

The Relationship between Achievement Motivation and Job Efficiency of Agricultural Faculty Staff, Islamic Azad University, Shoushtar Branch

Masoud Ahmadinejad and Mahmoud Yaghoobidoost

Sama Technical and Vocational Training College, Islamic Azad University, Shoushtar Branch, Shoushtar, Iran

Corresponding Author Email: masoud_ahmadinejad751@yahoo.com



Abstract

Received: 11 April 2013,
Revised: 22 May 2013,
Revised: 27 May 2013,
Accepted: 21 June 2013

The purpose of research was identifying the relationship between achievement motivation and efficiency of agricultural faculty staff, Islamic Azad University Shoushtar Branch. The method of research was a descriptive-correlative. The sample size was agricultural faculty staff (n=45). A five-point Likert-type scale was used as the instrument to gather data in order to measure the achievement motivation. A quantitative analysis using data gathered by the survey questionnaire and Likert scale was used. Data were analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). Questionnaire reliability was estimated by calculating Cronbach's alpha and it was appropriate for this study (Mean Cronbach's alpha 0.82). The result of research revealed that the correlation between achievement motivation, responsibility adoption, activity rate, goal oriented and efficiency of staff at the level of 0.05 was significant. Linear regression was used to predict changes in efficiency by different variables. Based on the results achievement motivation, activity rate, responsibility adoption and goal oriented may well explain for 33.8% changes ($R^2 = 0.338$) in efficiency of staff.

Keywords: Achievement Motivation, Responsibility Adoption, Activity Rate, Goal Oriented, Efficiency

1. Introduction

Motivation is the basic drive for all of our actions. Motivation refers to the dynamics of our behavior, which involves our needs, desires, and ambitions in life. Achievement motivation is based on reaching success and achieving all of our aspirations in life. Achievement goals can affect the way a person performs a task and represent a desire to show competence (Harackiewicz, Barron, Carter, Lehto, & Elliot, 1997). People demand success, reject goals that others set to them, automatically. They just accept the help and advice of experts that could provide the required knowledge or skills (Moorhead and Griffin, 2004).

Safety needs, emerge when the physiological needs are relatively satisfied and occupy the second level in the hierarchy of needs. These needs include a desire to security, stability, dependency, protection, and freedom from fear and anxiety, and a need for structure, order and law. These needs are also satisfied through adequate wages or salaries, although Maslow does not consider money as an effective motivator (Cherrington, 1989).

David McClelland's and his associates' investigations of achievement motivation have particular relevance to the emergence of leadership.

McClelland was interested in the possibility of deliberately arousing a motive to achieve in an attempt to explain how individuals express their preferences for particular outcomes a general problem of motivation. In this connection, the need for achievement refers to an individual's preference for success under conditions of competition (McClelland, 1961).

In 1961 McClelland published *The Achieving Society*, which articulated his model of human motivation. McClelland contended that three dominant needs -for achievement, for power, and for affiliation- underpin human motivation. McClelland believed that the relative importance of each need varies among individuals and cultures. Arguing that commonly used hiring tests using IQ and personality assessments were poor predictors of competency, McClelland proposed that companies should base hiring decisions on demonstrated competency in relevant fields, rather than on standardized test scores. Iconoclastic in their time, McClelland's ideas have become standard practice in many corporations (McClelland, 1961).

Achievement motivation consists of a varied and complex set of assumptions, assessments, predictions, inferences, values, standards, and

affective reactions that may be irrational, inaccurate, and contradictory (Dweck & Elliott, 1983).

David McClelland (McClelland, 1961) is most noted for describing three types of motivational need, which he identified in his 1961 book, *The Achieving Society*:

- Achievement motivation (n-ach)
- Authority/power motivation (n-pow)
- Affiliation motivation (n-affil)

David McClelland's needs-based motivational model. These needs are found to varying degrees in all workers and managers, and this mix of motivational needs characterizes a person's or manager's style and behaviour, both in terms of being motivated, and in the management and motivation others.

The need for achievement (n-ach):

The n-ach person is 'achievement motivated' and therefore seeks achievement, attainment of realistic but challenging goals, and advancement in the job. There is a strong need for feedback as to achievement and progress, and a need for a sense of accomplishment.

The need for authority and power (n-pow):

The n-pow person is 'authority motivated'. This driver produces a need to be influential, effective and to make an impact. There is a strong need to lead and for their ideas to prevail. There is also motivation and need towards increasing personal status and prestige.

The need for affiliation (n-affil):

The n-affil person is 'affiliation motivated', and has a need for friendly relationships and is motivated towards interaction with other people. The affiliation driver produces motivation and need to be liked and held in popular regard. These people are team players.

Atkinson (1964), defined achievement motivation as the comparison of performances with others and against certain standard activities. Atkinson and Feather (1966) suggested that achievement motivation is a combination of two personality variables: tendency to approach success and tendency to avoid failure.

Hypotheses of the Study:

There is a significant relationship between achievement motivation of agricultural faculty staff and their efficiency.

There is a significant relationship between competitiveness oriented of agricultural faculty staff and their efficiency.

There is a significant relationship between responsibility adoption of agricultural faculty staff and their efficiency.

There is a significant relationship between activity rate of agricultural faculty staff and their efficiency.

There is a significant relationship between goal oriented of agricultural faculty staff and their efficiency.

2. Materials and methods

The method of research was a descriptive-correlative method. This study was done in 2011 in the faculty of agriculture, Islamic Azad University, Shoushtar branch. The sample size was 45 people. The questionnaire of achievement motivation was used by Weldon, Jehn, Pradhan, (1991). This questionnaire determines the degree to which people are motivated to achievement.

A five-point Likert-type scale was used as the instrument to gather data in order to measure the achievement motivation. A quantitative analysis using data gathered by the survey questionnaire and Likert scale was used. Data were analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS).

This questionnaire was set in four subscales including: responsibility adoption, competitiveness, activity rate, and goal-orientation. The questionnaire of efficiency includes 25 questions, and the total score is used to evaluate the personnel's efficiency.

Questionnaire reliability was estimated by calculating Cronbach's alpha and it was appropriate for this study (Mean Cronbach's alpha 0.82).

3. Results and discussion

Demographic profile

Table 1 shows the demographic profile and the descriptive statistics for some characteristics of agricultural faculty staff. The results of the demographic information and the descriptive statistics of the participant indicated that 68.89% of participants were men. The minimum age of participant was 24 years. Their maximum work experience was 21 years.

Table 1. Demographic profile of staff

Variables	F	P	CP
Age			
24-30	12	26.67	26.67
30-35	11	24.44	51.11
35-40	14	31.11	82.22
40-50	8	17.78	100.00
Marital			
Married	39	86.67	86.67
Single	6	13.33	100.00
work experience (Year)			
1-5	28	62.22	62.22
5-10	12	26.67	88.89
10<	5	11.11	100.00

F:Frequency, P:Percentage, CP:Cumulative Percentage

Correlation study:

Spearman correlation coefficients to test hypotheses was used, the results of this test are as follows (Table 2):

Test the first hypothesis:

The results of table 2 showed, the correlation ($r=0.413$) between achievement motivation and efficiency at the level of 0.05 was significant. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected. It means that with 95% of confidence, we can conclude that staff with high achievement motivation had high efficiency.

Test the second hypothesis:

Also the results of table 2 showed, the correlation ($r=0.112$) between competitiveness oriented and efficiency was not significant.

Test the third hypothesis:

Based on the results of table 2, the correlation ($r=0.338$) between responsibility adoption and efficiency at the level of 0.05 was significant. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected. It means that with 95% of confidence, we can conclude that staff with high responsibility adoption had high efficiency.

Test the fourth hypothesis:

As the results of table 2 showed, the correlation ($r=0.319$) between activity rate and efficiency at the level of 0.05 was significant. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected. It means that with 95% of confidence, we can conclude that staff with high activity rate had high efficiency.

Test the fifth hypothesis:

Also the results of table 2 showed, the correlation ($r=0.308$) between goal oriented and efficiency at the level of 0.05 was significant. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected. It means that with 95% of confidence, we can conclude that staff with high goal oriented had high efficiency.

Table 2. Relationship between efficiency and independent variables.

Independent variable	Dependent variable	r	p
Achievement Motivation		0.413	0.000
Competitiveness Oriented	Job Efficiency	0.112	0.091
Activity Rate	of Staff	0.319	0.000
Responsibility Adoption		0.338	0.000
Goal Oriented		0.308	0.000

Regression analysis

Table 3 shows the result for regression analysis by stepwise method. Linear regression was used to predict changes in efficiency by different variables. Achievement motivation, activity rate, responsibility adoption and goal oriented may well explain for 33.8% changes ($R^2 = 0.338$) in efficiency of staff.

$$Y=1.012+0.542x_1+0.643x_2+1.450x_3+0.348x_4$$

Table 4. Multivariate regression analysis

Independent variable	B	Beta	T	Sig
Achievement Motivation	0.542	0.534	3.433	0.000
Goal Oriented	0.643	0.432	3.237	0.000
Activity Rate	1.450	0.634	3.435	0.000
Responsibility	0.348	0.588	2.290	0.000
Constant	1.012	----	3.008	0.000

$$R^2=0.338, F=6.594 \text{ Sig}=0.000$$

4. Conclusion

The results of research showed the correlation between achievement motivation and efficiency at the level of 0.05 was significant. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected. It means that with 95% of confidence, we can conclude that staff with high achievement motivation had high efficiency. According to Davidoff (1987) individual performance is generally determined by three factors namely; Ability—the capability to do the job; Work environment—the tools, materials and information needed to do the job; and Motivation—the desire to do the job. Maslow (1943) and Alderfer (1972) believe that human beings have needs which must be satisfied if high performance is to be achieved.

Also the results this research showed, the correlation between responsibility adoption and efficiency at the level of 0.05 was significant.

As the results of study showed, the correlation between activity rate and efficiency at the level of 0.05 was significant. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected. It means that with 95% of confidence, we can conclude that staff with high activity rate had high efficiency. Also the results of research showed, the correlation between goal oriented and efficiency at the level of 0.05 was significant. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected. It means that with 95% of confidence, we can conclude that staff with high goal oriented had high efficiency.

Acknowledgement

We gratefully acknowledge for financial support from the Sama Technical and Vocational Training College, Islamic Azad University, Shoushtar Branch, Shoushtar, Iran. The research leading to

these results has received funding from the this university

References

- 1) Alderfer, C. (1972). Existence, relatedness & growth. New York: Free Press.
- 2) Atkinson, J. W., & Feather, N. T. (Eds) (1966). A theory of achievement motivation. London : Wiley.
- 3) Atkinson, J. W. (1964). An introduction to motivation. Princeton, NJ: Van Nostrand.
- 4) Cherrington, D., Nyal, D., & McMullin, B. (1989). Organizational behavior. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- 5) Davidoff, L. L. (1987). Introduction to psychology (3rd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill
- 6) Dweck, C. S., & Elliot, E. S. (1983). Achievement motivation. In . H. Mussen, & E. M. Hetherington (Eds.). Handbook of child psychology Vol. IV, Socialization, personality, and social development (pp. 643-691). New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- 7) Harackiewicz, J. M., Barron, K. E., Carter, S. M., Lehto, A. T., & Elliot, A. J. (1997). Predictors and consequences of achievement goals in the college classroom: Maintaining interest and making the grade. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 73, 1284-1295.
- 8) Maslow, A. (1943). A theory of human motivation, *psychological re-view*, 50, 370-396.
- 9) McClelland, D. C. (1961). *The Achieving Society*. Free Press, New York
- 10) Moorhead, G and Griffin, R. W. (2004). *Organizational behavior : managing people and organizations*. Edition 7th ed. Boston : Houghton Mifflin, 2004.
- 11) Weldon, E., Jehn, K. A., & Pradhan, P. (1991). Processes that mediate the relationship between a group goal and improved group performance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* , 61: 555–569