Relationship between Extra Works on Performance of Faculty Members of Islamic Azad University in Mazandaran
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ABSTRACT

This research project aims to shed light on recognition of effective factors on performance of faculty members and measuring the effect of extra work on their performance and the impact of extra work on their research activities and as a result, presenting solutions to the people who are in charge. To show the relationship between the achieved data, descriptive methods such as table of distribution and mean were utilized, to analyze, data and to generalize the results and to answer clearly, inferential statistics, correlation coefficient, and t-test were employed. The results showed that those instructors teaching 6-10 hours a week had lower performance in comparison with other groups. The highest performance goes to those instructors teaching 21-25 hours a week; also, increasing working hours from 25 to more, leads to lower performance of instructors. Also, those instructors teaching 26-30 hours a week received higher rates considering students point of view but the most researches were done by the instructors teaching 36-40 hours a week.

KEYWORDS: faculty members, Islamic Azad University, Mazandaran, extra work

INTRODUCTION

Faculty members have high position in society to train human resources [1, 2, and 3]. Educational system is very important and faculty members must pay more attention and provide an enough motivation for students [4, and 5]. Higher education system of any country undoubtedly plays an effective role in the economic development and will be responsible for labor productivity [6]. If funding (per capita per student) reduced total higher education activities may be affected. Any higher educational system highlights four parts [7].

1) Environment that is social, cultural and economic.
2) Inner higher educational system and faculty member groups, time table, educational system and educational facilities.
3) Higher educational system and faculty members groups, humanities management’s, studying course.
4) Inner higher educational system is including new production, human training expert and skillful service.

Samarla et al (2012) examined the Effective Factors on Creating Job Motivation among Faculty Members of Wood and Paper Industry Groups in Iran [8]. So it is essential that each part of the higher education system and give enough attention is paid to the whole set goals and the program track. In this study the data and statically importance extra work for the faculty members were surveyed and the impact of these extra activities on their performance evaluation [9]. It is essential that for higher educational system to pay attention till all systems move in aim. This research tries to search information and statistic data with faculty members groups and effect to their activities.

METHOD

In this research shows the search of Islamic Azad University and the relation between extra work among faculty members and their activities in MS.C government management from 1999 to 2000, in Mazandaran. We did Study to 413 people of professor’s, faculty members to Islamic Azad University in Mazandaran province (instructors, assistant professors, associate professors, and full professor) men and women. According to the extensive capacity of society, we did search one by one people by researcher among 103 samples in societies. We also select in secretariat in 3 area in Islamic Azad University according to the alphabet between 4, 1 suddenly select.
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The way of getting information in this research is three ways:

a) Getting data by standard application from student’s.

b) Evaluation result by educational groups in assistance educational dominant.

c) Faculty members research activities.

To find out the relationship between the discipline and the resulting data, descriptive statistical methods such as frequency tables and figures, and the average was used and to analyze data and make decisions about the generalizability of results and accountability explicit inferential statistical methods, correlation and the T test was used [10].

Since this research work double as the independent variable and the dependent variable is considered as a function of three fields (student, research and educational), and each has a rating of zero to one hundred and rating of each member the samples were in the category of average hours worked per week and the average total score was calculated for each group and each group based on a Likert score of the (very poor, poor, average, good and excellent) with a score of 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 are considered.

RESULT

Abundance of sample size (103) is shown in Figure 1.

According to figure 1, faculty members groups will divide to 9 groups. More sample refers to 26 till 30 hours on weeks equal to 26.2 present.

Figure 2 shows the distribution curves of the number of hours worked weekly faculty members, as is clear from the work week for 8 hours minimum and maximum working week is 28 hours.
Table 1 shows the working hours of faculty members with their performance in the academic year.

Table 1. Working hours of faculty members with their performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Works average on week</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Works average</th>
<th>Survey of Student</th>
<th>Educational Groups</th>
<th>Research Experience</th>
<th>Average Likert scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>2.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>84.33</td>
<td>90.33</td>
<td>18.75</td>
<td>3.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>89.8</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>61.1</td>
<td>3.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>90.6</td>
<td>90.2</td>
<td>26.22</td>
<td>3.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>90.74</td>
<td>92.5</td>
<td>19.71</td>
<td>3.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>90.89</td>
<td>91.18</td>
<td>19.49</td>
<td>3.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-40</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>83.89</td>
<td>87.22</td>
<td>29.92</td>
<td>3.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-45</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>86.38</td>
<td>90.88</td>
<td>17.47</td>
<td>3.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-50</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>82.73</td>
<td>88.73</td>
<td>22.09</td>
<td>3.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>202</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2944</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 shows, only one person working between 6-10 hours per week that the average five-item Likert scores range corresponds to 2.96 is moderate to low.

According to Table 1, three people working between 11-15 hours per week that the average spectrum of the five-item Likert scores equal to 3.22 is that the trend is the previous group.

Table 1 shows, five people working between 16-20 hours per week that they function according to figures obtained in three different areas (Survey of Student, Educational Groups, and Research Experience) GPA privileges spectra obtained with the five-choice Likert 3.26, respectively, which is good level.

According to Table 1, 15 people working between 21-25 hours per week that they function according to figures obtained from the 3.45, respectively, compared to the previous group, the positive upward.

Table 1 shows, 27 people working between 26-30 hours per week that they function according to figures obtained from the 3.38, respectively, compared to the previous group, the downside is negative.

According to Table 1, 19 people working between 31-35 hours per week that they function according to figures obtained in three different areas (Survey of Student, Educational Groups, and Research Experience) GPA scores five-item Likert spectrum corresponding to 3.36, respectively, when compared to the previous downward trend is negative.

Table 1 shows, 9 people were working between 36-40 hours per week that the average spectrum of the five-item Likert scores equal to 3.35, which represents the highest level of performance, it is the previous group.

According to Table 1, 13 people was working between 41-45 hours per week that the average spectrum of the five-item Likert scores equal to 3.24, which represents a decline of the level of performance of the groups compared previous.

Table 1 shows, 11 people was working between 46-50 hours per week that the average spectrum of the five-item Likert scores equal to 3.22, which has a lower performance of the previous group.

Between extra work and performance of the faculty members of Islamic Azad University, Mazandaran province, there is a significant correlation, r is calculated with 0.87 and show what proportion of the variation is justified by extra work shifts.

The results showed that the additional work and the faculty members of Islamic Azad University, Mazandaran, there is a significant correlation, t is calculated as (17.73) is greater than t table (1.96).

**DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION**

According to the study, which examines the relationship between academic performance and extra work on Islamic Azad University, Mazandaran, we reached the conclusion that the additional work and academic performance, according to research results (r = 0.87)

Confirmed that extra work on the impact of test performance about 0.87 of the performance justifies the additional work and the result of policymakers and administrators can decision making on the use of the help motives necessary able appropriate mechanisms working class communities to improve performance. Identifying effective factors on creating job motivation among faculty members is believed to be one necessity which can contribute to increase productivity, job satisfaction, successful planning for an exciting and useful workplace within the university [11].
Overall, the study results were as follows:

1) Contrary to the expectations of those teachers who were working in the week between the hours of 6-10, the performance was fewer than the next group.
2) Based on the results of those teachers that are at the highest level between 21 to 25 hours worked per week.
3) With the increase in the working week from 25 hours to a higher level of performance of teachers is reduced.
4) Teachers are those between 26 to 30 hours a week doing, in terms of points gained from the survey and evaluation of Survey of Student and Educational Groups have the highest rates, but the highest rates of those teachers that are out research between 36-40 hours a week doing.
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