, and salary dissatisfaction, which motivated this research. The objective was to design a job satisfaction management procedure that contributes to improved individual performance and the achievement of organizational goals. Theoretical and empirical methods were employed: document analysis, surveys, interviews, focus groups, and the Iadov technique for user validation. The diagnostic results revealed an authoritarian leadership style, a lack of clear feedback, and total dissatisfaction with compensation. Based on these results, a five-phase structured procedure was designed based on the PDCA cycle (Plan-Do-Check-Act). The procedure

was validated using the Iadov technique with the participation of 15 key actors of the company, obtaining a Group Satisfaction Index of 0.53, which places it in the satisfaction zone.

Keywords: job satisfaction; procedure; management.

RESUMEN

La satisfacción laboral es una variable crítica del comportamiento organizacional que impacta directamente en la productividad y el desempeño empresarial. En la Empresa de Acopio y Beneficio del Tabaco La Palma se identificaron deficiencias en su gestión, como la ausencia de un sistema formal de gestión de la satisfacción laboral, liderazgo autoritario e insatisfacción salarial, lo que motivó esta investigación. El objetivo fue diseñar un procedimiento para la gestión de la satisfacción laboral que contribuya a la mejora del desempeño individual y al cumplimiento de los objetivos organizacionales. Se emplearon métodos teóricos y empíricos: análisis documental, encuesta, entrevistas, grupos focales, y técnica de Iadov para validación por criterio de usuarios. Los resultados del diagnóstico revelaron un estilo de liderazgo autoritario, falta de retroalimentación clara e insatisfacción total con la retribución económica. Con base en estos resultados, se diseñó un procedimiento estructurado en cinco fases basado en el ciclo PDCA (Planificar-Hacer-Verificar-Actuar). El procedimiento fue validado mediante la técnica de Iadov con la participación de 15 actores clave de la empresa, obteniendo un Índice de Satisfacción Grupal de 0.53, que lo ubica en zona de satisfacción.

Palabras clave: satisfacción laboral; procedimiento; gestión.

RESUMO

A satisfação no trabalho é uma variável crítica no comportamento organizacional que impacta diretamente a produtividade e o desempenho dos negócios. Na Empresa de Coleta e Processamento de Tabaco La Palma, foram identificadas deficiências em sua gestão, como a ausência de um sistema formal de gestão da satisfação no trabalho, liderança autoritária e insatisfação salarial, o que motivou esta pesquisa. O objetivo foi desenvolver um procedimento para a gestão da satisfação no trabalho que contribua para a melhoria do desempenho individual e para o alcance dos objetivos organizacionais. Foram utilizados métodos teóricos e empíricos: análise documental, questionários,

entrevistas, grupos focais e a técnica de Iadov para validação com usuários. Os resultados do diagnóstico revelaram um estilo de liderança autoritário, falta de feedback claro e insatisfação total com a remuneração. Com base nesses resultados, foi desenvolvido um procedimento estruturado em cinco fases, baseado no ciclo PDCA (Planejar-Executar-Verificar-Agir). O procedimento foi validado utilizando a técnica de Iadov com a participação de 15 principais participantes da empresa, obtendo-se um Índice de Satisfação do Grupo de 0,53, o que o coloca na zona de satisfação.

Palavras-chave: satisfação no trabalho; procedimento; gestão.

INTRODUCTION

The study of organizational behavior is a fundamental discipline for understanding the dynamics of contemporary organizations. From Adam Smith's pioneering ideas on the division of labor to Chiavenato's (2022) systemic concepts, the evolution of management thought has shown that the systematic analysis of the behavior of individuals and groups in the workplace is an indispensable tool for optimizing performance, enhancing human talent, and promoting a healthy organizational climate. As Wagner and Hollenbeck (2021) point out, organizational behavior allows us to understand, predict, and manage human behavior in organizations, which is essential for any business management process.

In this field, job satisfaction stands out as one of the most critical and determining variables, not only because of its direct impact on the employee's psychosocial well-being, but also because of its proven influence on key organizational outcomes such as productivity, talent retention, quality, and corporate profitability. Robbins (2004) defines it as an individual's general attitude toward their work, distinguishing it as a fundamental dependent variable within the basic model of organizational behavior, alongside productivity, absenteeism, turnover, and organizational citizenship. This attitudinal conception of job satisfaction has been enriched by multiple theoretical approaches that help us understand its dimensions, causes, and consequences.

The historical evolution of the concept reveals a shift from conceptions centered on individual well-being toward strategic perspectives on talent management. A decisive theoretical contribution to the management of job satisfaction was Frederick Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory, which distinguished between motivating factors -intrinsic to the work, such as achievement, recognition, responsibility,

and opportunities for growth- and hygiene factors -extrinsic to the job, such as company policy, supervision, interpersonal relationships, working conditions, and salary- (Herzberg, 1959). According to this theory, the presence of motivating factors generates satisfaction, while the absence of hygiene factors produces dissatisfaction, implying that management strategies must address both dimensions differently. Ahmad et al. (2025) empirically confirm the validity of this distinction in the context of contemporary public organizations, demonstrating that hygiene factors such as personnel policies and interpersonal relationships have a significant influence on employees' job satisfaction, which underscores the need to manage both dimensions in an integrated manner.

In the 1970s, Locke (1976) provided a widely accepted definition by conceptualizing job satisfaction as a positive emotional state resulting from the evaluation of one's job or work experiences, highlighting the importance of the congruence between expectations and reality as a determinant of one's attitude toward work. Recent research has confirmed the relationship between job design and job satisfaction. A meta-analysis published by Panda (2025), which included 113 studies with a total sample of over 38,000 employees, demonstrated a moderate positive correlation ($r = 0.339$) between job satisfaction and individual performance. This study identifies that job characteristics -such as skill variety, task identity and significance, autonomy, and feedback- constitute essential dimensions that directly influence worker satisfaction, empirically validating the postulates of classical job design models.

From a process-oriented perspective, Vroom's Expectancy Theory (1964) and Adams' Equity Theory (1963) provide tools for understanding the cognitive mechanisms underlying satisfaction. Vroom (1964) establishes that motivation and satisfaction depend on the interaction of three variables: the effort-performance expectancy, the performance-outcome expectancy, and the valence or value of the reward. Adams (1963), for his part, demonstrates that workers continually compare their outcome-to-effort ratio with that of significant reference points, generating feelings of equity or inequity that directly impact job satisfaction.

In recent decades, the Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) Model developed by Bakker et al. (2023) has gained prominence by positing that performance and workplace well-being depend on the balance between job demands and the resources provided by the organization. Recent research has confirmed that intrinsic motivation is a central predictor of job satisfaction, surpassing extrinsic incentives in its impact on sustained well-being at work (Martela, 2025). Schaufeli et al. (2002)

defined work engagement as a positive, satisfying, work-related mental state characterized by vigor, dedication, and absorption -a conceptualization that remains valid in current literature.

Job satisfaction management, understood as the set of practices, policies, and strategies that organizations implement to measure, maintain, and improve the well-being and motivation of their employees, is now a systematic process that integrates the measurement, analysis, and interpretation of actions aimed at optimizing human capital. As Huselid (1995) demonstrates, human res s management practices have economically significant effects on key organizational outcomes such as turnover, productivity, and financial performance. In this regard, longitudinal studies, such as that by Węziak Białowolska et al. (2020), have revealed significant links between life well-being and work well-being, including job satisfaction as a central variable, which underscores the need to address well-being management in a comprehensive and systemic manner. Recent cross-cultural studies have confirmed that job satisfaction is positively associated with organizational diversity and inclusive practices, regardless of the national context (Ghazzawi et al., 2025).

In the Cuban context, job satisfaction takes on particular relevance in agricultural enterprises, where the management of organizational behavior faces specific challenges stemming from the sector's complexity, the seasonality of production, and the country's socioeconomic conditions. The La Palma Tobacco Collection and Processing Company, the subject of this research, is a strategic entity within the Tabacuba Business Group, with a workforce of 746 employees and a history dating back to 1971. Despite its economic and social importance, there is no evidence of a formal job satisfaction management system that would allow for the ongoing assessment of its workers' well-being and the implementation of specific improvement measures.

Organizational leadership is showing a growing interest in understanding the effects that both organizational structure and processes have on their staff, as these fundamentally influence individual behavior. However, significant shortcomings were identified in the organization under study: the absence of a job satisfaction committee, leadership styles perceived as authoritarian, a lack of clear feedback, dissatisfaction with compensation, and a lack of specific indicators to evaluate the management of employee well-being. These limitations, identified through a literature review, employee surveys, and interviews with managers and focus groups, highlight the urgent need for a methodological approach that systematizes the process of managing job satisfaction.

In light of the above, the objective of this study is to design a procedure for managing job satisfaction at the La Palma Tobacco Collection and Processing Company, which will contribute to improving individual performance and effectively achieving its organizational objectives.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The dialectical materialist method was employed as the general method of scientific research to assess the evolution of research in the field of job satisfaction management. The abstraction procedure was used to analyze and break down the object of study, and induction-deduction was used to identify generalities and regularities in the process. Similarly, these procedures were used in the development of the proposed solution and its validation.

As theoretical-level methods, the historical and logical methods were used to determine trends in job satisfaction management, based on the technologies preceding the proposal in this research. The systemic-structural method was also used to ground the procedure for job satisfaction management. The procedures used were analysis and synthesis to decompose the functioning of the object into its various components and establish the relationships among them.

As an empirical method, the measurement method was used to process the information obtained from the questionnaires administered using SPSS version 21 as database processing software.

Among the techniques applied, the following stand out:

- Survey: to characterize job satisfaction at the La Palma Tobacco Collection and Processing Company.
- Interview: to understand managers' perspectives on the management of job satisfaction within the company.
- Document analysis: to evaluate the literature related to the problem, as well as to uncover objective evidence regarding the conditions that influence job satisfaction at the La Palma Tobacco Collection and Processing Company.
- Iadov technique: to validate the proposed procedure based on user criteria.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Job satisfaction has evolved from an initial focus on individual well-being to becoming a key variable in organizational management, linked to productivity, motivation, and organizational culture.

Chiavenato (2022) defines organizational behavior as the study of the impact that individuals, groups, and structures have on behavior within companies, emphasizing that its objective is to help people and organizations achieve more efficient performance levels. This systemic approach is complemented by recent advances in the understanding of work motivation, where the Job Demands and Resources (JD-R) Theory has undergone significant innovations. Bakker et al. (2023) identify four major developments from the past decade: the person × situation approach, the multilevel JD-R theory, new proactive approaches, and the work-home resources model, which demonstrate the evolution from conceptions focused exclusively on individual well-being toward comprehensive perspectives that consider the dynamic interaction between job demands and resources.

In the field of work motivation and commitment, Zhang et al. (2025), in their bibliometric analysis of 563 publications on work commitment, confirm that this remains a central construct in contemporary organizational psychology. This study identifies that skill utilization is one of the strongest predictors of commitment, while emotional dissonance and emotional demands remain the primary predictors of burnout, explaining a significant portion of the variance in both variables. Furthermore, Ossa Cardona and Álzate Sánchez (2024) provide updated evidence on the relationship between compensation and work engagement, noting that both financial and non-financial compensation (emotional salary) contribute to organizational well-being, and that compensation influences key dimensions of *engagement* such as vigor, dedication, and absorption, constituting a relative factor that must be considered alongside other elements of the work context.

Recent research, such as that by Licandro et al. (2025), confirms that job satisfaction plays a key role as a moderating variable in the relationship between organizational practices and employee engagement, highlighting the importance of managing this variable across various sectoral contexts. These contemporary findings align with the classic tenets of Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory (1959) and Hackman and Oldham's Job Characteristics Model (1976), which remain valid as a foundation for understanding the distinction between intrinsic and extrinsic factors of job satisfaction.

Recent literature emphasizes that job resources -including feedback, autonomy, skill utilization, growth opportunities, and value congruence- are crucial factors for worker well-being, showing positive associations with work motivation and engagement, as well as negative associations with burnout.

In particular, supervisor support for recovery from work-related stress has emerged as a key predictor of job satisfaction. Liu et al. (2026) demonstrate that this type of organizational support significantly increases employees' growth and vitality, which in turn elevates their job satisfaction. Likewise, Bernini and Tampieri (2026) demonstrate that satisfaction with salary is less important in explaining overall job satisfaction than other non-monetary factors (job security, type of work, and hours worked), and that this composition varies significantly depending on the type of employment and the workers' income level. These findings underscore the need for comprehensive and differentiated approaches to managing workplace well-being.

The assessment of the current state of job satisfaction at the La Palma Tobacco Collection and Processing Company was conducted using a seven-stage methodology (determination of information needs, definition of the objective and scope of the assessment, identification of information sources, design of data collection forms, sample design, data collection, analysis and processing of information, and presentation of the report), which included a document review, 300 employee surveys, 24 semi-structured group interviews (with 10 participants each), and 19 individual interviews with members of the board of directors. The document review revealed the absence of a Job Satisfaction Committee, a succession plan with only 12.5% effective compliance, partially implemented morale-boosting procedures, and a high-performance pay system that has not been implemented since 2013. Furthermore, it was found that the organization's process map does not identify employee satisfaction management as an indicator to be studied, and that only 58% of positions have updated job descriptions. The financial results showed labor productivity at 99% and an average monthly salary of 4,298 pesos, lower than planned (5,070 pesos) despite exceeding sales targets by 131%.

The results of the surveys and interviews revealed significant limitations in key dimensions of job satisfaction. Ninety-one percent of respondents perceived an authoritarian and non-participatory leadership style, 72% noted a lack of clear feedback on their work results, and 100% stated that their compensation does not correspond to their responsibilities and workload. Regarding development opportunities, 66% indicated that their manager shows no interest in their long-term

career plan, while 83% of women felt that their job does not adequately utilize their skills and abilities. However, positive aspects were identified, such as a climate of cooperation and mutual support among peers (81% rated interpersonal communication as adequate) and a sense of belonging among 84% of employees with more than eight years of tenure. Dissatisfaction was particularly high in the economics department- the area with the highest staff turnover- and among university-educated employees (81% do not feel professionally fulfilled).

These findings justify the need to propose a tailored procedure that integrates the intrinsic and extrinsic dimensions of job satisfaction into a cycle of continuous improvement, taking into account both current theoretical developments and the specific characteristics of the organizational context studied.

Taking these elements into account, a procedure was designed to improve job satisfaction, aimed at establishing a systematic, continuous, and strategically aligned system for job satisfaction at the La Palma Tobacco Collection and Processing Company, which allows for the ongoing assessment of employee satisfaction levels, the implementation of specific actions by dimension, the monitoring of their effectiveness, and the progressive improvement of workplace well-being, thereby contributing to improved individual performance and the achievement of organizational objectives.

This procedure is based on a set of principles that underpin its conception from both a scientific and practical standpoint, namely: a systemic approach, strategic coherence, proactivity, logical consistency, action orientation, operational feasibility, flexibility, and coordination.

Based on the definition of the principles underpinning the theoretical framework of the procedure, the following are identified as the main premises for its implementation: commitment from senior management, conscious collective participation, and a defined corporate strategy.

The procedure designed for the La Palma Tobacco Collection and Processing Company is structured into five main phases that follow the continuous improvement cycle known as PDCA (Plan, Do, Check, Act). Each phase includes a set of specific steps and activities with designated responsible parties, expected deliverables, and estimated durations. Each phase is described in detail below.

Phase I: Strategic management planning

This phase has an estimated duration of one month and constitutes the foundation upon which the entire management system is built. Its objective is to establish the strategic framework, policies, and guidelines of the system, defining performance indicators and clear responsibilities. It includes the following steps:

- Definition of the job satisfaction policy. In this activity, the CEO drafts and signs a statement establishing the organization's commitment to job satisfaction as a priority organizational value. This policy must include guiding principles such as equity, participation, human development, and work-life balance. Once drafted, the policy must be formally approved through a resolution by the Board of Directors and communicated institutionally at all hierarchical levels of the company.
- Strategic Alignment. The Director of Human Capital, in coordination with the Board of Directors, conducts an alignment workshop where the objectives of the job satisfaction management system are linked to the company's strategic objectives outlined in its Global Strategy. The workshop identifies how each job satisfaction objective contributes to goals related to productivity, talent retention, and improvement of the organizational climate, resulting in a contribution document that demonstrates the strategic value of the system.
- Design of the indicator system. A specialist in organizational behavior management, with the support of the committee to be formed later, defines a set of quantitative and qualitative indicators for each dimension of job satisfaction. For the nature of work dimension, for example, the percentage of employees satisfied with the content of their work is established (80% target, measured every six months). For supervision and leadership, the percentage of employees who perceive participatory leadership is defined (75% target). Objective indicators are also included, such as the annual voluntary turnover rate (target below 5%) and the sick leave rate (target below 3% monthly). For each indicator, a baseline is established based on the initial assessment, along with specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, and time-bound (SMART) goals.
- Allocation of permanent resources. The Director of Human Capital, in conjunction with the Board of Directors, prepares a specific annual budget for employee satisfaction management, which includes allocations for training, recognition, infrastructure improvements, and supporting technology. Managers are designated in each Business Unit (UEB) and department, and the necessary software licenses are acquired for conducting digital surveys and

performing statistical analysis of the data. Dedicated time from the human resources specialist is also allocated for the system's activities.

- Formation of the employee satisfaction management committee. The CEO convenes representatives from different areas: a human resource professional, two operations representatives, two employees elected by their peers, and a member of senior management. The committee should not exceed six members to ensure its effectiveness. Its functions include the general coordination of the system, the analysis of measurement results, the proposal of improvement actions, and the monitoring of implementation. The committee must schedule mandatory monthly meetings and receive initial training on the management methodology.
- System Rollout. The Director of Human Capital designs an internal communication campaign titled "Our Well-being Matters," which includes informational meetings in each UEB and department, the posting of the policy on bulletin boards and the corporate intranet, and awareness workshops for managers and middle managers on the role they must play in managing their teams' job satisfaction.

Phase II: Continuous diagnosis

This phase lasts 15 days per measurement cycle, and its objective is to establish systematic and permanent mechanisms for measuring job satisfaction that allow for the timely detection of trends and deviations. It includes the following steps:

- Design of the measurement system. The human resources specialist develops a standardized protocol that includes the biannual job satisfaction survey (structured across eight dimensions using a 1-to-5 Likert scale), a guide for semi-structured interviews with focus groups conducted quarterly, and a record form for exit interviews administered to 100% of employees leaving the company.
- Systematic biannual measurement. The survey is administered using a digital platform that guarantees the anonymity of responses. Coverage includes 100% of management and a random sample of employees, rotated in each cycle, that adequately represents the distribution by gender, tenure, and hierarchical level. Progressive reminders are implemented to maximize the response rate, with a minimum target of 80%. Once the responses are collected, the internal consistency of the instrument is validated by calculating Cronbach's alpha, which must be greater than 0.8.

- Implementation of continuous feedback channels. A digital suggestion and complaint box is launched, with an institutional commitment to respond to every communication within a maximum of 48 hours. A program of informal quarterly meetings is established for each UEB, where employees can freely express their concerns without their direct supervisors' present. Exit interviews are conducted using a structured questionnaire that explores the reasons for leaving and the general perception of the company. Additionally, the Management Committee holds monthly meetings with employee representatives to gather qualitative feedback.
- Compilation of objective indicators. Each month, the Human Resources system provides absenteeism data broken down by UEB and turnover rates. Productivity indicators are consolidated by area based on production reports, and all formal complaints filed by employees with the various authorities are recorded. The causes of workplace accidents and occupational illnesses reported to the health and safety department are also analyzed.
- Data processing and preliminary analysis. The specialist calculates descriptive statistics for each dimension and each UEB, identifying the mean scores, standard deviations, and minimum and maximum values. Correlation analyses are performed between satisfaction levels and objective indicators of productivity and absenteeism. An early warning system is established that is triggered when any dimension receives an average score below 3.0 out of 5. Finally, an executive report summarizing the most relevant findings is prepared for presentation to the Board of Directors.

Phase III: Analysis and interpretation of results

This phase lasts 15 days and aims to analyze the collected data to identify trends, root causes of problems, and establish evidence-based intervention priorities. It includes the following steps:

- Comparative dimensional analysis. The specialist performs cross-tabulations of the results by UEB (the six existing units), by gender, by tenure brackets (0 to 5 years, 6 to 15 years, and over 16 years), and by hierarchical level (operational, technical, and managerial). Significant gaps between groups are identified, with differences greater than 0.5 points on the Likert scale considered relevant. A satisfaction heat map is constructed that visually represents the performance of each dimension in each UEB using color coding, allowing for the rapid identification of critical segments requiring priority attention.
- Identification of root causes. The management committee convenes analysis workshops with the heads of the areas that obtained the lowest results. In these workshops, the "five whys"

technique is applied, iteratively asking "why?" until the root cause of each identified problem is reached. In addition, Ishikawa diagrams (also known as fishbone diagrams or cause-and-effect diagrams) are created for each critical dimension, classifying possible causes into six categories: method (inefficient processes), machinery (obsolete or inadequate equipment), labor (lack of training or skills), materials (insufficient or poor-quality inputs), environment (poor physical conditions), and measurement (lack of feedback or inadequate indicators). All proposed causes must be validated with quantitative data whenever possible.

- Trend analysis. Historical trend charts are created to show the performance of each dimension over the last three to five measurement cycles. Semiannual rates of change are calculated for each indicator, allowing for the identification of upward trends (sustained improvement), downward trends (progressive deterioration), or stable trends (no significant changes). Based on these trends, future scenarios are projected that predict the expected situation if current dynamics continue without intervention.
- Prioritization of needs. The committee constructs a prioritization matrix that intersects two axes: the potential impact of resolving each problem on overall job satisfaction and the effort required to implement the solution (considering time, financial resources, technical complexity, and the need for cultural changes). Problems are classified into four quadrants: those with high impact and low effort are considered "quick wins" and should be implemented immediately; those with high impact and high effort are treated as "strategic projects" requiring detailed planning; those with low impact and low effort are considered "filler tasks" that can be delegated; and those with low impact and high effort should be eliminated or postponed indefinitely. The priorities defined by the Committee are validated by the Board of Directors before proceeding to the next phase.
- Definition of management objectives. Based on the previous analysis, SMART objectives are formulated for each prioritized dimension. An example of an objective would be: "Increase satisfaction with salary compensation from 2.8 to 3.5 on a scale of 1 to 5 within 12 months, by revising the performance-based pay system and conducting a pay equity audit." Each objective must have a designated person responsible for its implementation, quarterly interim verification milestones, and must be formally approved by the Board of Directors.

Phase IV: Implementation and control

This phase is carried out continuously in six-month cycles, and its objective is to execute systematic actions for managing job satisfaction, monitor their implementation, and make timely adjustments to ensure effectiveness. It includes the following steps:

- Design of the integrated action plan. The management committee formulates specific actions for each prioritized dimension, as shown in table 1.
- Assignment of responsibilities. A RACI matrix is created that specifies for each action who is responsible (Responsible), who is ultimately accountable, who should be consulted (Consulted), and who should simply be informed (Informed). For each action, answers to seven key questions are defined: what will be done, why it will be done, where it will be carried out, when it will be carried out (with start and end dates), who will do it, how it will be done (specific procedure), and how much it will cost (allocated budget). Those responsible sign compliance agreements formalizing their commitment.
- Communication and Awareness. UEB and department heads hold informational meetings in their respective units to explain the action plan, its objectives, and the expected benefits. A communication campaign called "Your Voice, Our Improvement" is launched to reinforce the message that the actions stem from the assessments in which workers participated. Visual progress posters are displayed in the common areas of all UEBs, showing the status of compliance with the committed actions. Additionally, question-and-answer sessions are held where workers can express doubts and concerns directly to the members of the management committee.
- Implementation of actions. A detailed schedule is drawn up with specific start and end dates for each action, and photographic and documentary records are kept of all implementations carried out. Attendance at training sessions is tracked via sign-in sheets, and the deliverables resulting from the actions (infrastructure improvement projects, procurement of equipment and materials, contracting of external services, among others) are monitored. Designated managers' report weekly on progress to the Management Committee.
- Continuous monitoring. The Management Committee meets monthly to review the progress of the action plan, analyzing a dashboard of performance indicators that shows the percentage of completion for each action relative to the plan. Automatic alerts are implemented that are triggered when an action is delayed by more than a week, allowing for early intervention.

Quarterly executive reports are prepared and presented to the Board of Directors to keep senior management informed of the system's progress.

- Deviation Management. An escalation protocol is established for non-compliance, defining who must be notified and within what timeframes when an action is not carried out as planned. An analysis of the causes of deviations is conducted, distinguishing between lack of resources, lack of technical capacity on the part of the person responsible, or lack of willingness. For each deviation, a recovery plan is developed that redefines deadlines and corrective actions. When the organizational context changes (reorganizations, economic crises, new legal provisions), the necessary adjustments are made to the plan to maintain its relevance.
- Continuous feedback. A monthly newsletter titled "Progress in Satisfaction Management" is published and distributed to all employees, highlighting achievements and ongoing actions. Public recognition is given to the UEB that shows the greatest progress in implementing the plan. Periodically, quick perception surveys are conducted to assess how employees are receiving the actions, and adjustments to the plan are made based on that feedback.

Table 1. Specific actions for each dimension of job satisfaction

Dimensions	Actions
Nature of work	Semiannual job rotation to enrich tasks.
	Implementation of quality circles that allow employees to participate in process improvement.
	Job redesign to increase the variety of skills required.
	Granting greater autonomy in daily operational decisions.
Recognition	A program called "Hall of Fame" is created, featuring monthly public recognition of outstanding employees.
	A bonus system is implemented for successfully implemented suggestions.
	Quarterly recognition ceremonies are established.
	A mentoring program is developed to recognize employees with the most experience.
Supervision and leadership	A mandatory training program called "Participatory Leadership" is designed for all middle managers.

	A system for evaluating leaders by their employees (360-degree evaluation) is implemented.
	Individual coaching is offered to managers who receive low leadership ratings.
	Weekly meetings for constructive feedback between managers and subordinates are scheduled.
Compensation	The reinstatement of high-performance pay (suspended since 2013) is being managed with clear and transparent criteria.
	An annual pay equity audit is conducted by gender and job function.
	Flexible benefits are implemented, allowing employees to choose from different options based on their personal needs.
	The meal and transportation policy is reviewed to make it more equitable.
Development opportunities	The succession plan is reactivated, aiming to increase compliance from the current 12.5% to a target of 45%.
	A documented and communicated individual career plan is created for each employee.
	A scholarship program for technical and university studies is established.
	A scheduled job rotation program is being implemented to develop diverse skills.
Working conditions	A monthly preventive maintenance program for equipment and facilities is established.
	Annual ergonomic assessments are conducted to identify and correct risks.
	Rest areas and the cafeteria are expanded.
	An exercise and physical wellness program is implemented in the workplace.
Organizational culture	Participatory workshops are held to collectively build organizational values.
	A policy of transparent communication regarding business results and decisions is established.

	A family integration program called "Family Day at the Company" is created.
	Positive organizational rituals that strengthen the sense of community are encouraged.
Relationships with colleagues	Group integration activities focused on teamwork are organized on a quarterly basis.
	A mediation service for interpersonal conflicts is offered by the Human Resources department.
	Opportunities for socializing are created during the workday.
	A "buddy" (mentor) program is implemented to facilitate the integration of new employees.

Source: Own elaboration

Phase V: Evaluation and continuous improvement

This phase lasts 15 days per cycle and aims to evaluate the effectiveness of the management system, document lessons learned, and make necessary adjustments for the next cycle, thereby closing the PDCA cycle. It includes the following steps:

- Post-implementation measurement. The job satisfaction survey is administered again using exactly the same methodology and instrument as in the initial (baseline) measurement to ensure the comparability of the results. Statistical tests are performed, specifically Student's t-test for paired samples, to determine whether the changes observed between the initial measurement and the post-implementation measurement are statistically significant (considering a significance level of p less than 0.05). The dimensions that showed significant changes and those that did not achieve relevant improvements are identified, and an analysis of variance is performed to examine differences in specific segments of the population (by UEB, gender, tenure, and hierarchical level).
- Comparative analysis of results. The percentage change for each dimension is calculated by comparing the post-implementation value with the baseline value. The degree of achievement of the SMART goals established in Phase III is evaluated, identifying which goals were exceeded, which were partially achieved, and which were not met. A correlation analysis is

conducted between the investment made in each action (in terms of time, financial resources, and organizational effort) and the improvement achieved in employee satisfaction, which allows for the identification of which actions proved most cost-effective.

- Calculation of return on investment (ROI). The human capital director quantifies the benefits obtained through the implementation of the management system. These benefits include reduced employee turnover (calculating the cost of replacing a departing employee, which includes recruitment, selection, and training expenses, as well as lost productivity during the onboarding period), decreased absenteeism, increased productivity (measured in terms of output per employee), and improved quality indicators. All these benefits are added together and compared with the total costs of the management system (investment in training, recognition, infrastructure improvements, man-hours dedicated, software purchased, among others). The ROI is calculated using the formula: (Benefits minus Costs) divided by Costs, multiplied by 100 to obtain a percentage. Additionally, expected benefits are projected over the medium term (three years), taking into account the sustainability of the improvements achieved.
- Documentation of lessons learned. The management committee organizes a workshop with all key stakeholders (executives, UEB heads, participating specialists, and worker representatives) to systematically capture the lessons learned during the cycle. Success factors that contributed to positive results (for example, the commitment of a particular leader, a particularly effective communication strategy, or a specific action that generated high impact) are documented, as well as factors that limited or prevented the achievement of expected objectives. A repository of best practices is created that the entire organization can access, and the management system's manuals and operational guidelines are updated to incorporate the lessons learned.
- Making adjustments to the management system. Based on the evaluation conducted, the indicator system is critically reviewed to determine whether the current indicators are adequate or whether it is necessary to add, remove, or modify any of them. The established measurement frequencies are evaluated, considering whether they were appropriate or whether some dimensions require more frequent monitoring or, conversely, can be spaced out. Analysis protocols are updated to incorporate new techniques or methodological refinements identified as useful during the cycle. If new dimensions of job satisfaction that were not previously considered emerged during the analysis, they are incorporated into the

system. Finally, the next PDCA cycle is planned with revised and updated objectives, starting again with Phase I.

- Recognition and closing of the cycle. An annual recognition event is organized in which all company employees participate, publicly celebrating the achievements made during the management cycle. The UEB that has shown the greatest progress in job satisfaction is recognized, as are the employees and leaders who contributed most to the system's success. The overall results obtained are communicated to the entire organization, including both achievements and areas that still require improvement. Finally, a symbolic ceremony is held to formally close the completed cycle and open the new management cycle, renewing the entire organization's commitment to the continuous improvement of job satisfaction.
- Strategic Feedback to Phase I. This final step includes the following actions: reviewing and adjusting the policy, recalibrating the indicator system, updating SMART goals, reallocating resources based on ROI, reviewing the committee's composition, and communicating adjustments for further dissemination.

Table 2 shows the job satisfaction management indicators to be considered as part of the proposed procedure, each with its target and evaluation frequency.

Table 2. Job satisfaction management indicator system

Dimension	Specific Indicator	Target	Frequency
Nature of work	% of workers satisfied with job content (score ≥4/5)	≥ 80%	Semiannual
Supervision and leadership	% of employees who perceive participatory leadership (score ≥4/5)	≥ 75%	Semester
Relationships with colleagues	% of employees satisfied with the work environment (score ≥4/5)	≥ 85%	Semiannual
Compensation	% of employees who perceive pay equity (score ≥4/5)	≥ 70%	Annual
Development opportunities	% of employees with a defined, documented, and communicated career plan	≥ 60%	Annual

Working conditions	% compliance with health and safety standards (internal audits)	100%	Quarterly
Organizational culture	% of employees with a high sense of belonging (score ≥4/5)	≥ 80%	Semiannual
Overall satisfaction	Overall job satisfaction index (weighted average of dimensions)	≥ 4.0/5.0	Semiannual
Objective indicators	Annual voluntary turnover rate	< 5%	Annual
	Sick leave rate	< 3%	Monthly
	Labor productivity index (vs. previous year)	↑ 5% annually	Quarterly

Source: Own elaboration

The proposed procedure was validated using the Iadov technique, with an Iadov questionnaire administered to 15 key stakeholders at the La Palma Tobacco Collection and Processing Company, strategically selected for their knowledge of the organization and their potential involvement in implementing the procedure.

The sample consisted of 4 executives, 3 human resources specialists, 4 UEB managers, 2 union representatives, and 2 operational workers. This composition ensured the diversity of perspectives necessary for robust validation. The validation questionnaire consisted of five questions: three closed-ended and two open-ended. The closed-ended questions were interrelated using Iadov's Logical Framework to measure the Individual Satisfaction Index (ISI); the open-ended questions served to elicit qualitative reasoning and assess the respondent's coherence regarding the evaluated topic.

The Group Satisfaction Index obtained was GSI = 0.53, a value that falls within the range of +0.50 to +1.00, indicating the evaluators' satisfaction with the proposed procedure.

Eighty percent of the evaluators (12 out of 15) held a favorable view, distributed between clear satisfaction (26.7%) and more satisfied than dissatisfied (53.3%). The remaining 20.0% (3 evaluators) held an undefined position, with no cases of dissatisfaction or contradiction recorded.

All response patterns were logically consistent, with no instances of ambiguity. The open-ended questions allowed for the identification of the following strengths of the procedure:

- Coherence of the sequence of phases based on the PDCA cycle.
- Relevance for a company without a formal satisfaction management system.
- Integration of intrinsic and extrinsic dimensions of job satisfaction.

Likewise, the evaluators suggested the following improvements:

- Operational simplification for middle managers (one-page summary version for UEB heads).
- Reduction of the pilot cycle duration from six to four months.
- Strengthening training on the benefits of continuous management versus a one-time approach.

As part of this research, a five-phase structured procedure (Strategic Planning, Continuous Diagnosis, Analysis and Interpretation, Implementation and Control, Evaluation and Continuous Improvement) based on the PDCA cycle was documented. The procedure integrates a system of indicators by dimension (intrinsic and extrinsic), defines responsible parties, resources, and specific actions for each phase. Its systematic and cyclical design allows for a shift from a reactive to a proactive approach in workplace well-being management, contributing to improved individual performance and the achievement of organizational objectives.

Validation of the procedure using the Iadov technique with 15 key stakeholders (executives, human resources specialists, UEB managers, union representatives, and operational workers) yielded a Group Satisfaction Index of 0.53, placing the proposal in the "satisfied" range. 100% of the evaluators showed consistent response patterns, with no reports of ambiguity or dissatisfaction. Suggestions for improvement (simplification for operational managers and reduction of the pilot cycle) were incorporated, confirming the feasibility, relevance, and scientific quality of the procedure for implementation within the organization.

REFERENCES

Adams, J. S. (1963). Towards an understanding of inequity. *The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, *67*(5), 422-436. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0040968

Ahmad, M. F., Ma'amor, H., Samaan, S. S., Syed Ahmad, S. F., & Dahalan, N. A. (2025). The Herzberg's Theory: Hygiene Factors and Job Satisfaction at a Public Agency in Federal Territories of Malaysia. *Journal of International Business, Economics and Entrepreneurship*, *10*(1), 151-160. https://doi.org/10.24191/jibe.v10i1.5512

Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., Sanz Vergel, A., & Rodríguez Muñoz, A. (2023). La Teoría de las Demandas y Recursos Laborales: Nuevos Desarrollos en la Última Década. *Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, *39*(3), 157-167. https://doi.org/10.5093/jwop2023a17

Bernini, C., & Tampieri, A. (2026). Disentangling job satisfaction: The roles of monetary and non monetary factors across job types and income levels. *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, *64*(1), 52-75. https://doi.org/10.1111/bjir.70013

Chiavenato, I. (2022). *Comportamiento organizacional: La dinámica del éxito de las organizaciones*. McGraw-Hill. https://www.google.com.cu/books?id=mt810AEACAAJ

Ghazzawi, R., Bender, M., He, J., Daouk Öyry, L., & Van Der Heijden, B. (2025). Examining the interplay between job crafting and job satisfaction: A cross-cultural investigation. *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management*, *25*(2), 507-529. https://doi.org/10.1177/14705958251340537

Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. (1976). Motivation through the design of work: Test of a theory. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, *16*(2), 250-279. https://doi.org/10.1016/0030-5073(76)90016-7

Herzberg, F. (1959). *The Motivation to Work*. Wiley. https://books.google.com.cu/books?id=3xpPAAAAMAAJ

Huselid, M. A. (1995). The Impact Of Human Resource Management Practices On Turnover, Productivity, And Corporate Financial Performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, *38*(3), 635-672. https://doi.org/10.2307/256741

Licandro, O., Severino González, P., Ortigueira Sánchez, L., Veas González, I., Correa, P., Trigos Tapia, P., Rojas Bravo, V., Villanueva Arequipeño, T., & Rebolledo Aburto, G. (2025). Job Satisfaction as a Factor That Moderates the Relationship Between Internal Social Responsibility and Organizational Commitment: A Structural Equation Analysis. *Sustainability*, *17*(18), 8091. https://doi.org/10.3390/su17188091

Liu, Z., Gao, C., & Yu, C. (2026). A weary soul needs to recover! A study on the impact of supervisor support for recovery on employees' thriving at work and job satisfaction. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *16*, 1725037. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2025.1725037

Locke, E. A. (1976). The nature and causes of job satisfaction. En M. D. Dunnette (Ed.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 1297-1343). Rand McNally.

Martela, F. (2025). Well Being as Having, Loving, Doing, and Being: An Integrative Organizing Framework for Employee Well Being. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *46*(5), 641-661. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2862

Ossa Cardona, J. L., & Álzate Sánchez, K. A. (2024). La conexión salarial: Más allá de los números, una relación psicológica. Efectos de la compensación salarial en el engagement del empleado. *Revista CEA*, *10*(24), e3041. https://doi.org/10.22430/24223182.3041

Panda, R. K. (2025). Exploring The Relationship Between Job Satisfaction And Employee Performance: A Meta-Analysis. *Journal of Information Systems Engineering and Management*, *10*(3), 1439-1451. https://doi.org/10.52783/jisem.v10i3.7859

Robbins, S. P. (2004). *Comportamiento organizacional*. Pearson Educación. https://books.google.com.cu/books?id=OWBokj2RqBYC

Schaufeli, W. B., Salanova, M., González Romá, V., & Bakker, A. B. (2002). The Measurement of Engagement and Burnout: A Two Sample Confirmatory Factor Analytic Approach. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, *3*(1), 71-92. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1015630930326

Vroom, V. H. (1964). *Work and Motivation*. Wiley. https://books.google.com.cu/books?id=kexEAAAAIAAJ

Wagner, J. A., & Hollenbeck, J. R. (2021). *Organizational Behavior: Securing Competitive Advantage*. Taylor & Francis Group. https://books.google.com.cu/books?id=oKoxzgEACAAJ

Węziak Białowolska, D., Białowolski, P., & McNeely, E. (2020). The impact of workplace harassment and domestic violence on work outcomes in the developing world. *World Development*, *126*, 104732. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2019.104732

Zhang, Z., Mohamed, R., Rahman, R. A., & Dong, T. (2025). Bibliometric and visualized analysis of work engagement in business management. *Business: Theory and Practice*, *26*(1), 162-175. https://doi.org/10.3846/btp.2025.21416

Conflict of interest

Authors declare that they have no conflicts of interest.

Authors' contribution

Geidy Peraza Rodríguez and Tania Vargas Fernández designed the study, analyzed the data, and prepared the draft.

Geidy Peraza Rodríguez was involved in data collection, analysis, and interpretation.

All the authors reviewed the writing of the manuscript and approve the version finally submitted.

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License

Translated from the original in Spanish