

Study and comparison of relationship between job enthusiasm, job performance and behavior of anti- efficiency among permanent and non-permanent staffs in the Pazargad petrochemical (Assaluyeh)

Moslem Mansori¹, Dr. Mohammad Rabiee^{2,*}, Dr. Mohammad Ghasemipirbaloti³

¹Department of Educational Psychology, faculty of Human science Shahrekord Branch, Islamic Azad University, Shahrekord, Iran

²Assistant professor, Department of Consulting, university of Shahrekord, Shahrekord, Iran

³Assistant professor, Department of Psychology, faculty of Human science Shahrekord Branch, Islamic Azad University, Shahrekord, Iran

Abstract: The main objective of this research is study and comparison of relationship between job enthusiasm, job performance and behavior of anti- efficiency among permanent and non-permanent staffs in the Pasargadae petrochemical. For this purpose, 204 personnel of Pazargad Petrochemical randomly selected class and enthusiasm questionnaires job, job performance and behavior, anti-productivity responded. To analyze the data, indicators and descriptive statistics including frequency, frequency, mean and standard deviation and inferential statistics such as the Mann-Whitney and Kruskal-Wallis, U and t-tests were used. The results showed that there were significant differences between the enthusiasm of staffs and resident permanent, subscales except fascination professional and job performance of staffs residing and permanent significant difference between the self-evaluation Tests there, but the manager there was a significant difference between the performances of staffs. There were no significant differences between the behaviors of anti-productivity staffs. The passion for the job and demographic characteristics at different levels, such as marital status, work experience, age and education level, no significant differences were found. It is also a significant difference between job performance and demographic characteristics were found. Anti-serving behavior and demographic characteristics of age, work experience, and marital status, there are also different, but there are significant differences in the level of work experience.

Key words: Job enthusiasm; Job performance; Behavior; Anti-productivity; Non-permanent and permanent staffs

1. Introduction

In the present study because the permanent and non-permanent staff working in the petrochemical and it was likely that these employees may desire, performance and efficiency in the conduct of anti-demographic characteristics such as age, education, work experience, and marital status differences exist, and the staff and residents of the permanent, which can be due to distance or near the living conditions and their families, different behaviors in passion, performance and behavior to show proof productivity, the efforts of the employment relationship, passion, performance and conduct anti-permanent and non-permanent employee productivity in petrochemical staff Pasargad (Assaluyeh) specified. And determine whether these components can desire, performance and anti-productivity activities have an impact or not. Terass et al. (2006) as the result of a desire create opportunities for staff to communicate with colleagues and their managers. Job enthusiasm of Hevitt (2004), the passion that their employees. One study conducted by Becker, Albrecht L (2011) recognized that there is a growing community

though passion may mean that a high level of energy and a high level of job involvement (Inseoglo and Maniac, 2012). In most cases eager as defined in the organization's intellectual and emotional (Richman, 2006) or the voluntary efforts by staff shown in their jobs (Frank et al., 2004; quotes Asgary, 2011). Robinson et al (2004) as well as enthusiasm and a positive attitude towards the value of is defined (Asgari, 2011). Christine and et al. (2011) also has a passion for the job is defined:

Relatively stable state of mind and at the same time reflects on the experiences of energy or work performance. Kahn (1990) and the desire to express personal use of individual members in their work roles defined. He was the first person who used the term personal passion, believed that the enthusiasm, his people physically, cognitively and emotionally during role play and work are expressed. The most common definition of the concept of Shofly et al is passion for the job. They desire to make a positive and satisfying career subjective described in connection with the work in this condition a person feel more energetic and communicate effectively with the work activity and described himself as a competent person for the job is responding to demand.

* Corresponding Author.

2. Methodology

The population of this study, all staff the petrochemical Pasargad permanent and non-permanent (Assaluyeh) is the total number of 359 people. The sample size of this study was to estimate the sample size, the sample (petrochemical Pasargad Asalooe) a sample of 359 employees from a total of 204 subjects was selected by simple sampling. In order to study the statistical population sampling using a stratified sampling method, 204 were randomly selected. Sampling was conducted in the staff the number of employees in different jobs by referring to the separation unit was received. Accordingly, the ratio of the sample was determined. It should be noted that the implementation of the questionnaire was done on an individual basis at work. Way of implementation and coordination of the study was that after obtaining the necessary permits, these questionnaires were distributed among employees. The researcher to gain the confidence and motivate staff to answer questions Pasargad petrochemical and was told that they were

introduced to the work of a master's thesis is to all information will be treated confidentially and answer them honestly will help the researcher to gain access to the right information. Uniformity in running order, questionnaires was used for each of the directions. This study used statistical methods to analyze data, descriptive and inferential statistics were used. The method for calculating descriptive statistics descriptive parameters such as frequency, frequency, mean and standard deviation of custom tables are also used. And inferential statistical methods to examine the relationship between variables, the Mann-Whitney U test and Kruskal-Wallis is the independent t-test to compare the behavior of the anti-Employment, education, marital status, age, permanent and non-permanent with drawing tables is used.

3. Analysis of data

Hypothesis 1: there is a relationship between the career and passion of resides and permanent staff.

Table 1: Comparison of enthusiasm for the job and the size of the resident staff and permanent

Variable		sample size	Middle	Mann-whitney U	z	Significance level
Job enthusiasm	Resident	102	77	5180/00	-0/05	0/958
	Permanent	102	78.5			
Energy Professional	Resident	102	25.5	4921/500	-0/666	0/505
	Permanent	102	27.5			
Professional dedication	Resident	102	23.5	4699/500	-1/193	0/233
	Permanent	102	28.5			
Professional fascination	Resident	102	25	4386/00	-1/937	0/053
	Permanent	102	23.5			

The desire to compare the job Mann-Whitney U test was used for static and permanent.

According to the results, a significant difference between the employee resides (102 n =, Md = 77.00)

and staff permanent (n = 102, Md = 78.500), P = 0.958, U = 5180/00, z = -0.052.

Table 2: Comparison of enthusiasm for the job and the size of the resident staff and permanent

Variable		sample size	Middle	Mann-whitney U	z	Significance level
Job enthusiasm	Resident	102	77	5180/00	-0/05	0/958
	Permanent	102	78.5			
Energy Professional	Resident	102	25.5	4921/500	-0/666	0/505
	Permanent	102	27.5			
Professional dedication	Resident	102	23.5	4699/500	-1/193	0/233
	Permanent	102	28.5			
Professional fascination	Resident	102	25	4386/00	-1/937	0/053
	Permanent	102	23.5			

Longing to compare scores of employees residing and permanent Mann-Whitney U test was used. According to the results, a significant difference between the score-the staff resides (102 n =, Md = 77/00) and staff permanent (n = 102, Md = 78.500), P = 0.958, U = 5180.00, z = -0.052, there are not a professional fascination subscales. To compare the Mann-Whitney U test was used measures of career passion.

The results obtained for the energy scale professional relationship between the resident staff (102n =, Md = 25.500) and permanent staff (n = 102, Md = 27.500), P = 0.505, U = 4921.500, z = -0.666 does not exist.

It also marks the dedication of employees and residents of permanent, shows the difference between the resident staff (102n =, Md = 23.500) and permanent staff (n = 102, Md = 28.500), P = 0.053, U = 4386.00, z = -1.937 does not exist.

The dedication of the employees of the permanent represents the difference between the resident and the resident staff (102n =, Md = 25.00) and permanent staff (n = 102, Md = 23.500), P = 0.958, U = 5180.00, z = -0.52 is not.

Hypothesis 2 there is a relationship between the dimensions of the job performance of staff and permanent residing.

Table 3: Comparison of performance between staff and resident permanent

Variable		sample size	Middle	Mann-whitney U	z	Significance level
Evaluation of their performance	Resident	102	35/00	4643/500	-1/327	0/185
	Permanent	102	36/00			
Performance Evaluation (Form Manager)	Resident	101	35/00	4266/00	-2/120	0/034
	Permanent	102	33/00			

The performance comparison of self to resident and permanent Mann-Whitney U test was used. According to the results, a significant difference between the scores of the resident staff (102n =, Md = 35.00) and permanent staff (n = 102, Md = 36.00), P = 0.185, U = 4643.500, z = -1.327 does not exist.

To compare the performance evaluation by the Director of the Mann-Whitney U Tests was used.

The results are significant differences between the resident staff (101n =, Md = 35.0) and permanent staff (n = 102, Md = 33.0), P = 0.034, U = 4266.00, z = -2.120.

Hypothesis 3 there is a relationship between Anti-efficiency the behavior of the staff and permanent resides.

Table 4: Comparison of living and job performance among staff permanent

Variable		sample size	Middle	Mann-whitney U	z	Significance level
Anti-efficiency practices	Resident	102	56	4338/00	-2/052	0/40
	Permanent	102	52			
Aggression	Resident	101	7	4956/00	-0/491	0/624
	Permanent	102	7			
Vandalism and sabotage	Resident	101	7	4793/00	-0/955	0/340
	Permanent	102	7			
Abuse of position of others	Resident	101	9	3993/00	-2/804	0/005
	Permanent	102	8			
Time consuming	Resident	101	7	4187/00	-2/271	0/018
	Permanent	102	6			
Deceptive behavior	Resident	100	6	4256/00	-2/191	0/028
	Permanent	102	5			
Disruption of service	Resident	102	10	4645/00	-00/618	0/537
	Permanent	102	9			
Defiance and disobedience	Resident	102	5	4171/500	-2/509	0/012
	Permanent	102	5			
Failure to observe discipline	Resident	101	5	4687/00	-1/135	0/257
	Permanent	102	5			

To compare the behavior of anti-resident employee productivity and permanent Mann-Whitney U test was used. According to the results, a significant difference between some of the components of the resident staff (102n =, Md = 56.0) permanent and staff (n = 102, Md = 52.0), P = 0.40, U = 4338.0, z = -2.052 there. To compare the behavior of the scale of the Mann-Whitney U test was used against productivity. The results obtained for the difference between the employee resides aggression scale (101n =, Md = 7) permanent and staff (n = 102, Md = 7), P = 0.624, U = 4956.00, z = -0.624 does not exist. Compare scores and permanent sabotage resident staff, show a significant difference between the resident staff (101n =, Md = 7) and permanent staff (n = 102, Md = 7), P = 0.340, U = 4793.00, z = -0.955 does not exist. The abuse of

residents and staff positions other than permanent show a significant difference between the resident staff (101n =, Md = 9) permanent and staff (n = 102, Md = 8), P = 0.005, U = 3993.00, z = -2.804's. Also compare scores Time consuming resident staff and permanent show a significant difference between the resident staff (101n =, Md = 7) permanent and staff (n = 102, Md = 6), P = 0.018, U = 4187.500, z = -2.271. Compare the behavior of residents and permanent deceitful staff showed no significant difference between the resident staff (100n =, Md = 6) and permanent staff (n = 102, Md = 5), P = 0.028, U = 4256.0, z = -2.191. The results obtained for the scale disruption of service difference between the resident staff (102n =, Md = 10) and permanent staff (n = 102, Md = 9), P = 0.537, U = 4945, z = -0.618 does not exist in order to evaluate the results of the

scale of non-compliance and discipline significant difference between the scores of staff-resident (101n =, Md = 5) and permanent staff (n = 102, Md = 5), P = 0.257, U = 4687, z = -1.135 does not exist, compare also the following scale insubordination and between staff and residents of permanent significant difference between the resident staff (101n =, Md =

5) permanent and staff (n = 102, Md = 5), P = 0.012, U = 4171.500, z = -2.509.

Hypothesis 4: there is a relationship between the passions for the job based on different demographic characteristics.

Kruskal-Wallis test for differences between levels of enthusiasm course seeks employment in five age groups were used.

Table 5: Comparison of enthusiasm for the job in five age groups

Variables		sample size	Middle	X2	Significance level
Job enthusiasm	20-29	51	77	7/597	0/108
	30-31	33	77		
	32-34	53	73		
	35-37	34	68		
	38 and above	31	91		

Table 6 Comparison of the three groups of enthusiasm for the job according to the above Table of Contents getting a job can be a significant

difference in the levels of enthusiasm different age groups = 7.597, p = 0.108 (4, n = 202) 2χ.

Table 6: To examine differences in levels of job enthusiasm and experience of using Kruskal-Wallace

Variables		sample size	Middle	X2	Significance level
Job enthusiasm	5 years or younger	74	77	3/583	0/167
	5 years and 1 month to 10 years	85	77		
	10 years and 1 month and up	45	73		

The above table shows, significant differences in the levels of enthusiasm occupational groups work experience = 3/582, p = 0/167 (2, n = 204) 2χ.

To check Tghavt enthusiasm at work and education were the Kruskal-Wallace.

Table 7: Comparison of enthusiasm for a career in education groups

Variables		sample size	Middle	X2	Significance level
Education	Diploma	60	79/500	5/162	0/160
	Associate	40	84/500		
	Bachelor	83	71		
	Masters	20	76		

The above table shows, significant differences in the levels of enthusiasm occupational groups work experience = 5.162, p = 0.160 (3, n = 203) 2χ.

To investigate differences in levels of employment and marital enthusiasm was the Kruskal-Wallace.

Table 8: Comparison of enthusiasm occupational group's marital status

Variables		sample size	Middle	X2	Significance level
Marital	Single	53	77	0/119	0/730
	Married	140	77		

The above table shows, significant differences in the levels of occupational groups longing marital status = 0.119, p = 0.730 (2, n = 193) 2χ.

To investigate differences in levels of job performance and job experience was the Kruskal-Wallace.

H5-between job performance and demographic characteristics are different. Kruskal-Wallis test for differences between the courses seeks to job performance in five age groups were used.

The above table shows a significant difference in the performance of different groups of work experience = 2.854, p = 0.240 (2, n = 204) 2χ. To examine differences in levels of job performance and education were the Kruskal-Wallace.

Prompted by the above table, we find significant differences in job performance levels for different age groups = 1.639, p = .802 (4, n = 202) 2χ.

Table 9: Comparison of performance in five age groups

Variables		sample size	Middle	X2	Significance level
Job performance	20-29	51	35	1/639	0/802
	30-31	33	36		
	32-34	53	36		
	35-37	34	36		
	38 and above	31	377		

Table 10: Compares the performance of three groups of work experience

Variables		sample size	Middle	X2	Significance level
Job performance	5 years or younger	74	35	2/854	0/240
	5 years and 1 month to 10 years	85	35		
	10 years and 1 month and up	45	37		

Table 11: Compares the performance of four groups of education

Variables		sample size	Middle	X2	Significance level
Job performance	Diploma	60	36	5/277	0/153
	Associate	40	35		
	Bachelor	83	34		
	Masters	20	37		

The above table shows a significant difference in the levels of work experience and occupational groups = 5.277, p = 0.153 (3, n = 203) 2χ. To examine

differences in levels of job performance and marital Kruskal-Wallis test was used.

Table 12: Comparison between marital status and occupational

Variables		sample size	Middle	X2	Significance level
Job performance	Single	53	36	0/605	0/437
	Married	140	35		

The above table shows a significant difference in the levels of enthusiasm occupational groups marital status = 0.605, p = 0.437 (2, n = 193) 2χ.

Wallis Tests for differences between the behaviors of the course seeks to counter productivity in five age groups were used.

H6-between anti-productive behaviors and demographic characteristics are different. Kruskal-

Table 13: Comparison of the behavior of anti-productivity jobs in five age groups

Variables		sample size	Middle	X2	Significance level
Anti-serving behavior	20-29	51	52	4/019	0/403
	30-31	33	54		
	32-34	53	57		
	35-37	34	53		
	38 and above	31	56		

Prompted by the above table, we find significant differences in the levels of anti-serving behaviors of different age groups = 4.019, p = 0.403 (4, n = 202)

2χ. Investigate differences in levels of anti-serving behavior and experience of using the Kruskal-Wallis.

Table 14: Comparison of the behavior of anti-productivity jobs in the three groups work experience

Variables		sample size	Middle	X2	Significance level
Anti-serving behavior	5 years or younger	74	55	0/737	0/692
	5 years and 1 month to 10 years	85	54		
	10 years and 1 month and up	45	56		

The above table shows a significant difference in the levels of anti-served groups experience different behaviors = 0.727, p = 0.692 (2, n = 204) 2χ.

To examine differences in employment and education levels of enthusiasm were used Kruskal-Wallace.

Table 15: Comparison of counter-productive behavior careers in education groups

Variables		sample size	Middle	X2	Significance level
Anti-serving behavior	Diploma	60	50	21/229	0/000
	Associate	40	54		
	Bachelor	83	60		
	Masters	20	56		

The above table shows a significant difference in the levels of anti-serving behavior of different groups of work experience = 21.229, p = 0.000 (3, n =

203) 2χ. To investigate differences in levels of anti-serving behavior and the Kruskal-Wallace was married.

Table 16: Comparison of the behavior of two groups of anti-productivity jobs in marital status

Variables		sample size	Middle	X2	Significance level
Anti-serving behavior	Single	53	53	0/660	0/417
	Married	140	55		

The above table shows a significant difference in the levels of anti-serving behavior groups marital status = 0.660, p = 0.417 (2, n = 193) 2χ.

4. Conclusions

The first hypothesis of this study is to enthusiastically work of the staff and residents of the permanent it is different. According to the results, there is a significant difference between the scores of staff and resident permanent staff. This difference is evident in a small scale. The result of this hypothesis with the results of Vansi (2006) and Mi (2004) are coordinated and aligned. They said that their job as a result of the passion, skills, abilities, personal circumstances, and individual character. Macy's and Schneider (2008) argue that the job of environmental resources and personal resources come enthusiasm, after reaching impact on the environment and residents of permanent's passion employees. Cohen and Bayer (2009) and Sonty et al (2008) also examined the factors affecting the willingness of paid employment, the results showed that the location is very effective job of passion each value is the most desired places to live and work is odd, ashtya as one increases, to the extent that psychological separation from the workplace and their job is very difficult. Energy compared to professional staff in this study it was shown that there is no difference between permanent and resident staff. Salona and et al (2011) in the research process in terms of passion as a career and assimilation of ideas and beliefs of the teachers indicated there is no difference between teachers in different groups and the difference is due to the enthusiasm and positive job the results of this study are consistent with the theory and support it. The second hypothesis in this study is the performance of the job and the staff is inert and permanent. According to the results, there is a significant difference between the scores of staff and resident permanent staff. Hossam and online (2009)

conducted research that is consistent with this conclusion and hypothesis it was demonstrated that Hewitt, task, location, location is significant diversity of job performance are important factors. And they affect; following can be said for living and working in different places of residence and the permanent, its dimensions and job performance among staff and residents of permanent it is different. Research Motolido et al (1984) was also consistent with this hypothesis, their job performance among nurses tested and eventually found a job and work environment conditions and location are factors affecting stress, the main cause of stress is affecting job performance. James et al (2006) in a study of the factors influencing the performance of their job and positive and negative factors affecting divided into two groups. And also supports the hypothesis and the results of this hypothesis. The National Conference (2013) also conducted a study on employee job performance and the results indicate that the main factor affecting performance is the motivation and among all staff from all groups are equal. After motivating factor that will dampen job performance. The results of the present study were to investigate the suitability and compatibility of this hypothesis is not after the study is also consistent with this hypothesis, and even in spite of it. The third hypothesis of this study is to conduct counter-productivity of the staff is inert and permanent.

Given there is significant difference between the scores of staff by resident and staff permanent. Kloy and et al (2010) showed in a study anti-efficiency behavior occurs because the staff Who want to use it as a protest against their conditions and show that they are unhappy with their situation and the situation is different, staff living in the area might also permanent so because they are away from their homes, and counter-productive behavior of their show. Ryshad (2005) showed that differences in behavior between individuals with the same job, there is no counter-productive. Lisa and Paul (2005) also showed that

the behavior is counter-productive and stress has nothing to do with living the only difference is the impact on people in their working position and rank. So with this variant is not compatible with it. The results of the measurements showed that the scale of aggressive behavior, anti-productivity, sabotage, disruption in the provision of permanent service and non-observance of discipline among staff and residents, there was no significant difference. Neuman and Baron (1984) and Pearce and Gyakalvn (2003) as well as the following scale factors were introduced and conduct counter-productive as they protest are people who have problems these factors make the development show their objection to the environment, so it is consistent with the results of this study support. On the scale of abuse of positions of others, are Time consuming, deceitful behavior and insubordination and permanent staff and residents. Neuman and Baron (1988) and Pearce and Gyakalvn (2003) and Ansari (2013) found this behavior is similar to the incidence among all staff and there is no difference between them, because they are equal;

The findings supported the hypothesis that variant. The fourth hypothesis in this research is the desire employment and demographic characteristics such as age, education, marital status and history. However, the results showed that there is no difference. Arnold et al (2007) showed that the more job References teachers showed more enthusiasm for the Dhndv difference between them in terms of age, education, marital status and there and the results, this study supports the hypothesis. Julie and Golan (2005) inquiry into the performance of the teachers and the enthusiasm they showed job that history has an influence on career passion, the passion, the experience is much more work to be teachers; The present results do not support the hypothesis. The fifth hypothesis of this study is that there is a difference between job performance and demographic characteristics. However, the results showed no differences among employees in terms of age, education, marital status and history there. This hypothesis can be said about the results because all staff in terms of age, background, education, and marital status all have a specific purpose and they all work together to feel empathy, then there is no difference between these components. Borman (2003) in a study based on work experience, job performance showed that history can play a significant role in performance and staff with more experience can have superior performance than those with less experience. Austin et al (1994) also showed that experience and history plays a major role in performance. The study of the history, the present hypothesis is not supported by the violation. The sixth and last hypothesis is the hypothesis of this research is anti-productive behavior and demographic characteristics are different. The results of the analysis showed that anti-productive behavior in different work experience so you can easily show this behavior. Powell et al (2005) indicate that experience plays no role in the

development of anti-productivity does not after the research hypothesis about the impact of the behavior does not support the anti-productivity. But in the age group, educational level, and marital status there is no difference. Johnson (2006) revealed that job satisfaction and task and personality factors direct relationship with behaviors that are counter-productive, the demographic factors of age, education, and marital status has no effect on the behavior of counter-productivity and supports the findings of this study. Similar studies are suggested by this study, but is broader statistical community. It is suggested that a similar study, but in other areas the climate is different and staff. Relationship between behavior and anti-generate enthusiasm job can be checked in the statistics community. Factors affecting the production of anti-permanent and non-permanent petrochemical staff can be examined. Factors affecting the production of anti-staff bigger petrochemical can be examined. Practical suggestions could include:

- A) With respect to the relationship between the behaviors of anti-production, the staff there is such relationships between agencies and other companies examined.
- B) Organizations and career counseling centers of the findings from this study can be used to help people.
- C) If the proposal is prepared and ready to accept the results of the study intervention used.
- D) Rules and regulations of the company and try to be examined.

Limitations of the study include its small population and limited to a petrochemical company, care must be taken in generalizing the results to the entire community. One of the most important limitations of the study is uncooperative people to complete the questionnaire because of the large volume of items and occurrences.

References

- Alexander. E. & Ellinger , C. (Casey). Findley Musgrove Andrea D. Ellinger, Daniel G. Bachrach Ayşe Banuelmadağbaş. E. & Yu-Lin. W. (2013). Influences of organizational investments in social capital on service employee commitment and performance. *Journal of Business Research* 66 (2013) 1124–1133.
- Bagherian, M. (2005). New approach to decision making in the incredibly wise management, publishing of Asare Andisheh.
- Barrick, M. R. & Mount, M. K. (1991). The Big Five Personality Dimensions and Job Performance: A Meta-Analysis. *Personnel Psychology*; spring, 44, 1; ABI/INFORM Global
- Bernd. M. & Heinz. S. (2004). Antecedents of Counterproductive Behavior at Work: A General Perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology*

- Copyright 2004 by the American Psychological Association 2004, Vol. 89, No. 4, 647–660
- Borman. W.C. (2010). Task Performance and Contextual Performance
- Chockalingam. V. & Denizs. O. (2002). Perspectives on Models of Job Performance. Volume 8, Issue 4, pages 216-226, December 2000
- Danile. M. Cable. T. A. (1996). Person–Organization Fit, Job Choice Decisions, and Organizational Entry. ORGANIZATIONAL BEHAVIOR AND HUMAN DECISION PROCESSES Vol. 67, No. (3), September, pp. 294–311, 1996
- Donald. E. Miles. Walter. E. Borman. Paul. E. Spector. Sozy Fox. (2002). Building an Integrative Model of Extra Role Work Behaviors. INTERNAIONAL JOURNAL OF SELECTION AND
- Dorothea. Wahyu Ariani. the Relationship between Employee Engagement, Organizational Citizenship Behavior, and Counterproductive Work Behavior. Vol. 4, No. 2; 2013
- E. Kevin Kelloway, Lori Francis, Matthew Prosser, James E. Cameron. Counterproductive work behavior as protest. Human Resource Management Review 20 (2010) 18–25
- Emamiyemeybodi, A. (1999). principles of measuring effectiveness and efficiency, school publications.
- Eric Chong. Managerial competencies and career advancement: A comparative study of managers in two countries. Journal of Business Research 66 (2013) 345–353
- Fistjes, F. & Gerigori. J. (2009). theories of personality. Translation: Sayed Yahiya Mohammadi. Publishing of Ravan, Fourth printing. Tehran
- Gholipour, A. (2007). Organizational behavior management. Tehran: the Organization of study and compilation books of Humanities knowledge
- Gregory M. Hertz. John J. Donovan. Personality and Job Performance: The Big Five Revisited. Journal of Applied Psychology 2000, Vol. 85, No. 6, 869–879
- Hogan. R. (2011). A Socioanalytic Perspective on Job Performance.
- Jason A. Colquitt, Brent A. Scott, Jeffery A. LePine. Trust, Trustworthiness, and Trust Propensity: A Meta-Analytic Test of Their Unique Relationships with Risk Taking and Job Performance. Journal of Applied Psychology Copyright 2007 by the American Psychological Association 2007, Vol. 92, No. 4, 909–927
- Julie A. Luft Gillian Roehrig. Enthusiasm Is Not Enough: Beginning Secondary Science Teachers in Primarily Hispanic Settings. Volume 105(3), March 2005
- Karamsichani, F. (2008). What is efficiency?, the industrial base of Iranian intelligence.
- Marisa Salanova* and Susana Llorens. Wilmar B. Schaufeli. "Yes, I Can, I Feel Good, and I Just Do It!" On Gain Cycles and Spirals of Efficacy Beliefs, Affect, and Engagement. APPLIED PSYCHOLOGY: AN INTERNATIONAL REVIEW, 2011, 60 (2), 255–285
- Marloes de Graaf-Zijl, Gerard J. van den Berg and Arjan Heyma 2009. Stepping stones for the unemployed: the effect of temporary jobs on the duration until (regular) work. Journal of Population Economics Journal of the European Society for Population Economics (ESPE)
- Mirsepasi, N. (2002). Strategic management of human resources and Relationship work. Tehran: Mir publications
- Motowidlo, Stephan J; Packard, John S; Manning, Michael. R. (1986). Occupational Stress, cause and consequences for job performance. Journal of Applied Psychology, Vol 71 (4), 618-629.
- Pourabas, A. (2008). The effectiveness of professional self-efficacy in career workshops of Isfahan University employees of passion for University of Isfahan, master's thesis.
- Powell, J. (1987). The psychology of the self. Translate Cultural Services Institute Fereshteh Nayebi, Tehran.
- Reeshad S. Dalal. (2005). A Meta-Analysis of the Relationship between Organizational Citizenship Behavior and Counterproductive Work Behavior. Journal of Applied Psychology Copyright 2005 by the American Psychological Association 2005, Vol. 90, No. 6, 1241–1255
- Reisel, W. D., Probst, T. M., Chia, S.L., Maloles, C. M. & König, C. J. (2010). The effects of job insecurity on job
- Remus. I., Matthias. S., Smithey. F. & Michael D. (2009). Personality and Citizenship Behavior: The Mediating Role of Job Satisfaction. Journal of Applied Psychology © 2009 American Psychological Association 2009, Vol. 94, No. 4, 945–95
- Russell. C., Kaith. J. & Mary. A. K. (2006). Dispositional affectivity as a predictor of work attitudes and job performance.
- Scott I. Tannenbaum & Christopher. P. (2012). Human Factors: The Journal of the Human Factors and Ergonomics Society
- Stephan. J. (2003). Job Performance. Handbook of Psychology. One: 39-53
- Stephan. J., Van. S. James. R. (1994). Evidence that task performance should be distinguished from contextual performance. Journal of Applied Psychology, Vol 79(4), 4

- Timothy. A., Judge. D. (2012). Kammeyer-Mueller. Job Attitudes. *Annu. Rev. Psychol.*
- Timothy. A., Judge. J. & Bono. E. (2001). Relationship of Core Self-Evaluations Traits—Self-Esteem, Generalized Self-Efficacy, Locus of Control, and Emotional Stability—With Job Satisfaction and Job Performance: A Meta-Analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 86, No. 1, 80-92
- Zargaranmoghadam, S. (2011) the impact of the resources and Job requests in Burnout and job passion Staff, the case study: Mobarakeh steel complex, Master's thesis, University of Isfahan
- Zausig, Y. A., Grube, C., Boeker-Blum, T., Busch, C. J., Bayer, Y., Sinner, B., Zink, W., Schaper, N., & Graf, B. M. (2009). Inefficacy of simulator-based training on anesthesiologists' non-technical skills. *Acta Anesthesiologica Scandinavica*, 53, 611-619.