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Abstract
The main aim of current research is surveying the relationship between work ethics and employee’s productivity of Lorestan province’s Education Department. Its statistical society includes 205 formal employees of Lorestan province’s Education Department that 136 persons are selected within them. The aim of research is applicable and its method is descriptive-correlation. For this reason, a questionnaire with 30 questions is used for surveying the work ethics as well as a questionnaire with 27 questions for surveying the productivity. Questionnaires’ reliability is confirmed by professors and their validity is confirmed by Cronbach’s alpha coefficient (83% work ethics and 81% productivity). Spearman correlation coefficient is used for statistical analyzing. Research’s result shows a direct positive relationship between all elements of work ethics (individual, occupational, organizational and management elements) with employees’ productivity.
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Introduction
Human being is the most important capital of an organization. If we remove human factor from an organization, what is remain will be elements and facilities such as buildings, machineries, equipment, tools and instruments, materials and etc. that are useless themselves with have no value. (Sharifi, 2002). Simultaneous with the end of classic android’s dominance and instrumental view towards management, more attention are gained to human and its existence dimensions; as a result, related researches to organizational behavior receive more attention and a territory as “work ethics or conscience” is raised within a lot of intellectuals. Conscience is defined as an inner force that guides a person or society towards good and correct behaviors. This force or power that is located within human heart or senses, impact on the way of thinking and behaviors via a complex process (Abbas Zade, 1995). On the other hand, the main aim of each organization is access to optimal productivity. It means pay attention to the management of an organization as well as employees’ metal and physical health for providing a situation for each employee to try with satisfaction and interest without any force and fear of punishment for the best level of productivity and use all of his potential cognitive, emotional and behavioral power (Saatchi, 2003).

Literature and background of the research
Work ethics: in different definitions of ethics, it is known as an inner and individual’s judgment power of a person that make a human aware of his good and evil acts and help him in selecting correct behaviors. As it can been perceived from this total definition, conscience is an inner power as well as an individual’s perception and understanding that is not same in all persons (Alvani, 1998).
Conscience means core, heart and intellect in English language and is named as inner and spiritual feeling that causes to recognize good against bad (Satoot, 2001). Concepts such as work ethics and commitment have meaning after the person entrance to the society and his interact with the surrounding environment. Therefore, it can be said that against political, cultural and economic system as well as related structures to these systems, it reinforces or weakens the person’s attitude towards work and producing; but desire to work and satisfy the needs are embedded in every human and it is inherent (Torabian, 2002).

Cohen believes that work ethics is not related to the organization or profession since it is related to the work, itself. Ones, who do a work, have a strong sense of duty towards it and they have inner value for any kind of work that is the main element in their lives (Christopher, 2010).

Effective elements on work ethics (Abbas Zade, 1995):
- Personal elements: values, culture, perceptions, attitudes, needs and personality.
- Professional elements: work attraction, work meaningfulness, hardness of the work, sensitivity and complexity of the work.
- Organizational elements: organizations have different specifications, dimensions and elements that are effective on the persons’ work ethics.
- Management elements: actuation of the employees, performance appraisal, reward and punishment as well as job satisfaction

Productivity: it is an English term that means “production power, fertility and productivity”

In some definitions, productivity is pointed in two concepts of efficiency and effectiveness and sum of them. Traditionally, effectiveness is defined as achieving the aims of an organization. Meanwhile, that efficiency has a close meaning to productivity is defined as a proper use of resources. According to these two definitions, productivity can be defined as proper doing of a work that includes two concepts of efficiency and effectiveness (Mobini, 2008).

Research methodology
The aim of current research is applicable and its nature and method is descriptive-correlative. The statistical society of the current study includes 205 formal employees of Lorestan province’s Education Department. Morgan table is used for determining the sample volume. According to the statistical society volume in this research (205 persons), 136 persons are selected as sample volume. Since research is done in six different fields, for surveying a sample that is representative of the community, classified random sampling method is used in each level and according to its contribution forms the total community, questionnaires are distributed and gathered.

Required data and information are regulated according to documentations, books, articles, papers and questionnaires that is one of the most common field techniques according to 5-choince scale of Likrat. For this reason, grading for each question is from very much to very little. Questionnaire is related to sociological characteristics including gender, educational level, years of service and marital status. Meanwhile, used questionnaire in this research is a combination of two parts of work ethics and productivity:

Reliability of the questionnaire
First, both questionnaires are distributed between 30 persons of statistical society and then it is done via SPSS software and Cronbach’s alpha coefficient that this coefficient is equal to 83% for work ethics questionnaire and 81% for human resources productivity questionnaire. According to this matter that the above coefficients are more than 70%, therefore, the questionnaire reliability has internal consistency and proper reliability coefficient.

Surveying the research hypothesis
First hypothesis: there is a relation between personal elements and employees’ productivity.
Zero hypothesis: no relationship between personal elements and employees’ productivity.
Opposite hypothesis: a relationship between personal elements and employees’ productivity.

Table 1: Surveying the research hypothesis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kind of test</th>
<th>First variable</th>
<th>Second variable</th>
<th>numbers</th>
<th>The correlation coefficient</th>
<th>The significance level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spearman test</td>
<td>Personal elements</td>
<td>Employees’ productivity</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>0.538</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the above table, since significance level of the correlation test is less than 0.05, therefore, zero hypotheses is rejected and it can be said with 95% confidence that there is a significant relation between two variables.

Second hypothesis: there is a relation between professional elements and employees productivity.
Zero hypothesis: no relationship between professional elements and employees productivity.
Opposite hypothesis: a relationship between professional elements and employees productivity.

Table 2: variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kind of test</th>
<th>First variable</th>
<th>Second variable</th>
<th>numbers</th>
<th>The correlation coefficient</th>
<th>The significance level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spearman test</td>
<td>professional elements</td>
<td>Employees productivity</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>0.481</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the above table, since significance level of the correlation test is less than 0.05, therefore, zero hypotheses is rejected and it can be said with 95% confidence that there is a significant relation between two variables.

Third hypothesis: there is a relation between organizational elements and employees productivity.
Zero hypothesis: no relationship between organizational elements and employees productivity.
Opposite hypothesis: a relationship between organizational elements and employees productivity.

Table 3:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kind of test</th>
<th>First variable</th>
<th>Second variable</th>
<th>numbers</th>
<th>The correlation coefficient</th>
<th>The significance level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spearman test</td>
<td>organizational elements</td>
<td>Employees productivity</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>0.354</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the above table, since significance level of the correlation test is less than 0.05, therefore, zero hypotheses is rejected and it can be said with 95% confidence that there is a significant relation between two variables.

Fourth hypothesis: there is a relation between management elements and employees productivity.
Zero hypothesis: no relationship between management elements and employees productivity.
Opposite hypothesis: a relationship between management elements and employees productivity.

Table 4:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kind of test</th>
<th>First variable</th>
<th>Second variable</th>
<th>numbers</th>
<th>The correlation coefficient</th>
<th>The significance level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spearman test</td>
<td>organizational elements</td>
<td>Employees’ productivity</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>0.425</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
According to the above table, since significance level of the correlation test is less than 0.05, therefore, zero hypotheses is rejected and it can be said with 95% confidence that there is a significant relation between two variables.

Main hypothesis: there is a relationship between work ethics and employees’ productivity.

Zero hypothesis: no relationship between work ethics and employees’ productivity.

Opposite hypothesis: a relationship between work ethics and employees’ productivity.

| Table 5: |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Kind of test | First variable | Second variable | numbers | The correlation coefficient | The significance level |
| Spearman test | Work ethics | Employees productivity | 136 | 0.715 | 0.000 |

According to the above table, since significance level of the correlation test is less than 0.05, therefore, zero hypotheses is rejected and it can be said with 95% confidence that there is a significant relation between two variables.

Conclusions
While performed analysis on four sub-hypothesis reveal correlation between personal elements and productivity, professional elements and productivity, organizational elements and productivity and management elements and productivity, therefore, four elements that are dimensions of the research’s predict variable determine correlation between work ethics and productivity in the studied society. If we want to change the employees’ productivity, we should improve each of these four dimensions of work ethics since they are effective in employee’s’ productivity.
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