Trends in Life Sciences
An International Peer-reviewed Journal
www.sciencejournal.in

EXAMINING THE RELATIONSHIP AMONG PRODUCTIVE MOTIFS IN INDUSTRIAL WORKGROUPS TO BOOST THE RELATIVE COMPETITIVE POWER AIMING AT INCREASING THE PURE PRODUCTION

Seyed Hamed Razavi and Mehran Molavi[1]
Department of Public Administration, Mahabad Branch, Islamic Azad University, Mahabad, Iran

ABSTRACT
The other attitude toward the production is the pure production. In this method, one attempts to minimize the waste of effort and that the maximum level of productivity is achieved by human resources and capital. Also, the enterprises should consider the competitive power as the fundamental concept. The competitive power involves observable and non-observable assets which come together to improve the efficiency of required inputs for the production of good. Another factor to be given attention is the motivation. Employers' motivation is regarded as an important asset for every business particularly for the enterprises. The aim of the present study is to examine the establishment of motivation across industrial group works for boosting the relative competitive power aiming at increasing pure production in Songon copper of Varzegan. The study follows a descriptive-survey design. The data were collected via questionnaire. To determine the effect of variables on each other was made by Pearson correlation test and linear regression. The sample size was 196. Findings of the present study indicated that there was a significant relationship between field, comparison, management, and content-based factors and pure production; however, no relationship was found between productive motivation and relative competitive power.

KEYWORDS: productive motivation, pure production, relative competitive power

INTRODUCTION

Globalization and the increase of global competition in recent years have made fundamental changes in industries and organizations so that the management science experts have drawn their attention toward the establishment and using those types of mechanisms through which the organizations can improve the level of productivity and reduce the expenses so that they continue to resist them. Because of the fact that pure production is discussed as a philosophy in implementation management, most of the experts have suggested diverse instruments for effective and efficient use such as value-based engineering, customer relation management, reengineering of processes, immediate production, and etc. In practice, many of the companies have faced numerous problems due to the lack of a comprehensive model of implementation and evaluation as well as its tools hen confronting the problems. Hence, the main need of the researches into the field of pure studies is developing appropriate models for implementing and evaluating the extent of pureness. Regarding the vast use of the industry of this model, conducting researches on the comprehensive model is of great importance and can be taken into account as the problem solving factor when it comes to purity. One can mention production motivation as another possible effective element among the employers, the lack of which would bring about problems in this regard. Motif is not an issue only regarded in recent years; rather it has captured the attention of philosophers, wise men, and production managers.

Review of literature

Definition of pure

Basically, there are two definitions of pure. One of them is the systematic in order to remove the wastes through continuous prosecution and the other definition is the comprehensive process of business and not only the production. The pure production is not only restricted to a particular activity, rather it encompasses the activities which involve the business form the production time to the aftersales services. Different organizations should identify that purity is a journeys which no one achieves. Imagine that Toyota company makes efforts to achieve it, yet is has failed to do so. There is no unite formula. Every business should implement the purity in proportion to its conditions. Although larger companies such as Toyota and Honda have attempted to attain the purity throughout their trip, the purity can be implemented in business involving less than 15-member groups (Modiryar, 2008). There are twenty types of instruments and techniques, all of which are related to the measurement issue. Many of these instruments are dependent

[1] Corresponding author, email: dr_molavi1967@yahoo.com

despite the fact there is no set of established implementation way. Most of these instruments can be integrated within a business, either they are a protective way for production or as service providing organization. Every organization is in its own and exclusive size, but it is these instruments that are used to support the performances. Many of these instruments can be integrate with one another within a business, either in support systems or in service providing organization. There are two common measuring cases: inventory turnover and the expectation time. The pure core is embed in the continuous improvement of processes and its philosophy roots within all activities that do not add value and that their implementation reduces the wastes in organization. The related term to unity is the Kaizen word which means continuous improvement. Kaizen is the methodology whose main purpose if to improve the process. The main goals of Kaizen involve the reduction of waste, improvement of quality, reduction in delivery time, guaranteeing safe working place and increase of customer satisfaction (Ajripor, 2012).

The other philosophy and attitude to the production is pure production whose origin is in Japan. Later, this approach developed in Europe and America and captured the attention of many car manufacturing companies. It is attempted in this method to minimize the waste and to maximize the efficiency in facilities as well as human resources. Of the factors contributing to the pure production are information technology and management information system, human resources, suppliers chain management, organizing and leadership, purchasing and supplying, supply chain management, production process management, maintenance and repair management (Seyedhoseini and Bayat tork, 2005). The pure production is a trend which is initiated by the formation of multi-task groups and involves continuous development of processes, continuous reduction of expenses, total quality management, expansion of qualitative performance and designing for production. Also, pure production system with such a mixture endeavors to offer its new products rapidly in a way that lower expenses are considered. The focus of pure production is one continuous reduction of expenses and improvement of quality. A producer whose immediate goal is purity ignores the demand of consumer compared to the efficiency of expenses. Another factor which should be given utmost attention in workgroups and enterprises is the motivation. In this regard, Rezaeian demonstrates that people with higher levels of motivation outperform the other people. Hence, employers' needs should be met. In other words, the nature of affairs should be motif-based (Rezaeian, 1993; 286-287). Investigation into the motivation issue is the answer to human behaviors. The answer to the questions of why people work, why some people are more hard work than others, and what are the reasons of reluctance and enthusiasm toward job. These questions have to do with the issue of motivation (Elvani, 1997; 179-180). When employers perform in a correct and motivated way, the production increases and economic wheels turn out to work properly. Motivating employers to do activities in business leads to development in workplace for doing the job and affairs.

Goals of pure production

The aim of pure production is perfectionism. Such a perfectionism is based on integrated reduction of expenses, minimizing the deficiencies and increase of products diversity. The most important goal of pure production is increasing customer satisfaction and lowering of expense. Mosakhani *et al.* (2006) demonstrate the goal of pure production as follows:

Production of things that are not followed by people
Assets and sold products to be stored
A number of levels and stages which are not necessary
Movement and exchange of human force
Transportation of goods from one area to another
Stopping and expectation (Mosakhani, Feghi Farahmand, & Panahi, 2006).

Related studies

In a study conducted in 2008 to evaluate the results of reward based on the increase of production in one of the large companies in Iran, the data were as follows: production amount, reward cost, productivity of human force, productivity of energy, long life of equipment, base wage, training, quality of materials, repairing and maintenance. The data were collected from 5-month performance of company and were analyzed by the simultaneous equations. The results indicated that the relationship between the variables was not in line with the expected results. In other words, paying the reward was not necessarily effective (Keramati, Nori, & Rezazade, 2008).

Toloei Ashlagi *et al.* identified in their study the effective indexes in establishing pure production and prioritized the identified indexes using hierarchical analysis process. In order to convert different indexes and relative importance, dimensional analysis model was employed. The number obtained from this model was compared with the standard global pure production scale. Finally, appropriate mathematical model was provided (Toloei Ashlagi & Ehtesham Rati, 2009).

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The present study is applied since all theories, laws, principles and techniques are used to solve the problems. So, the study is that of applied and is descriptive-survey in terms of the design. The statistical population comprises of 530 employers working in Songon Copper Company, so the sample size was obtained as 217 using Morgan table. Two questionnaires were utilized in the study; the former including the 18 items having to do with effective factors o employers' motivation. The second question included 31 items among which 27 items were related to the pure production and 4 items had to do with the relative competition power.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

First hypothesis: there is a relationship between field factors of production motivation and pure production.

Table 1: Correlations between production motivation and pure production

		Pure Production	Production Motivation
Pure Production	Pearson Correlation	1	.197**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.006
	N	196	196
Production Motivation	Pearson Correlation	.197**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.006	
	N	196	196

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

The relationship between field factors and pure production was positive. Also, there was a significant relationship between field factors and pure production. Linear regression test indicated that beta was 0.143. So, regression coefficient was significant. So, one unit increase in score of field factors increased one unit of pure production to 0.143.

Table 2: Coefficients (dependent variable: pure production)

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	4.961	.157		31.672	.000
	Production Motivation	.143	.051	.197	2.805	.006

Second hypothesis: there is a relationship between comparison factors of production motivation and pure production.

Table 3: Correlations between comparison factors of production motivation and pure production

		Pure Production	Comparison Factors
Pure Production	Pearson Correlation	1	.165*
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.021
	N	196	196
Comparison Factors	Pearson Correlation	.165*	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.021	
	N	196	196

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

The relationship between comparison factors and pure production was positive. Also, there was a significant relationship between comparison factors and pure production. Linear regression test indicated that beta was 0.136. So, regression coefficient was significant. So, one unit increase in score of field factors increased one unit of pure production to 0.136.

Table 4: Coefficients (dependent variable: pure production)

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	5.008	.168		29.727	.000
	mogayesemean	.136	.059	.165	2.324	.021

Third hypothesis: there is a relationship between management factors of production motivation and pure production.

Table 5: Correlations between management factors of production motivation and pure production

		Pure Production	Management Factors
Pure Production	Pearson Correlation	1	.148*
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.039
	N	196	196
Management Factors	Pearson Correlation	.148*	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.039	
	N	196	196

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

The results of Pearson correlation tests indicated that the relationship between management factors and pure production was positive. Also, there was a significant relationship between management factors and pure production. Linear regression test indicated that beta was 0.106. So, regression coefficient was significant. So, one unit increase in score of management factors increased one unit of pure production to 0.106.

Table 6: Coefficients (dependent variable: pure production)

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	5.136	.127		40.405	.000
	Management Factors	.106	.051	.148	2.078	.039

Fourth hypothesis: there is a relationship between content factors of production motivation and pure production. The relationship between content factors and pure production was positive. Also, there was a significant relationship between content factors and pure production. Linear regression test indicated that beta was 0.091. So, regression coefficient was significant. So, one unit increase in score of content factors increased one unit of pure production to 0.091.

Fifth hypothesis: there is a relationship between establishing production motivation and pure production. Pearson correlation test indicated that there was a slight positive relationship between establishing production motivation and relative competition power; however, no relationship was found between establishing production motivation and relative competition power. Linear regression test showed that beta was 0.008, so the regression coefficient was not significant. Sixth hypothesis: there is a relationship between relative competition power and pure production. The relationship between relative competition power and pure production was positive. Also, there was a significant

relationship between relative competition power and pure production. Linear regression test indicated that beta was 0.506. So, regression coefficient was significant. So, one unit increase in score of relative competition power increased one unit of pure production to 0.506.

REFERENCES

Ajrapor A. (2012). Pure production. http://maghaleh.net/article311.html
Elvani S.M. (1997). Public management. Tehran: Nei publications.
Keramati M., Nori, Z., Rezazade, A. (2008). Evaluating the relationship between reward and increase of reward using simultaneous equations. *Solut.-bas. Manag. Res.*19150: 160-177.
Modiryar (2008). Pure Management Principles. *J. Man*. 3(12): 65-72.
Mosakhani M., Feghi Farahmand and Panahi, S. (2012). Pure production. *Man. Develop.*, 1(140), 54-63.
Rezaeian A. 1993. Organizational behavioral management. Tehran: Tehran University.
Seyedhoseini S.M. and Bayat Tork, A. (2005). Evaluating the factors of pure production in productive organizations (case study: Sadid Industrial Group). *Hum. Sci. Instru.* 9 (1): 59-86.
Toloei Ashlagi A., Motadel, M.R., and Ehtesham, R. (2009). Providing analytic model in establishing pure production system 9case study: Tehran Shoes Industry). *Researcher*. 6 (10): 36-45.

