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Abstract

The study is carried out in a public institution that provides services related to the management of identity, facts and acts of civil status of persons, General Directorate of Civil Registry, Identification and Identification DIGERCIC Zone 5; its officials are governed under the Organic Law of Public Service (LOSEP), in which its article 54 states that the Integrated System of Human Talent Development of the Public Service is formed, among others, by the Performance Evaluation Subsystem, applied once a year to all its employees. The objective of this work is to analyze the relationship between the variables performance evaluation and the productivity of its employees, for which descriptive non-experimental research with a correlational design of quantitative approach was used. The results showed that the performance evaluation positively impacts the productivity of their daily work. It should be emphasized that the performance evaluation and productivity results have very good and excellent averages.
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RESUMEN

La presente investigación se realiza en una institución Pública proveedora de servicios relacionados con la gestión de la identidad, hechos y actos del estado civil de las personas Dirección General de Registro Civil Identificación y Cedulación DIGERCIC Zona 5, sus funcionarios se rigen bajo la Ley Orgánica del Servicio Público (LOSEP); en la que su art. 54 establece que el Sistema Integrado de Desarrollo del Talento Humano del Servicio Público está conformado, entre otros, por el Subsistema de Evaluación del Desempeño, la cual se realiza una vez al año a todos sus empleados. El objetivo de este trabajo es conocer el análisis de la relación de las variables evaluación del desempeño y la productividad de sus funcionarios, para lo cual se utilizó la investigación descriptiva no experimental con un diseño correlacional de enfoque cuantitativo, los resultados arrojaron que la evaluación del desempeño incide positivamente en la productividad de sus labores diarias, cabe recalcar que los resultados de la evaluación del desempeño y la productividad tienen promedios muy buenos y excelentes.
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1. INTRODUCTION

Traditionally, the performance of public sector organizations has focused mainly on the constraints and stimuli posed by external factors, such as the rule of law and specific contingencies. In addition, increasing attention is focused on internal organizational variables, of which management is essential. For example, in their model for assessing and predicting organizational performance in U.S. federal agencies, Brewer and Selden (2000) focus on internal factors, such as organizational culture, task-related functions, and management-related issues, such as leadership and supervision (management of) human capital, and capacity. Their meta-analysis of more than 800 empirical studies is based in the U.S. (Piñeiro, 2016).

Most relevant in the context of the internal-external dichotomy on collaborators’ performance is the classification by Boyne (2003) of sixty-five statistical studies on the determinants of public service improvement, which is his understanding of “performance.” He groups the studies according to five theoretical perspectives, which point to possible determinants. In his view, the relevant external factors are resources, regulation and market structure (competition or not), and for internal factors, he lists organizational change (mainly concerning size and type of organization) and management. “Management” refers in his study to issues of organizational culture, leadership styles, human resource management, processes and strategy content. His overall conclusion is that public service performance is “subject to systemic influences” and that extreme contingency views are inappropriate to describe organizational reality (Boyne & Julian, 2003). Resources and management appear to have the “most consistent influences on performance” (Valdivia, 2019).

It should be taken into account that to improve performance, it is necessary to know if the performance of employees affects productivity, the same that is shown in the economic growth or decline within the company, the productivity of an organization is the first objective of managers and their responsibility (Robbins & Judge, 2009).

Productivity being an indicator linked to the efficiency of process execution, it is measurable and, therefore, must be present in the research since we can know the levels of efficiency and quality in work performance and know that these will help to achieve the institutional objectives. Moreover, it can be indicated that productivity is a global measure of the performance of an organization (Prokopenko, 1999).

Today, the country presents an abysmal growth of public institutions “public sector organizations in Western countries have generally introduced elements of the new public management” (Van Rinsum & Verbeet, 2012, p. 1) for those who run the institutions have the responsibility to represent and maintain the good name “to direct information from the state to the municipalities and as a form of management...it is an increasingly important feature” (Niiranen, 2008, p. 2).

In recent years in Ecuador, within the public sector, the administrative units of Human Talent of each institution are responsible for conducting performance evaluations that aim to boost productivity “the managerial skills of coordination and command staff in the public sector are essential to achieve the objectives of each organization in its field of competence” (Aburto & Bonales, p. 2). The objective of these evaluations is to encourage employees to perform their assigned roles assertively.

While public servants in the country undergo an evaluation process through the Technical Standard of the Performance Evaluation Subsystem; which is the set of standards, techniques, methods, protocols and harmonized, fair, transparent, impartial and free of arbitrariness procedures that systematically aim to evaluate under objective parameters following the functions, responsibilities and profiles of the position. Article 76 of the LOSEP, Organic Law of the Public Service, determines that “the evaluation shall be based on quantitative and qualitative management indicators, aimed at promoting the achievement of institutional aims and purposes, the development of public
servants and the continuous improvement of the quality of the public service provided by the entities, institutions, agencies or legal persons indicated in Article 3 of this Law” (Jácome, 2016).

Bearing in mind that the evaluation of work performance is a measurement tool that ensures an objective assessment and productivity establishes qualitatively and quantitatively what a person, group or organization in the performance of a job has achieved and provided the targeted objective, referring to the efficiency with which production occurs and its measurement is related to the proportions in which the resources used are transformed into new goods, in the various productive processes (Fidel, 2018). The evaluation of the Civil Registry public institution shows that employees feel affected by being evaluated, which is why it is necessary to know if they perform their work efficiently despite their performance evaluation scores since, based on reports, there have been some calls for attention for the failure to meet goals and various complaints from external users for the poor attention of public servants.

Therefore, this article aims to analyze the performance evaluation of public servants of DIREGIC ZONE 5, Guayas Province, Canton Milagro and its impact on their work productivity.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

The research design is descriptive and non-experimental with a correlational design.

The approach is quantitative since it attempts to analyze the results found in a group or segment (sample) to a larger collectivity (universe or population); it also seeks that the studies carried out can be replicated. In the end, quantitative studies seek to confirm and predict the phenomena investigated, looking for regularities and causal relationships between elements, which means that the main goal is formulating and demonstrating theories (Hernandez et al., 2014).

The type of probability sampling was used, the results collected were through physical questionnaires, and they were analyzed through SPSS statistical software to facilitate data analysis of the variables investigated; probability samples are essential in transactional research designs, both descriptive and correlational-causal (opinion polls or surveys, for example), where it is intended to make estimates of variables in the population. These variables are measured and analyzed with statistical tests in a sample, which is assumed to be probabilistic and that all population elements have an equal probability of being chosen (Hernandez et al., 2014).

For the development of this study, it analyzes the relationship between the two stated variables: performance evaluation and productivity, so correlational research is developed since it has an explanatory value, although partial, knowing that two concepts or variables are related provides some explanatory information (Hernandez et al., 2014).

At the inferential level, when carrying out the sampling in the General Directorate of Civil Registry, Identification and Identification Zone 5 with a universe of 1 public servant, a sample of 126 was taken from the results obtained from the performance evaluations and productivity indicators with a margin of error of 2% and a confidence level of 95%; it is a subset or part of the universe or population in which the research will be carried out (Lopez, 2004).

3. DEVELOPMENT

For decades, business leaders believed that simply focusing on performance management was the key to building a successful enterprise. If they just had the right vision and strategy, clear objectives, people with the skill sets to achieve those objectives, and alignment toward their goals throughout the organization, they would achieve high employee performance and financial success and live happily ever after (Rivera et al., 2018).

The widespread provision of public services as utilities in developed countries generally began in the late 19th century, often with the municipal development of gas and water services. Later, governments began to provide other services, such as electricity and health care. In most developed countries, local or national governments continue to
provide such services, the major exceptions being the US and the UK, where private provision is arguably proportionally more significant (Arredondo & Bautista, 2018).

However, in the late 1980s, company culture emerged as another core element and predictor of organizational performance and success and has since become one of the most talked about keys to building a successful organization in today’s zeitgeist. Numerous studies have shown the correlation between a great culture and high employee performance (Cornejo et al., 2019).

The general definition of the public sector includes government ownership or control rather than mere function the concept of governance is found to appear associated with the redistribution of public responsibilities and rights between government and civil society (Mendoza Yepez et al., 2021) and therefore includes, for example, the exercise of public authority or the implementation of public policies. When represented as concentric circles, the core public service in central and subnational government agencies defines the inner circle of the public sector. In this case, the distinction between the public sector and the private sector is relatively straightforward: it is obvious in terms of labor relations and the right to exercise public power. The next circle includes a number of different quasi-governmental agencies that, however, lie outside the direct line of responsibility within government. Examples range from social security funds to regional development agencies. Finally, the outer circle is populated by state-owned enterprises, generally defined by government ownership or majority shareholding. Beginning in the 1980s, several developed countries witnessed extensive privatizations of state-owned enterprises, either in parts or in whole (examples range from airlines to the telecommunications sector), although public ownership remains a pervasive feature, for example, in the field of local public transport (Alvarez, 2018).

For the public sector, it is essential to evaluate the performance of its servants constantly; since, in order to obtain a better result before society, they need to perform adequate and responsible management of their activities. Therefore, in general, all public servants wish to obtain good results from their performance and achieve all the goals and objectives proposed within their work (Cortés et al., 2018).

Introducing performance evaluation systems to public service organizations is one of the new management elements. However, monitoring and measurement are performed as expressions of classical, scientific management techniques, and others are hostile to what they see as the importation of production management techniques native to the private sector (Portuguez, 2018).

However, others see the production of performance measures as a means to exert greater control over public service bureaucracies. Therefore, an organization’s ability to assess and reward executive performance in the public sector is vitally important if performance management systems are realistically expected to promote the successful execution of an organization’s strategic goals and objectives. This paper provides a model that can be used to assess organizational performance in government organizations. The model allows executives to focus on what is essential to their organization and customers and links their performance appraisals not only to the organization’s objectives but to the importance of each objective; thus, it provides leaders with an open and explicit link between the performance attributes of individual and organizational objectives (Maquera, 2018).

Moreover, measuring employee performance is not easy; companies need to plan it well to execute it well. If a company wants to evaluate the performance levels of all employees in an organization, the owner needs proper planning with a performance manager. Based on that discussion, certain standards should be set and an ongoing employee evaluation should be conducted on various aspects (Piñeiro, 2016).

However, doing an employee performance appraisal is not enough; it must be followed up with mentoring and coaching sessions. Most organizations conduct workshops on this. The best practice for increasing employee input in a company is a reprimand followed by an encouragement policy. It should also be remembered that a worker’s performance depends on the relationship he or she shares with the company, so it is also essential for a company to motivate and coach an employee to get the best results (Cortés et al., 2018).
Effective performance management systems typically include three general elements: goal setting, performance review, and a performance improvement process. Employers may use many options in executing the performance management process, but an effective system will incorporate all three essential elements in some form (Delgado, 2019).

4. DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

According to the Technical Standard of the Performance Evaluation Subsystem, this allows to generate an evaluation; which aims to measure and stimulate the management of the entity, cover the internal processes and servers, through the approach of objectives, goals and quantitative and qualitative indicators, based on organizational culture; based on the observation and subsequent expected results, as well as a performance standard in terms of the performance of the public servant, which allows the development of the company; maintaining its quality and improving its productivity. In this way, it will continue to function to meet the requirements of the citizens (Organic Law of Public Service, 2018).

For Gutiérrez et al. (2018), the expected results of this evaluation are given through the analysis of the following perspectives or measurement variables: the Institutional perspective, external user perspective, internal processes perspective, and human talent perspective.

Likewise, Garcés & Matellán (2016) state that applying this standard is of utmost importance to improve the quality of service the state offers through its multiple institutions. For this, the authors emphasize that the evaluation scales play an essential role in applying the standard. Therefore, they describe it as follows:

Table 1. Evaluation scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCALE</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>Excellent The maximum score reflects that the server has exceeded the proposed objectives and goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>Very good Defines the public servant’s performance as meeting the proposed objectives and goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>Satisfactory Establishes that the server maintains a minimum acceptable level of productivity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td>Regular In this case, the evaluated obtained results below the minimum acceptable productivity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e)</td>
<td>Insufficient The person evaluated does not meet the needs of the position.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Garcés & Matellán (2016).

These authors agree that this evaluation application makes it possible to know the performance of public servants in greater depth so as not to affect the institutional image of state enterprises that offer services and products to the public. In addition, they point out that, with this procedure, they can fulfill their general objective in developing their activities, which is to increase productivity. This increase is an important objective for these institutions since the more productive their workforce is, the closer they are to achieving institutional excellence and efficiency.

Figure 1. Comparison between Productivity and Performance Appraisal
As can be seen in the results obtained for the productivity variable, the province with the highest score is the Galapagos with 88.58, followed by Milagro and the province of Santa Elena with values of 88.62 and 88.06, respectively; below these is the province of Los Ríos, with a score of 85.67 for the variable under study.

Similarly, the figure shows the results obtained for the Performance Evaluation variable, with the province of Los Ríos standing out with values that reach 94.37, followed by the city of Milagro with results corresponding to 93.55, followed by the province of Santa Elena with a determined value of 93.40, and ending with the province of the Galapagos, where the lowest result is 92.18.

The scores of the Galapagos and Los Rios agencies could be considered ironic, considering that the latter has higher performance evaluation levels than the rest of the agencies, but its productivity levels in the comparative are lower. On the contrary, the island agency has high evaluations but lower than the agencies in the area, but its productivity level is the highest among the agencies.

It is important to consider variables that otherwise influence this observation; for example, when considering the number of procedures carried out in the various study areas, it is important to understand the increase in failures or claims that affect the scores of the study performed.

Table 2. Evaluation by Job Levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PERFORMANCE</th>
<th>PRODUCTIVITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SUPPORT</td>
<td>95.04</td>
<td>87.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VALUE</td>
<td>93.21</td>
<td>87.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGGREGATORS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>93.92</td>
<td>87.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Own elaboration.

From another perspective, the study variables are analyzed by focusing on the job positions; for this purpose, the operational positions were classified into two levels for analysis; all positions that perform activities whose responsibility is marked in the value chain were considered within the level of value aggregators. On the other hand, the support levels include positions supporting value-adding processes. The support levels show an average of 95.04 in performance evaluation and 87.48 in productivity.
On the other hand, positions with value-adding levels average 93.21 in their performance evaluation, while their productivity shows an average of 87.60. This shows that the averages of the support levels are slightly higher than those of the value-adding positions; however, the productivity levels measured are very similar between the two.

**Table 3. Performance Evaluation/Productivity Correlation.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRODUCTIVITY LEVELS</th>
<th>Pearson correlation</th>
<th>Sig. (bilateral)</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.429**</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Own elaboration.

A moderate positive correlation was found (0.429 p < 0.001), indicating a significant linear relationship between the two variables. This leads to considering that high levels of staff performance tend to increase employees’ productivity.

**Table 4. Regression Coefficients**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Error</th>
<th>Standardized Beta</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>34.355</td>
<td>9.632</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.567</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT</td>
<td>0.555</td>
<td>0.102</td>
<td>0.429</td>
<td>5.413</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Own elaboration.

Simple linear regression was calculated to predict the productivity of workers based on their results obtained in performance evaluations. A significant regression equation was found (F (1,130) = 29.298, p < .001), with an R-squared of 0.184. The prediction of the productivity of individuals is equal to 34.35 + 0.555 (Performance evaluation); in other words, when the average weighting goes up one point, the productivity reflects an increase of 0.555 points in its weighting.

**5. CONCLUSION**

The study corroborated the assertions made by previous authors that the competencies, experiences and knowledge developed in the workplace and measured by performance are positively related to productivity measured in working hours.

In the specific case of the General Directorate of Civil Registry, Identification and Identification in Zone 5, comprising the agencies of Los Ríos, Milagro, Galapagos and Santa Elena, there is evidence of excellent performance levels which, evaluated over an annual period, are related to moderate growth in productivity levels, the latter considered very well.

The behavior of the variables related to the study is the same in each of the different agencies, which makes clear the high level of normalization and standardization applied by the centralizing authority of this public institution, considering the requirements for compliance with performance and productivity standards by state control entities.
It can be certified that the Los Rios agency has the most competent staff among the agencies in the area. However, the Galapagos agency reports the best productivity levels, demonstrating a more efficient application of resources and reporting fewer inconveniences without considering the amount of paperwork each can process.
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