INVESTIGATING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN MOTIVATIONAL POTENTIAL SCORE WITH JOB INVOLVEMENT IN PRIVATE AND PUBLIC BANKS OF PARS ABAD MOGHAN CITY

"ROBABEH SEYFI, "RAMIN MOUSAVI MOHAMMAD REZALOU

Abstract: The current study aimed to investigate and study the relationship between the Motivational Potential score and Job involvement in banks of Pars Abad. The sample size of the study obtained via applying Cochran sampling formula which involved 155 participants. To analyze the study's hypothesis, Pearson's correlation coefficient, T-Test, and correlation of two independent societies were used. Results of data analysis indicated that there was a significant relationship between motivational potential score and job involvement among staffs. There is no significant difference among public and private banks in dimensions of jobs' motivational potential score and job's involvement, and also in comparative study of variables of public and private banks there is no significant difference.
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1 Introduction

Banks as one of the country's large organizations formed in order to serve community, play key role in development of the country, and this factor causes managers and staffs as a skilled and expert manpower in this section, be a key element which requires attention and research (Mousavi Mohammad Rezalou, 2015). Banks as a main economic resources play vital role in development and economic growth of a country, because they act as a provider of liquidity in services and manufacturer of information (Sofian & Habiballah, 2010), and play key role in the fostering of economic and social conditions of a country. Due to this issue that banks staff organize economic system, and play their role at public and private sectors as an economic core with mobilizing household savings; however the current study investigates the relationship between motivational potential score with Job involvement among staffs, and whether there is a relationship between jobs motivational potential score with job involvement? Why someone in the company with owning the same possibilities and benefits are active and motivated, but in the other hand why someone else with many problems are persistent? In which condition staffs use their maximum capacity to do their responsibility? Answering to such questions will be accessible by recognizing what factors motivate staffs. Consequently, with regarding the importance of subject in this domain, this study was conducted with the aim of recognizing effective factors on motivational potential score and job involvement among Pars Abad's private and public banks staff, in which on the basis of obtained results we steps towards suitable planning and increasing job motivation and staff's capability and also to achieve organizational goals. Job involvement recognized as one of the effective tools to increase staff's efficiency with increasing their participation and obligation. Organizations are facing with intense competitive pressure, to survive and develop in the changing and unstable business world. Therefore, organizations require energetic, active staffs which completely are involved in their jobs. Because, quality of human resources is vital for organization's success especially in unstable working conditions. Business partnership has a positive effect on staffs' individual and organizational performances (Lu et al, 2014). Also job's motivation has been one of important effective factors in success or mistrust of system, and if we neglect it will waste organization's resources. Result of a study indicated that 20% effort and 80% motivation reported as a success factor in organizations, and nowadays managers' great challenge is facing with staffs which have low motivation and low responsibility (Bahadori et al, 2014). Recognizing causes and consequences of job involvement for managers of organization is important. Job involvement has a positive effect on indicators of job's performance such as efficiency (Emery & Barker, 2007), job performance (Rottenberry & Moberg, 2007; Chughtai, 2008), job satisfaction (Zupatis, et al., 2014; Linz, 2010), desertion (Zupatis, et al., 2014; Wickramasinghe & Wickramasinghe, 2010; Lambert, 2010; Nancy & Kely, 2011), participation in decision-making (Siegel & Ruh, 1972; Ruh & Wood, 1975; Hollon & Gemmill, 1976), and organizational obligation (Zupatis, et al., 2014; Karin, 2010; Ting, 2011; Iqbal Khan, et al., 2012). From the according to Lodhali and kejnerjob involvement points to degree which persons psychologically identify themselves with their current job (Tastan & Turkier, 2014). Lubakaya (2012) defined job involvement as a motivation for doing activity, and he knows very appropriate those individual and organizational objectives which causes motivation among staffs to reach production and creating positive business results. Job involvement is fulfillment of individuals cognitive needs, which helps him/her at harder work and his/her performance speed. In fact a higher degree of job involvement among participants of an organization in order to increase organizational effectiveness is necessary. Of the factors that create job involvement we can point to the job's characteristics, education, motivation, and staffs personality (Seyfi, 2015).

The main point in management of motivation is that we recognize that staffs are motivated with such tools, which they believe it's substantiation, and this substantiation can create motivation among staffs not by a managers promises but by required three conditions of motivation, such as self-confidence, confidence, and satisfaction via creating such an environment which those three conditions be reinforced. Motivational factors are divided into two categories: internal factors and external factors. In order to which mangers motivate their staffs, at first they must recognize factors of their staffs dissatisfaction, and then in accordance with status of staffs, they select appropriate motivational factors (Naily, 2013). According to the model, motivation and job's satisfaction and job's characteristics such as skill variety, careers, importance of work, independence, and works feedback according to the job and work are related with one another (Oldham & Hakman, 2010). Above mentioned five central dimensions for creating a stock unit as a motivational potential score for a job can be combined (Yavarbhum & kulpian, 2011). According to Malek (2010) motivation can improve performance of staffs, and motivation of staffs is away to return towards organization's development. According to David Man (1989) effective motivation causes increasing in output and decreasing in costs, and as a result profit increases (Navaz & Yasin, 2014). Therefore, in an overview we can claim that: Job's motivational potential score can be created when staffs feel job security and stability, partnership, effective role in organization and also there be a sense of freshness and vitality. Having job motivation in the direction of healthy motives is one of necessities in correct application of human resources.

Hackmamand Oldham (1974, 1975) has been prescribed a method by detecting opportunities for calculating the overall rating based on the measured characteristics of an individual's career, Motivational Potential score (MPS). MPS expression reflects the potential motivation of a job. Five variables of the main model can be seen as a work-related dependent variable (Skill variety, nature of work, importance of working) or related to management of the work (independence, feedback). Theoretical model forms a cross connection between the main components, in computing the overall motivational scores, average of work-related main variable was computed and then multiplied by the independence and then multiplied by the feedback scores (Figure.1). This relationship means that when each of the components is low has a remarkable effect on MPS scores,
therefore only maximum results can be achieved in which all the characteristics are maximum.

$$MPS= \text{(Skill variety+ Task Identity+ Task Significance)} \times \text{Feedback} \times \text{Autonomy}$$

(1)

Figure 1. Job Characteristics Model (Hackman & Oldham, 1974)

2 Research Methodology

The current study is an applied research. Statistical society of this study includes Pars Abad’s private and public banks staffs which their population is 260 participants. As regards, society consists of two private and public classes, Stratified random sampling method with applying Cochran formula conducted, and 155 participants was selected as samples for doing the study. In the current study for investigating motivational potential score Linda and Ann scale (199) was used. This scale consists of five dimensions in which it has 15 items, and different dimensions of the motivational potential score which has 3 questions about Skill variety, 3 questions about the Task Identity, 3 questions about feedback from supervisor, 3 questions about Task Significance, and 3 questions measure the independence, subjects in a four options scale from 1(completely incorrect) to 4(completely correct) answer to each of items in overall scale and each of its dimensions get a score, therefore in overall scale maximum score is 4 and minimum score is 1. As well Meggins on and Clutter buck job involvement questionnaire (2006) with20 questions was used.

2.1 Research Hypotheses

1. There is a significant relationship between Motivational Potential Score and staffs Job involvement among public banks.

2. There is a significant relationship between Motivational Potential Score and staffs Job involvement among private banks.

3. There is a significant difference between private and public banks from the Motivational Potential score dimension.

4. There is a significant difference between private and public banks from the Job involvement dimension.
5. In comparative investigation between Motivational Potential Score and Job involvement among private and public banks there is a significant difference.

3 Results

In the current research to find out that the variable distribution is normal, Kolmogorov-Smirnov test was used. Result of this test is presented at table. 1. The significance level greater than 0.05 represents the normal distribution of data. For all variables, because the level of significance is greater than 0.05, we can conclude that these variables are normal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Motivation Potential scores</td>
<td>1.062</td>
<td>0.326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Involvement</td>
<td>1.314</td>
<td>0.109</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The First Hypothesis:** There is a significant relationship between Motivational Potential Score and Staffs Job involvement among public banks.

Table 1: One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test

The Pearson correlation coefficient between motivational potential score and Job involvement among public staffs is 0.700. Because the significance level of correlation coefficient (0.000) is less than the error level 0.05, we can conclude that there is a significant relationship between motivational potential score and staffs job involvement among public banks. Also, due to the positive correlation coefficient, we can claim that there is a direct and significant relationship between motivational potential score and staffs job involvement among public banks. In other words, by increasing staffs motivation, job involvement also increases. Therefore, according to the previously mentioned materials and existence of a significant relationship between motivational potential score and staffs job involvement among public banks, with 95% confidence (because the significance level is less than 0.01, with 99% confidence) we can claim that the first hypothesis "There is a significant relationship between motivational Potential Score and Staffs Job involvement among Public Banks" is confirmed (Table 2.).

Also Motivational Potential Score has five dimensions, according to the significance level of motivational potential score, we can conclude that between dimensions of skill variety, Task identity, feedback from supervisor, Task Significance, and job's independence with job involvement among public banks there is a direct and significant relationship.

**The Second Hypothesis:** There is a significant relationship between Motivational Potential Score and Staffs Job involvement among Private Banks.

Table 3 - Test correlation coefficient of Dimension potential motivations job involving "private banks"

The Pearson correlation coefficient between motivational potential score and job involvement among public staffs is presented at table.2. The significance level greater than 0.05 represents the normal distribution of data. For all variables, because the level of significance is greater than 0.05, we can conclude that these variables are normal.
The Pearson correlation coefficient between motivational potential score and staffs job involvement in private banks is 0.381. According to the significance level of correlation coefficient (0.000) which is less than the error level 0.05, we can conclude that there is a significant relationship between motivational potential score and staffs job involvement in private banks. Also, due to the positive correlation coefficient, we can claim that there is a direct and significant relationship between these two variables. In other words, by increasing motivation, job involvement also increases. Therefore, according to the presented material and existence of a significant relationship between motivational potential score and staffs job involvement with 95% confidence (because the significance level is less than 0.05, with 99% confidence) we can claim that the second hypothesis "There is a significant relationship between Motivational Potential Score and Staffs Job involvement in Private Banks" is confirmed (Table. 3.). Also according to the significance level of motivational potential score we can conclude that between dimensions of Skill variety, Task identity, feedback from the supervisor, Task Significance and independence, and job involvement in private banks there is a direct and significant relationship.

The Third Hypothesis: There is a significant difference between private and public bank from the Motivational Potential score dimension.

Table 4-t-test results on the different dimension potential motivations state and private banks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean comparison test</th>
<th>Levene's Test for Equality of Variances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>tStd. Deviation</td>
<td>Mean Difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The test results about the hypothesis testing are presented at the above table. At the above table to reaching the correct answer, two testing carried out the first has been done about the equality of variance between groups and the second has been done about the comparison of potential scores mean. According to the obtained significance level for equality of variance testing which is 0.672 and is greater than 0.05, the equality of variance assumption is accepted. With 95% confidence can be said that the variance between public and private banks is equal. As a result, all numbers obtained is considered in the line corresponding to an equal variance. In comparing two samples mean it's possible that the difference between public and private bank will be random or maybe actually it exists. Achieved significant level for t-tests 0.089, and because this amount is greater than predetermined amount of 0.05, therefore the main null hypothesis is which there is no difference between public and private banks is not rejected. Amount of difference between studied groups is about 2.66, and with 99% confidence this difference can be random. Therefore between private and public banks from the motivational potential score there is no significant difference.

The Fourth Hypothesis: There is a significant difference between private and public banks from the Job involvement dimension.

Table 5. Results of t-test on the difference between private and public bank job involvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean comparison test</th>
<th>Levene's Test for Equality of Variances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>tStd. Deviation</td>
<td>Mean Difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>2.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>2.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The test results conducted on the hypothesis is presented in the above table. Two testing to reach the correct answer is conducted on the above table, the first is about the equality of variance and the second is conducted about mean comparison of job's involvement. According to the significance level for equality of variance which is 0.755 and greater than 0.05, this equality assumption is confirmed. With 95% confidence we can claim that variances of two groups of public and private banks are equal. As a result, all the obtained numbers considered in the corresponding level with equality of variance. In comparing two samples means it is possible difference between public and private banks be by random or maybe it really exists. Achieved significance level for t-test is 0.244, and because this amount is greater than predetermined amount of 0.05, therefore the main null hypothesis which there is no difference between public and private banks is not rejected. Amount of difference between studied groups is about 2.66, and with 99% confidence this difference can be random. There is no significant difference between private and public banks from the job involvement dimension.

The Fifth Hypothesis: In comparative investigation between Motivational Potential Score and Job involvement among private and public banks there is a significant difference.
To inferring whether correlations in two different communities have a significant difference or not, Fisher test was conducted. Correlation between motivational potential score and job involvement in order is 0.700 and 0.381. Also achieved significance level is 0.471659. Now we must investigate that is this correlation in both public and private banks are different? Test results in order to investigate the hypothesis and answer to the question are presented in the following table.

Information on the above table indicates which at significance level of 0.05 in the correlation between motivational potential score and job involvement among two groups of private and public banks there is no significant difference.

4 Conclusion

Low job's motivation can has a negative effect on organization's growing trend, with using motivating potential index we can compute the overall index of each job for creating motivation among staffs, and following that with using diagnosis investigating of job we can identify jobs which have low or high level of motivation, and finally to reach organizational growth, jobs which their MPS is low be determined and separated in order to redesigning and increasing of motivational ability. According to the results of the current study, there is a positive significant relationship between motivational potential score and job's involvement. Also there wasn’t any significant difference between private and public banks from the motivational potential score and job involvement dimensions.

5 Suggestions

As regards the research hypothesis which there is a significant relationship between motivational potential score and job involvement was confirmed, but suggestions presented in which banks managers by noticing this point that motivational potential dimensions(diversity, identity, importance, independence, and feedback), education because education can improve increasing of staffs job's involvement, decreasing updating of skills, increasing a sense of belonging, benefitting from welfare, maximizing commitment to the organization, creating organizational competition, and there is a positive relationship between educational programs and staffs job's participation; creating motivation among staffs for increasing participation in activities especially participation in decision-making which creates a kind of obligation among decision-makers which support taken decisions, and noticing to the personality style of staffs can increase participation or job involvement of staffs. Also with sharing of staffs in organization's success (need for sociability, need for success, and hope for power), c. Hosing a formidable staffs (feedback from supervisor, Task Identity, Task Significance), accurate assessment of activities and performances, noticing to the organizational structure and job (independence) and promoting staffs knowledge (skills diversity), have a conviction to a management of motivation as an inevitable rule.
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Table 6: compares the Fisher test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Result</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>Z</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>communities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The difference is not acceptable</td>
<td>0.471659</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.700</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>State bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.381</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>private bank</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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