INTRODUCTION

Today's human being is living in an organized world. Organization is a phenomenon as an instrument for operating different social goals and human sources is considered as the soul and heart of organized world. Therefore the accuracy of organizations goal depends on the knowledge of human's sources [1]. Looking at management eras shows that management has been considered as a power instrument from hunting, agriculture, industrial, and hyper-industrial era considering the chronological order and today as wisdom era means knowledge.

Today having human skills and the knowledge of behavior management and human relationships in organizations are the necessary part of managing an organization. Investigator's findings indicates that although professional and conceptual skills are necessary for guiding the organizations, but having human skills are main basis for guiding and leading the existing organizations. In the other world although having instruments and technology and etc. are necessary parts of effective management, and essential for these days organizations. In addition, managers need to get new skills [2].

a) Technical: The ability of applying the knowledge, methods, ways and technology that are necessary for performing special tasks and it is earned by experiences, education and learning

b) Conceptual: (comprehensive): comprehension, knowing the delicacies, understanding the complexities and understanding the quality of compatibility of one special unit's operations and the whole organization, in the other word conceptual skill makes familiar the managers with universality, meditation and flexibility. It creates this attitude in managers to adjust their own organization unit with the total plans and needs of the organization.

c) Human skills: Ability to work with the people, by the people, for people and for God's satisfaction.

The logical combination of these three skills in comparison to the individual in his place in the organization is different. It means that while individual from lower levels of organization’s hierarchy goes to the higher ranks, the importance of technical skills decreases but conceptual skill will be increased. But in all the levels of management and guidance from the lower situation to the highest official, human skills and its pragmatics the crucial matter is the same and these skills are more effective than both technical and conceptual skills, and organizational effectiveness and efficiency will be guaranteed.

Etic [3] in a study showed that being success full of an organization depends on having and applying human's skills by the leaders of the organizations. This study presented that the most important factor for creating motivation is appliance of humanistic relationships of managers. Training places like an organization are 100% humanistic, and their responsibility is turning the humanistic source to human investments.

Unesco [4] therefore presence of powerful motivation in the employees of these organizations is critical and necessary. In the other word motivation is the main stimulus for humans' movement in organizations. Therefore having more motivation is caused (specially inner and spiritual motivation) the more effectiveness in the employees of organization.

*Corresponding Author: Abbas Khorsheid (Ph.D., Associated Professor). Department of Education, Islamshahr Branch, Islamic Azad University, Islamshahr, Iran. Email: a_Khorsheid40@yahoo.com.
Basically the employees who have motivation, have more creativity, entrepreneurship, effectiveness and efficiency, and Nagy [5] believes that reviving employees' motivation will be valid inside the humanistic relationships authority. The existing article is dealing with the relation of the humanistic relationships of managers on the employee's job motivation in the regional of Tehran's educational system. A lot of inquiry about managers humanistic relationships and employees motivation has been done that we will consider some of them in this article:

Alexi [6] in a study in educational environments came to this conclusion that there is a positive relationship ($r=0.7$) between authority of managers humanistic relationships and job motivation.

Cilicoze [7] showed in a study that motivation is resulted in two internal and external factors in educational environments, and finally the accuracy of this factor in appliance group of manager's humanistic relationships will result in a better contact of managers with their own employees.

Dillman et al. [8] reported the previous result in a study titled "The effective factors in job motivation in employees".

Marjolinwelyiyan [9] showed in a study titled "understanding effective factors on job motivation on sanitary organization employees in Vietnam" that although having a stable job with sufficient salary causes in job motivation, but he knows authority of manager's humanistic relationships is the most important factor of job motivation.

Gary Lyun [10] in study titled "The effect of management method an employee's job satisfaction" showed that the most important factor in employee's job satisfaction is appliance of authority of humanistic relationships of managers in dealing with them.

Patrick [12] in several studied that done in different organizations showed management methods according to managers humanistic relationships in dealing with the employees will effect on their job’ s satisfaction and motivation.

Fetman [13] showed in a study titled " investigation of the relationships between organizational environment and human basis in organizations, that in organizations where t managers have concentrated decisions and their hypothesizes with dealing with the employees according to X theory, have less motivation and have the worst efficiency finally. But managers who decide in partnership, their hypothesis is according to Y theory and treat with their employees on the basis of humanistic relationship, their employee has more motivation and efficiency.

Sekro [14] repeated the same things again in a study titled "effective factors in employee's efficiency".

Williz-Shattuck [15] in a study titled “motivations factors among hygiene organization employees in developing countries showed that seven factors, financial bonus, promotion, frequent education, appropriate subtraction about the workplace, sources accessibility, management and human leadership and gratitude are the most important motivation factors. He believes although all factor are important, but the most important motivation factor is authority humanistic relationships in organizations by managers.

Khorshidi et al. [16] showed in a survey titled "effective factors in reinforcement of job motivation of training managers that the self-actualization (51%), Social factors (7.9%) self-esteem factor (3.3%), job's desirable features (2.3%) and physiologic factor (1.6%) are effective factors in improvement of motivation. This study showed that the Realization of spiritual needs in managers in authority of human relationships in a higher level hierarchically.

Rollin Son [17] in a study showed that human's needs and motivation are things that are leaned and the most important needs that their satisfaction in workplace will play the most important role in motivation, needs development, searching for connection and power that all three are possible inside the authority of humanistic relationships.

Mitchell [18] showed in a study that most important factor in employee motivation certainly meet social needs, esteem, and self-actualization is in them. He said the three requirements in the context of human relations managers in dealing with government employees can be realized.

Vroom Viton [19] divides decision making methods into two parts 'a) Dictatorial; b) in partnership. These two showed that the leaders who have dictatorial decisions, the employees don’t have job motivations and in comparison with the leaders who work in partnership, the employees have more motivation.

Bas [20] showed in her study that extract of leadership is influence. He believes that ethical and humanistic leaders have important effect in motivation amplifying’, successful life and great biography of followers and organizations. He believes that ethical leaders have an ideal influence in their employees by appliance of authority of humanistic relationships on their employees; they give them mantic motivation and cause them intelligent incitement.

Sashkin [21] showed in a study that leaders who have the authority of human relationships, have strategic thought and are aware of key factors in success, develop trust, animate the ambitions, they are the architect of eternal basis, they are complete symbols of desire in organization, they are the founder of the point of vision and insight and their employees have a lot of motivation. Considering the mentioned things the following hypothesizes are the goals of this study:

There is a direct relationship between manager's human relationships and incensement of motivation their employees in Tehran's educational system.

2- There is a direct relationship between managers' human skills and an increase in self-development.

3- There is a direct relationship between manager’s human skills and an increase in self-esteem.

4- Female employees have more human relationship in comparison with the male employee.
5- Female managers have more human skills than male managers do the method changes and dependent changes without manipulating the dependent changes.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The statistical community of this survey s consisted of all principals and employees of Tehran's educational systems having M.A in educational sciences in 2011. Simple random sampling according to Bulla [22] was used for choosing the sample group. This group consisted of 200 people (100 female principals and 100 male principles) and (100 employed men and women equally). The demographic information of sample group is in Table.

The instruments of the estimation, consists of two questionnaire, Maslow 60 questions [23] and the questionnaire for the existing survey has 20 questions that is collected by motivation theories and investigating the previous findings, then this questionnaire was sent to 30 education specialist in 3 levels and finalized. The continuous is between 1 and 5. 1 means the minimum and 5 means maximum of accessibility of per question in the questionnaire.

All data from this study were statistically analyzed by SPSS software, also some exams called correlation, regression, variance analysis and common ways in distributional statistics has been used. The credibility of the method has been computed by Cronbach. The amount of credibility is 9% for human relationships instrument and 97% for motivation. Content validity has been used for investigating of questionnaires validity and determining whether surveys instrument's content is in direction of goal or not.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The findings of the existing survey have been shown in two parts. Demographic information of the sample group is shown in Table 1.

Table 2. Statistical of human relationships of female principal's and Maslow's quintet needs

Table 3. Statistically characteristics of human relationships of men principal's and Maslow's quintet needs in men employee

Self-actualization needs self-esteem need social need security need physiologic need human relationship

1) The comparison of the averages between quintet needs of male and female employees from the sample group shows that the appliance of authority of human relationship's effects on self-development need, social need, self-esteem need, security need and physiologic need. 2) The comparison of the medium of the authority of human relationship shows that although the medium is more in male principals than female, there is no meaningful difference between these two groups. 3) The comparison of standard deviation in the sample group shows that dispersion in each male and female group is more in physiologic group. 4) The minimum grade from two group’s point of view is for physiologic needs and the maximum grade is for self-development need. 5) Positive skewness shows that the distribution skewness is to right in comparison with normal distribution and positive strain shows that distribution is longer than normal distribution. 6) Data analysis: statistical exams called correlation, regression and variance analysis has been used to acknowledge the data and generalizing the consequences of the survey. The consequence is shown in the Tables below.
Table 4. Matrix correlation human relationship manager and Maslow's fifth need employee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Human relationship</th>
<th>Physiological need</th>
<th>Security need</th>
<th>Social need</th>
<th>Self-esteem need</th>
<th>Self-acquisition need</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Human relationships</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physiologic need</td>
<td>-0.43 *</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security need</td>
<td>-0.31 *</td>
<td>0.30 *</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social need</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.53 *</td>
<td>-0.40</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-esteem need</td>
<td>0.42 *</td>
<td>-0.47 *</td>
<td>-0.30 *</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-acquisition need</td>
<td>0.46 *</td>
<td>-0.60 *</td>
<td>-0.59 *</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Level correlation in the 0.01 is meaning in statistical (two function)

Table 5. Multivariate correlation coefficient, coefficient of determination and adjusted coefficient of determination for human relations and social security needs social, self-esteem

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>regulation</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The consequences show that correlation between human relationships and physiological needs, security, social and self-actualization of employees is meaningful in level 1% statistically. Therefore there is a direct connection between human relationships of principals and physiologic needs, security, respect and self – actualization of employees who work for them. The relation between human relationships and physiologic needs and security is Vis-à-vis and the relation between human relationships and social respect needs and self – actualization is direct. The maximum correlation between principals’ human relationships with Maslow’s quintet needs of employees is about self-development need (r=0.46) and the minimum is about security need (r=0.31). The correlation among human relationships and social needs is not meaningful statistically. Multi variables Regression the consequences of regression analysis have been shown in Tables 4, 5 and 6 for anticipating principals’ human relationships according to Maslow’s quintet needs. The physiologic needs have been deleted because they have tolerance factor equal zero and they have full regression with other pre-definition variables. As Table 5 shows multivariable correlation between managers human relationships and linear combination of security, social, self-esteem and self-development needs is equal 0.57 (R²=0.33). Therefore you can say that the linear combination of these needs is almost 33% and describes human relationships the modifier R2 equals 3% that shows the estimate of the society. The consequences estimated from F test, has been shown for multivariate.

CORRELATION

Table 6. Result analysis variance for research meaningful R2 in the human relationship and security need social, self-esteem and self-acquisition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource startle</th>
<th>Freedom degree</th>
<th>Total Square</th>
<th>Average Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1946.64</td>
<td>486.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>3958.20</td>
<td>41.66</td>
<td>11.68</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>5904.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7. The regression coefficients for human relations and social security needs social, self-esteem

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The stable amount</td>
<td>41.36</td>
<td>15.63</td>
<td>41.36</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>0.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security needs</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social needs</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-esteem needs</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-development needs</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the above table is based, F calculated (68.11) in less than 001.0 was statistically significant in the multivariate correlation coefficient is calculate data statistically significant . As you can see in the table regression for anticipating human relationships according to Maslow needs: 
Y1=41.36+0.06x1+0.04x2+0.35x3+0.32X
In another word: Human relationship = 41.36+0.06 security need +0.04 (social need) +0.35 (self-esteem need) +0.32 (self-development needs).
As you can see in Table 6, the consequence shows that self-esteem and self-development needs is less than 0.01 and is meaningful statistically and social and security needs is not meaningful in any statistical level. Therefore self-esteem need is equal to 0.35 and self-development 0.32 gave the best anticipators for principal’s human relationships

**The side findings**

The consequence of independent T examination for comparing male and female human relationships and comparison of Maslow’s quintet needs between male and female employees has been shown in Table 7. Human relationship =41.36+0.06 (security need) +0.04 (social need) +0.35 (self-esteem need) +0.32 (self-development need). As you can see in Table 7, the self-esteem and self-development is less than 0.01 statistically meaningful and security and social needs is not meaningful statistically. You can come to the conclusion that self-esteem need 0.35, self-development 0.33 are the best anticipators for managers human relationships. The consequence has been shown in Table 7.

**Table 8c** Result test t for competition human relationship female and male manager and Maslow's fifth needs in the female and male employee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Standard slope</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Human relationship</strong></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>92.66</td>
<td>8.34</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>male</td>
<td>92.26</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physiologic need</strong></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>43.54</td>
<td>12.40</td>
<td>-1.60</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>male</td>
<td>47.54</td>
<td>12.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Security need</strong></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>54.04</td>
<td>9.48</td>
<td>-1.70</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>male</td>
<td>56.96</td>
<td>7.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social need</strong></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>65.84</td>
<td>10.26</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>male</td>
<td>63.78</td>
<td>9.98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-esteem need</strong></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>64.18</td>
<td>8.81</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>male</td>
<td>63.28</td>
<td>7.31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-acquisition need</strong></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>72.40</td>
<td>10.74</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>male</td>
<td>68.44</td>
<td>9.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As you can see, the T computed for human relationships including men and women is 0.26 and the meaningful level is 0.80 that is not meaningful in any statistical level. There is no meaningful difference between male and female principals. T for self-development is 1.98 in level a (t=1.98) (a=0.05) and is statistically meaningful. Therefore there is a meaningful difference between male and female employees in terms of self-development. And this need is more in female than males. The other Maslow’s needs is not statistically meaningful and there is no meaningful difference between male and female employee in terms of physiologic, security, social and self-esteem

**DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION**

1- The first finding from the existing survey, shows that zero hypothesis based on no difference between the authority of principal's human relationships and employee's motivation – is rejected. In another word, in level (a=0.5) and freedom degree (df=198) you can say that appliance of principles human relationship results in increasing in employees motivation.

2- The second finding from this survey shows that zero hypothesis based on no relationships between principals human skills and the employee's social motivation – is rejected, in the other word in level (a=5%) with freedom degree (df=198) it can be claimed with 95% safety that when the principals human skills increases, the social motivation increases too.

3- The third finding from this survey shows that between principals human skills and employee's self-hypothesis – based on no relationship between principals human skills and employee's Self-development – is rejected in the other word with meaningful level (a=5%) and freedom degree (df=198) you can say with 95% assurance that when the principals human skills increases, the self-development need increases too.

4- The fourth finding from this survey shows that the hypothesis that says there is no relationship between principals human relationships and employee's self-esteem is rejected and it can be claimed with 95% of safety that when the principals human skills increases, the self-esteem needs increases too. In the other word, with meaningful level (a=5%) and freedom degree (df=198) it can be claimed with 95% assurance that when the principals human relationships increases, the employee's self-esteem increases too.

5- The fifth finding from this survey shows that the hypothesis that says there is no relationships between human relationship including male and female employees in the other word with meaningful level (a=5%) and freedom degree (df=198) it can be claimed with 95% assurance that female employees have more human relationships than male employees.

6- The sixth finding from this survey shows that the hypothesis that says there is no difference between male and female principals is not rejected, in the other hand with meaningful level (a=5%) and freedom degree (df=198). it can be claimed with 95% safety that there is no difference between male and female human needs.

Totally this survey shows that the authority of principal's human relationships explains 33% of employee's needs. However this important issue is 6% for security needs, 4% for social needs 32% for self-esteem needs and 35% for self-development needs. There is no meaningful relation between principals 'human relationships and physiologic needs.
These findings are the same as outcomes of surveys by Khorshidi et al. [1], Daft [2], Eric [3], Nagy [5], Alexi [6], Sylykvz [7], Dillman and etal [8], Gary Lyun [10], Noda [11], Patrick [12], Fetman [13], Sekro [14], Williz-Shattuck [15], Khorshidi etal [16], Rollinson [17], Mitchell [18], Vroom viton [19], Bas [20], Sashkin [21]. Because of credit of limitation in 5 levels motivation of in employees and validity is not computed. Finally it is suggested that with considering the importance of employee's motivation this survey should be used by experienced researchers in Iran's educational system, and considered as a standard instrument for testing the authority of principal's human relationships and the employee’s motivation, by experienced physiologists.
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