

An investigation of the relationship between motivational factors and performance of education staff

Akbar Jesarati^{1*}, Hossein Babazadeh², Saeed Zanjani³, Asgar Jesarati⁴, Hashem Azizi⁵, Amir Rezapur⁶ and Javad Hashemi⁷

¹*Young Researchers and Elite Club, Tabriz Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tabriz, Iran*

²*Department of Educational Administration, Tabriz Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tabriz, Iran*

³*Department of Industrial Management, Tabriz Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tabriz, Iran*

⁴*Department of Geography, University of Mohaghegh Ardabili, Ardabil, Iran*

⁵*Department of Chemistry, University of Tabriz, Tabriz, Iran*

⁶*Department of Literature, Ardabil Branch, Islamic Azad University, Ardabil, Iran*

⁷*Department of Psychology, University of Mohaghegh Ardabili, Ardabil, Iran*

ABSTRACT

This study examined the relationship between motivational factors and the performance of education staff in Miyandoab. The study population was all employees of the education department in Miyandoab in 2012-13 including 90 people and farmers which according to Morgan table 74 employees of the society were selected. Simple random sampling was used to select the sample. The study was descriptive- correlation. The research instrument was a questionnaire that included five components derived from the theoretical and empirical literature and comparative studies set on the Likert scale. Reliability of the questionnaire was calculated 0/83 using Cronbach's alpha. The findings showed a significant direct relationship between moderate elements of authority, participation and decision-making systems, salary system and employee performance and a weak significant relationship between job satisfaction and performance evaluation of staff education in Miyandoab. Generally, motivational factors predict employees' performance by 59 percent.

Keywords: Motivation, Motivational Factors, Performance, Education

INTRODUCTION

Progress and improvement in the quantity and quality of education in any country depends on the educational system. Development in its general sense has widespread meanings and can be viewed from different angles and perspectives. Significant changes, such as increasing global competition, the impact of information technology, restructuring, business process, as well as areas of service influence the world of work [1].

Modern organizations need to constantly change, change to adapt with internal circumstances, compliance with internal organization dynamics and establishing a kind of a balance between internal and external changes is essential. In order for an organization to achieve its goals, employees must bring their performance to reach the level of effectiveness, this issue in governmental organizations where the poor performance of agencies can be interpreted as a failure of public services [2]. As well as private companies in which poor performance can mean bankruptcy, the same is true. From a social perspective, organizations are looking for employees who perform well in their jobs so squeezed. Good performance increases organizational productivity, this in turn enhances the functioning of

government and the economy [3][7]. Many scholars, including "Sitzerz" and "Porter" have studied this issue. According to them, organization performance is the result of the interaction between three "physical, Financial and human resources [21]. Physical and financial resources do not result in production, but this will happen when the human element takes action, therefore, understanding of human behavior and its positive impact can improve and increase the efficiency. However, since the performance depends also on other factors. It is imperative to understand the factors. Room also believes that (the performance is a function of ability and motivation) $P = F(M, A)$ accordingly, a person who has the ability to perform an activity, but would not do it, will not result in optimal performance and if someone wants to do something but is not able to do that no action will take [20]. "Motivation factors are undeniable necessities to succeed in a sport. These factors (motivation) improve internal delight to achieve the predetermined goal, directs behavior and force him to multiple his effort, therefore we can say that motivation factors lead the athletes internally to reach the goal (i.e. success in various fields" [4].

Theoretical foundations

Motivation is those psychological processes that motivate, guide and sustain self- practice actions to in Accordance to the objective [23].

Organizational goals and individual needs to motivate people. First assumption in motivation topics is this human behavior is intentional means that the movement, thinking, work and creation in humans, is in direction to achieve certain goals, but why study and knowledge about determining the motives in humans is important. All studies on impulse responses are efforts to achieve responses about the reason of human behavior why some try more than others? However answer to these questions seem to be easy but analysis and ponder of individuals' behavior roots are very complicated and meanwhile separated and disunities, understanding motivation to determine to the humans' behavior Causes, Are Very Valuable [6][12]. Herzberg, after extensive research, provides motivation theory. He stated motivation factors are of two categories, the first category is extrinsic motivation factors or hygiene factors which are rooted in working background. These are factors which link individuals to the organization and keep them in the organization. In this group factors such as policy, management, interpersonal relations, salary, status, and job security are discussed. If in a working environment a high level and quality of these factors exist, as a result there would not be dissatisfaction. In contrast, intrinsic motivation factors included success, appreciation, competition, achievement, responsibility, growth in the capabilities and professional growth [11].

The research Timmreck conducted in 2003, the subjects considered factors such as sense of achievement, recognition of responsibility and promotion of important motivational factors and factors such as guilt and the threat of negative factors [26]. Robbins & Judge in an investigation of employees' motivational factors, such as positive support, interpersonal relationships, increasing personal motivation has been mentioned in the main report [23] [24]. Amiable in his research report decision-making ability, competence, participation in works and curiosity, as intrinsic motivation factors and climate of competition, evaluation and force work as extrinsic motivation [2]. In 2002, a study was conducted to investigate the motivational factors which based on motivational factors, such as proper law, the possibility of growth and employees development, job security, interesting work, appreciation, interpersonal problems empathy, participation in the work are important motivational factors[23]. Jameson in a study conducted in 2000 referred to factors such as feasibility of education, giving respect, being responsible, acknowledgement and equal reward as motivational factors [9]. Dindarhor (2009) investigated the relationship between job motivation and managers' performance and using job motivation and job performance questionnaires collected data. Some of the findings include: There is a relationship between motivation and performance, there is a relationship between variety of work and performance, there is a relationship between identity and managers' performance, and there is no significant relationship between the importances's of working with managers' performance. Habibi (2012) examines the relationship between job motivation and job performance of managers. The purpose of this paper is to identify and compare the motivation of managers on their performance and provide necessary guidance in establishing motivation in managers, the user criteria in choosing managers for management posts. The results showed that there is no significant relationship at 5% level between job motivation and performance management (the three motivational dimensions) but there is a relationship between job motivation of individual characteristics dimension and also significant relationship between job motivation regarding nature of the job and Performance [10]. Mohammadi in his study in 2012 examined the relationship between Herzberg's motivational factors and the performance of school principals. His findings show that "there is a relationship between appreciation as a motivating factor and practice of school teachers," which shows a significant and positive correlation. Results showed a significant positive correlation between at the level of $000/0 = \text{sig}$ and $n = 340$ and $r = 0/275$ between the nature of work and school teachers performance. Also there is a positive correlation between growth and personal development. His independent test results also show that there is no significant difference between teachers' sex and average performance of women is 87/66 average performance of men is 42/63. Results indicated a significant relationship between teacher performance and their service year. Results show that there is a significant relationship

between teacher performance and age. Results show that there is a significant relationship between motivation of men and women [17].

Goethals & Darley (1977) believes that people will be satisfied when they believe that their working conditions are comparable to others in similar circumstances[8] " Cecil G. Miskel, ", " Wayne Hoy" in a study on teachers in secondary schools and higher education, related workforce motivation to job satisfaction and perceived job performance. The results showed that the motive force in both groups was significantly related to job satisfaction and perceived performance [27] [5]. "Nancy K. Stein " in the research entitled "Motivating employees without overtime or promotion says in the Past , managers used two tools essential for motivating employees " exaltation "and" increased salary " Despite hard hierarchy and spending a lot money were widely used in many companies [21]. Complicating jobs and the need to adapt to rapid change, managers must find creative and inexpensive ways for keeping employees with high motivation and high creativity. In a study, conducted in Silicon Company, he and his colleagues came to the conclusion that giving freedom to employees, delegating authority to select partners and forming teams, and project units and teamwork can be useful in increasing individuals' incentive to work[19] [11]. Bartal's Research, show individuals with high internal locus of control are more likely to make reasonable .changes in their dreams. They show more balanced behavior and intermediate range of behaviors in comparison with going to extremes and have greater confidence in their own abilities in other words, when people accept responsibility for their own success, their performance reaches the highest level and they realize with effort and persistence they can overcome failure [16] [3]. Research carried out by "Francis MT, "and" Sergiovanni TJ," on educational status indicates widest professional deficient, is satisfying the dignity needs, autonomy, and self-discovery [25]. Mayo & White's Research, showed that the money, and improving financial status, as it was thought have not been effective in incentives to work, but the opinions of colleagues, ease of job, long-term career as a strong motive are effective in achieving an institution's goals [27].

The purpose of the research

The relationship between motivational factors and the performance of education staff in Miyandoab in 2012-2013

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Data collection: is descriptive - correlation. The study is practical regarding purpose. Time territory: a cross-sectional, in school year 2012-13 and the spatial domain: Miyandoab city's Department of Education. The population studied in this research, were any employee working in Education office during the year 2012 of, including 90 people.

Sampling method based on Morgan and Krejcie table was 74 out of 90 people using simple random sampling (lottery method). Data collection tools included researcher's questionnaire. In an extensive study of the theoretical background of the questionnaire consists of five components (delegation, participation in decision-making systems, salary, and appraisal and job satisfaction) preparation and organization after machine coding of the questionnaire in contained information manner was analyzed using SPSS software program. Questionnaire 's questions were distributed among a small sample of 30 subjects staff Based on a five-point Likert scale for the pilot study. To check the validity of the questionnaire opinions of experts, psychologists and education specialists were used. And after necessary modifications, they proved the validity of the questionnaire before data collection. The reliability of the questionnaire was calculated using Cronbach's alpha which is 83/0.

RESULTS

Table1: the distribution of employee performance score

Variable	NO	Average	SD	Deviation Coefficient	Minimum	Maximum	Range
Performance Score	74	90/79	3/05	-0/21	85	97	12

The distribution of employee motivation factors and its components

According to Table 2 the mean score of employees' delegation was 15/58 with a standard deviation of 2/3 and skewness of 0/ 6. As minimum score of delegates was 11 and the maximum was 24. In fact delegation of employees somewhat was more than moderate and was 62%. Average score for involvement and decision making is 15/78 with a standard deviation of 2/73 and the slope coefficient is -29/0. As minimum score was 8 and maximum were 24. In fact employee's participation and decision making were more than average somewhat and 63%. Job satisfaction average score of sample under study was 25/21 with a standard deviation of 3/64 and the skewness of -73/0. As minimum average score of Job satisfaction was 13 and maximum average was 32. The job satisfaction of employees

is somewhat more likely than average and 63%. Average score of payroll system and employees' salary was 20/7 with a standard deviation of 3/54 and the slope coefficient of -1/003. As minimum average payroll system of employees was 8 and the maximum was 29. Actually the employee payroll system is slightly higher than average and 59%. Average score for personnel evaluation system, was 14/22, with a standard deviation of 3/31 and the skewness of -58/0. As minimum average score of personnel evaluation system was 5 and the maximum was 21. Actually the employee evaluation system is little more than an average of 57%. And motivational factors of employees' total average score was 91/51 with a standard deviation of 11/94 and the slope coefficient of -64/0. As minimum average score of motivational factors of employees was 56 and the maximum was 116. The motivational factors of employees are somewhat more likely than average and 61%.

Table 2: The distribution of employee motivational factors and its components

Variable	NO	Average	SD	Deviation Coefficient	Minimum	Maximum	Range	Percent
Delegation	74	15/58	2/3	0/6	11	24	13	62
Decision Making and Participation	74	15/78	2/73	-0/29	8	24	16	63
Job Satisfaction	74	25/21	3/64	-0/73	13	32	19	63
Payroll System	74	20/7	3/54	-0/1	8	29	21	59
Evaluation System	74	14/22	3/31	-0/58	5	21	16	57
Respondents' Motivational Factors	74	91/51	11/94	-0/64	56	116	60	61

To what extent do components of motivational factors predict employees' performance?

In order to explain the performance of motivational factors component, Enter Multiple regression was used and finally, according to data from Table (3) we can observe that the overall multiple correlation coefficient components of evaluation system effects, authority, job satisfaction, payroll and personnel decisions and collaboration with the $R = -0/95$, and the determination coefficient of $R^2 = -0/91$, net coefficient of determination $R^2 = 90 /$, in sum components of motivational factors explain 90 percent of employees' performance and 10 percent of employees' performance variance could be explained by factors outside the subject of this study.

Table 3: multiple correlation for predicting the performance of employees

Form	Multiple Correlation Coefficient	Explanation Coefficient	Net Explanation Coefficient	Standard Criteria Error
	0/95	0/91	0/90	0/92

The figure also explained in accordance with Table (4) ANOVA was linear. Since the F-test to determine significant variables affecting employee performance equal to 144/66 with a significance level of $p=0/000$ and smaller than 0/05 the way of the relationship between variables is one-sided.

Table 4: Analysis of variance for testing the significance of regression

Form	Total Square	Range of Freedom	Mean Square	F	P
s	623/65	5	124/67	144/66	0/000
Remaining	58/6	68	0/86		
Total	681/95	73			

Overall, the data in Table (5) and the standardized beta coefficients it is considered constant (α) = 70/54, delegation with β of 0/11, and with β of - 83/0, job satisfaction with β 81/0 =, salary system with β of - 08/and evaluation system with β of 07/0, which can have a significant role in determining the performance of employees.

Finally, by eliminating the constant alpha (α) through standardizing the explanatory variable, it is considered that delegation with beta(β) of 086/0, decision making and participation with beta(β) of - 074/0, job satisfaction with beta(β) of 969/0, salary system with beta(β) of -098/0 and evaluation system with beta(β) of 0/08, may have an important role in predicting employee performance.

Table 5: the coefficients of the remaining variables in the stepwise regression analysis

The order of entry of independent variables	Raw Coefficient		Standardized Coefficient Beta	T	Sig.
	B	Std. Error			
F	70/54	0/87		80/22	0/000
Delegation	0/11	0/06	0/086	1/75	0/08
Decision Making And Participation	-0/08	0/05	-0/074	-1/46	0/14
Job Satisfaction	0/81	0/04	0/969	19/47	0/000
Payroll System and Salary	-0/08	0/04	-0/098	-1/96	0/05
Evaluation System	0/07	0/04	0/08	1/75	0/08

Linear Equation: Staff Performance = (delegation) 0/086 - (Participation and decision making) 0/074+ (job satisfaction) 0/969 - (payroll system) 0/098 + (The evaluation) 0/08

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Results of statistical analysis of research hypotheses showed: according to Pearson test performed, the significance level of the test $p=000/0$ was smaller than $05/0$ and the $r=58/0$. The research hypothesis is therefore confirmed that there is a significant direct relationship between two variables of delegation and employees' performance. And employees' delegation predicts their performance of 34 percent.

The research hypothesis is therefore confirmed that there is a relationship between partnership and decision making variables with employee's performance. Results showed that according to Pearson test, the significance level of the test $p=000/0$ is smaller than $05/0$ and $r=95/0$. And decision-making and employee's participation predicts their performance rate of 29 percent. Results showed that according to Pearson test, the significance level of the test $p=000/0$ is smaller than $05/0$ and $r=95/0$. The research hypothesis is therefore confirmed that there is a little relationship between job satisfaction and employee's participation which predicts their performance of 2 percent.

According to Pearson test the level of significance was $p=000/0$ which was smaller than $05/0$ and the $r=46/0$. The research hypothesis is therefore confirmed that there is a significant relationship between payroll and employee's participation which predicts their performance of 22 percent. According to Pearson test the level of significance was test $p=000/10$ which was smaller than $05/0$ and the $r=36/0$. The research hypothesis is therefore confirmed that there is a little significant relationship between evaluation system and employee's participation which predicts their performance of 13 percent.

According to Pearson test the level of significance $p=000/0$ was smaller than $05/0$ and the $r=76/0$. The research hypothesis is therefore confirmed that there is a significant relationship between motivational factors and employee's participation which predicts their performance of 59 percent.

Results showed that the most important motivational factors from the view point of employees are delegating and the least important job satisfaction. The second most important motivational factor from the view point of employees is participation and decision-making and the third most important motivational factor is payroll and evaluation system is the fourth major motivational factor.

According to the results of the original hypothesis that there is a relationship between motivation and job performance results of the five components of the hypothesis are in aligning with Herzberg's research, Dindarhor (2009), Mohammadi. 2012. Cecil Miskel, Wayne K Hoy (2012), and Nancy K. Austin (Humphrey and Halls, 1997), Francis M. Trusty and Thomas Francis Sergiovanni (Sergiovanni, 2001) and are not in aligning with the results of Habibi . 2012. Research conducted by Francis M. Trusty and Thomas Francis Sergiovanni (Sergiovanni, 2012) in instructional status shows that the largest professional deficit is satisfying dignity requirements, autonomy, and self-discovery and indeed decision making. So one of the variables that can enhance employee's motivation in job performance is the ability to make accurate and timely decisions that the more predetermined, rational and conscious the decision is, the better the individual job performance will be.

The results of Dindarhor (2009) showed that there is a relationship between job motivation and performance. Habibi (2012) in a study found no significant relationship at 5% level between job motivation and performance managers' (the three dimensions of motivation).

Findings of Mohammadi (2012) shows that there is a relationship between appreciation as a motivational factor and practice of school teachers, "which shows a significant positive correlation. Wayne K Hoy & Cecil Miskel, (1995), in their study found that motivating force is significantly related to job satisfaction and performance. In fact, if employees have job satisfaction and satisfaction with salary and wages they show better job performance. Nancy K.

and Stein (Hall & Hall, 1990) in their study came to the conclusion that giving freedom to employees, partners and delegating authority for selection of colleagues, team formations, project units and team work can increase job motivation and therefore improving job performance. In fact if in an organization employees were given Delegation and the right to decide they can to do their duty having cooperation with each other, their motivation has been crystallized and are more successful in their career services. Research in educational institutions based on Moody and Richard's expectation theory showed that school principals with high expectation in comparison with principals who have less expectation are more active in regional decisions and have better performance than other principals. Also, Maslow[18], McGregor, McClelland[20], Herzberg and Alderfer[13] [14] believe that organizations typically spend more time on meeting lower needs more meet than the meeting needs of high level stress, such as greater emphasis on the rights and monthly reward and income satisfaction. In fact, organization's employees first focus on external issues such as the level of monthly salary, and in case of having satisfaction with these components they consider internal factors such authority, have the right to make decisions [20].Bartal Research (1993) shows that when people accept responsibility for their own success, they performance reaches peak and they realize that they can overcome failure with effort and persistence. With attention to the results obtained in this research and theories and research results we can conclude that if employees were given Delegation and the right to decide from, managers and direct and indirect chiefs they can perform better. Also, if employees are satisfied with job, salary and wages they will have higher job performance. Thus, given the components of interest and motivation used and considered among employees, we can observe increase in their Performance; therefore if people in charge of organizations especially educational officials can endeavor to develop components of motivation among their employees we can observe improvement and success in their job Performance.

REFERENCES

- [1] Azizzadeh. FM, Alizadeh. S, Harandi. T, *J of Medical Education and Development Center*, **2012**, 2, 2.
- [2] Amiable. Tm, Hill Kg, Hennessey; the Work Preference Inventory: Assessing Intrinsic And Extrinsic Motivational Orientations. *J Peers Psycho*, **1994**, 67-95
- [3] Bartal. N; Research Can Be Fascinating, Especially When It Is Yours, *Oncology Nursing*,: (Hebrew).**1993**, 18–21.
- [4] Barghi. MJ, Salehian. MH, Hashem. AR, Ruhani. DN, *Euro J of Experimental Biology*, **2012**, 2 (3):769-773.
- [5] Cecil. G. Miskel, Wayne K. Hoy; *Educ Admin, Theory, Research, and Practice, Humanities & Social Sciences*; 9nd edition, **2012**.
- [6] Dunbar. SB, *J of Allied Health Sciences and Practice*, **2003**, 1, 1 .
- [7] Dindarhor. D, MS Thesis, Islamic Azad University (Tabriz branch, Iran, **2009**).
- [8] Goethals. GR, Darley. J; *Social Comparison Theory*, Washington DC: Hemisphere, **1977**, 86-109.
- [9] Jameson. C; *Helping People Change, Part 2: The Magic Of Motivation*, Dent Today, **2000**, 78-81.
- [10] Habibi. A, MS Thesis, Zanzan University (Zanzan, Iran, **2012**).
- [11] Hosseinian. MZ, *J Medical Sciences*, **2012** , 8 , 4 .
- [12] Hashemian. S, Yaghoubi. H, Rengasamy. SH, Valiolah. SH, Imanipour. V, Armandnia. M, *European Journal of Experimental Biology*, **2012**, 2 (6): 2419-2429.
- [13] Halls. E, Humphrey. WS; *Improving Productivity and Benefits* , Translated by and Horidokht and Khalili Scherwini. 1997, Tehran: Firoze Publication, **1997**, 54-52.
- [14] Humphrey. WS; *Managing technical people : innovation, teamwork, and the software process*, Addison Wesley Longman, Inc. **1997**.
- [15] Hall. ET, Hall. MR; *Understanding Cultural Differences*, Yarmouth, ME, Intercultural Press , **1990**.
- [16] Kioumarsi. F, *European Journal of Experimental Biology*, **2012**, 2 (5): 1892-1896.
- [17] Mohammadi .P , MS Thesis, Tabriz University (Tabriz, Iran, **2012**).
- [18] Maslow. A; *Motivation And Personality*, Harper & Brothers . New York: **1954**.
- [19] Nasiri. M, Mahmoodifar. E, Aghdam. L, Zamani. M, Moeini. S, *Euro J of Experimental Biology*, **2012**, 2 (4): 1098-1102.
- [20] Raeisi. M, Hadadi. N, Faraji. R, Salehian. MH, *Euro Jour of Experimental Biology*, **2012**, 2 (4): 1231-1234.
- [21] Siterz. M, Lover. M; *Motivation and job behavior*, Education and Public Administration Unit, **1993** ,6-3.
- [22] Robbins. SP, Judge. M, Scott. J, Porter. R; *Employee Motivation, New Perspective Of The Age-Old Challenge Of Work Motivation*. *Nursing Forum*,31 ,**1996**, 29-36.
- [23] Robbins. SP, David. A, Robert W, *Supervision Today*, Prentice Hall; 7nd Edition , **2012**.
- [24] Robbins. SP, Judge. TA, *Essentials Of Organizational Behavior* , Publisher: Prentice Hall; 11 edition, **2011**.
- [25] Sergiovanni. J, *the principal ship: creative leadership for effective school*. San Francisco , Jossy Bass, **2001**.
- [26] Timmreck. T, *Planning: Program Development And Evaluation*, 2nd Edition, Canada, Jones And Bartlett Publishers, **2003**.
- [27] Wayne. K.H, Cecil .G. Miskel, *Educational Administration: Theory, Research, And Practice*, Mcgraw-Hill College; 5 Sub Edition, **1995**.