

# MAJOR FACTORS AFFECTING ON THE PRODUCTIVITY OF FACULTY MEMBERS AND THEIR RANKING USING MULTIPLE CRITERIA DECISION METHOD. CASE STUDY: UNIVERSITIES AND HIGHER EDUCATION CENTERS OF THE ARDABIL

Shirin Delshad Namin<sup>1</sup>, Shahram Mirzaei Daryani<sup>2</sup>, Farzad Sattari Ardabili<sup>3</sup>  
(Master of Executive Management<sup>1</sup>; Dr, Assistant Professor<sup>2,3</sup>)

Department of Executive Management, Science and Research Branch, Islamic Azad University, Ardabil<sup>1</sup>

Department of Management, Ardabil Branch, Islamic Azad University, Ardabil<sup>2,3</sup>  
(Ardabil, Iran)

delshad@uma.ac.ir<sup>1</sup>

shahram.daryani@yahoo.com<sup>2</sup>

farzadsattari@yahoo.com<sup>3</sup>

Corresponding author: delshad@uma.ac.ir

## Abstract

This research has examined differences between factors affecting productivity of faculty of universities and higher education centers of the Ardabil based on three groups involved means faculty, staff of educational and research units and students, and are considered as basis of rankings. Based on components of NASIRI POUR model (2011) and using ANOVA test unanimity of different aspects affecting efficiency in terms of the three groups studied. Due to significant differences in means, LSD post hoc test was used and it was determined that in organizational culture, the mean of student than the other two groups, in empowering, the mean of employees than other groups, in the motivational factors, the mean of student than another groups and in the way of managing, the mean of employees than other two groups are different. Finally, using the technique of TOPSIS, factors affecting productivity of faculty were ranked. The results showed that the components of empowerment, environmental conditions, organizational culture, leadership method (management) and motivational factors are most important in enhancing the productivity of faculty members of Ardebil universities, respectively.

*Keywords:* faculty productivity; human resource development; empowerment; motivational factors; TOPSIS.

### Additional data:

UDC 331.445

GRNTI 06.77.71

JEL Code C810, J440

Received 05 October 2013

Accepted 06 December 2013

ISSN 2222-6532

www.meconomics.org

## Introduction

The concept of productivity in production and service units has been studied by many, but whether educational institutions and especially faculty can be assessed with common criteria or not? Productivity not only is considered as a benchmark for measuring the performance, but also its improvement is the prerequisite for socio-economic development of countries (BARANDAK, Mohammad 1997). Therefore, improvement in labor productivity in universities as centers of specialized manpower training and empowerment is important. VAKILI according to his research stated that due to limited human capacity, numerous factors has affected on labor productivity, the most important ones are: motivation, training, Labor relations with management and workplace (VAKILI, BAHMAN. 1991). In researches of GHANEI RAD and GHAZI POUR, the effect of factors such as academic rank and employment on Knowledge production is examined (GHANEI RAD, MOHAMMAD AMIN and GHAZI POUR, FARIDEH. 2002). Another study proposed a comprehensive model and from demographic characteristics (Alvani, M., Ahmadi, P. 2001) to leadership method (Ellis, S., Dick, P. 2003) has been investigated in this study. Wright and his colleagues in their study in China, the role of element of organizational culture on increasing employee motivation and also improving effective productivity evaluated (Wright, R.E 2006).

## Faculty productivity

About definition of the concept of "faculty productivity", there is no consensus (Weiss, D. 1998). The reason for this is lack of agreement on definitions, standards and suitable indicators for the productivity of the faculty members (Doellefeld, s. 1998). On the one hand, because of the lack of agreement on duties of faculty over a week, and difficult to measure and quantify what they are doing, on the other hand, the complexity of the issue has increased. The nature of Faculty productivity commensurate with the job stages (career) of faculty is different (Weiss, D. 1998). "BAR & TAG" believe that for productivity there are two definitions. The first definition is based on the paradigm of education according to it productivity is defined as the cost per hour teaching for each student. In the learning paradigm, productivity is defined as the cost per learning unit for each student (Barr, R. B., Tagg, J. 2008). GUNS and colleagues have found that in 2006, if more services in terms of quantity or quality in education are produced or same amount of resources because of productivity or effectiveness is improved, productivity has been achieved in this case. Also, the Teaching productivity can be defined in terms of taught units, average class size, training costs, etc (Poole, W. 2005). If the quality of student learning is increased more than their education costs, productivity will increase. Here, the quality of student learning is skills that students have acquired. Some scholars, Number of courses, the time allocated to the teaching and research activities or courses that will be taught by the faculty member consider as a measure of productivity (productivity at the individual level). While another group of researchers have analyzed faculty member productivity through data collected at the school level, group or field, not in individual level (Porter, S., Umbach, P. 2001). Activities of an

organization are influenced by a range of factors that understanding and studying these can help to improve activities and realization of organizational goals.

## **Factors affecting the productivity of faculty members**

### **1- Organizational Culture**

Organizations, like people, are the characters that this organization personality format is called culture of that organization (MOGHIMI ZADEH, SM. 2006). Morris knows organizational culture as values or shared perceptions that members of the organization keep them (Morris, M. 1992). Strong culture leads to creating better feeling for employees and do better things. Also, a strong organizational culture increases commitment of employees to the organization and creating align between employee goals and objectives, and this factor is an important factor for increasing productivity (Hersey, P., Blanchard, K. 1983).

**Hypothesis 1: Organizational culture is effective on productivity of faculty members.**

### **2-Environmental conditions**

A good environment can influence the development of personal values, increasing of their ability and their productivity. Environmental factors affecting the productivity of human resources can include observe workplace health and safety principles, precise in placement and arrangement of equipment, providing minimum physical standards for the design of the environment and different sectors, use of appropriate technology and facilities to do things better, accuracy and effort to sequence the parts related to each other in terms of working (ALLAH VERDI, Mustafa, Farah ABADI, SEYYED MOHAMMAD EHSAN and SAJADI, HANIYEH. 2010).

**Hypothesis 2: Environmental conditions are effective on productivity of faculty members.**

### **3-Empowerment**

Empowerment of human resources is the psychological concept that is related to emotions and beliefs to their job and organization and is defined as the process of increasing intrinsic motivation that 5 dimensions including sense of competence (self-efficacy), sense of autonomy (having choice right), feel the effectiveness (impact), the sense of being meaningful (useful) and trust (security) (ABDOLLAHI BIJAN, B. and grandson of Abraham, ABDORRAHIM. 2006). In a research, empowerment is defined as works done by organizations to share power and decision making. (Chang, L., Liu, C. 2008). Scott, in his studies introduced empowering employees as major factor to improve productivity. (Scott, P. 2000).

**Hypothesis 3: Empowering is effective on productivity of faculty members.**

### **4- Motivational Factors**

The motives are behavior grazing that led to beginning and continue of activity. SADEGHI in his research entitled evaluation of factors affecting labor productivity of Welfare Organization headquarters, has proposed motivational factors as the third component affecting labor productivity. From the perspective of faculty members and educational experts of schools of Medical Sciences university of GUILAN, ISSN 2222-6532

motivational factors are most important and have most predictive power to improve labor productivity. (NASIRI POUR, AMIR ASHKAN, MEHRABIAN, FARDIN, MOHAMADIAN, SAKINEH, 2011). Motivational factors may include the following:

1) Extrinsic rewards (financial) 2) intrinsic reward of 3) extrinsic rewards (nonfinancial) 4) Compensation of services 5) Salary and Benefits

**Hypothesis 4: motivational factors are effective on productivity of faculty members.**

#### **5-Leadership Method (management)**

Leadership is defined as one of the principal tasks of manager, the process of influencing and directing the activities related to the working of group members (Stooner and Vankle. 1985). Research conducted by Chuang Fong has shown that leadership style of managers is related to effectiveness, efficiency and productivity of organizations and use of most important relationship style lead to increasing effectiveness and efficiency and ultimately will improve labor productivity (Loke, C. 2001).

**Hypothesis 5: The style of leadership is effective on productivity of faculty members.**

### **Research methodology**

Faculty members, staff and students of educational units and students of Islamic Azad university of Ardabil and ARDABILI MOHAGHEGHE University constitute the population of this research. The number of faculty members is 482 persons, staff of training units is 50 persons and students are 15,000 persons. Cochran's formula is used to determine sample size and based on it the sample size for three groups has been 210, 44 and 370 respectively. The questionnaire was distributed among the three groups. The first part of the faculty questionnaire is related to the demographic characteristics of respondents that included Personal Information and background of people (age, sex, academic field, academic rank and university name). The second part which consists of 29 questions, 5 questions to the organizational culture, 5 questions to the environmental conditions, 6 questions to Empowerment, 7 questions to motivational factors and 6 questions to management method are related. The first part of the staff and students questionnaire is related to the demographic characteristics of respondents that included Personal Information and background of people (age, sex, academic field, academic rank and university name). The second part which consists of 26 questions, 5 questions to the organizational culture, 5 questions to the environmental conditions, 6 questions to Empowerment, 4 questions to motivational factors and 6 questions to management method are related. Results based on a LIKERT RANGE, from totally agree to totally disagree are adjusted which are shown in Table 1.

Table 1.

*Demographic characteristics (N=620)*

<b>Sex</b>	<b>Female: 42.5</b> <b>Male: 57.5</b>
<b>Age group</b>	Under 20 years: 9.9 Over 50 years: 1.1
<b>University</b>	Islamic Azad University: 24.4 University of Mohagheghe Ardabili: 75.6
<b>Lesson group</b>	Humanities: 8.7 Science: 32.1 Engineering: 23.2 Agricultural Sciences: 2.4
<b>Academic</b>	Associate: 4.5 Assistant: 19.2 Coach: 9.9

**Hypotheses Test****The first hypothesis test:**

The initial hypothesis ( $H_0$ ): The organizational culture has no impact on productivity of faculty members.

Research hypothesis ( $H_1$ ): The organizational culture has impact on productivity of faculty members.

Based on the results of the SPSS, given that the significance level calculated is less than five percent ( $sig \leq 0.05$ ), the null hypothesis is rejected. This means that there is a positive relationship between organizational culture and productivity. So with 95% probability, the first sub-hypothesis of research is confirmed. Furthermore, the results of other hypothesis tests of research are presented in Table 2.

Table 2.

*Calculations of hypotheses test*

<b>Hypothesis</b>	<b>Variables</b>	<b>ANOVA test</b>	<b>Significant level</b>	<b>Decision</b>
Hypothesis 1	Organizational culture has an impact on faculty productivity.	21.607	0.000	Reject H0
Hypothesis 2	Environmental conditions have impact on faculty productivity.	2.039	0.131	Accept H0
Hypothesis 3	Empowerment has an impact on faculty productivity.	8.433	0.000	Reject H0
Hypothesis 4	Motivational Factors have impact on faculty productivity.	25.510	0.000	Reject H0
Hypothesis 5	Management method has an impact on faculty productivity.	10.820	0.000	Reject H0

Cronbach's alpha was used for reliability testing. Based on these test, the value calculated for the questionnaire was 0.910 and for each group and any dimension of factors is given in Table 3.

Table 3.

*Cronbach's alpha*

Three groups	Student	Staff	Professor	Organizational Culture	Environmental conditions	Empowerment	Motivational Factors	Management method
<b>0.910</b>	0.913	0.897	0.906	0.848	0.768	0.866	0.684	0.835

When the test of variance analysis (*ANOVA*) was performed, which revealed a significant level for environmental conditions is *0.131*, and the *F* - *2.039*, the null hypothesis is accepted, that means there is no significant relationship between faculty productivity and environmental conditions. However, a significant level for organizational culture, empowerment, motivational factors and management method is equal to *0.000*, so the null hypothesis is rejected for these factors, that means the average of these variables are significant. To see the difference between which factors is a significant, *LSD* post hoc test was used and the results are shown in Table 4. In organizational culture, the mean of student than the other two groups, in empowering, the mean of employees than other groups, in the motivational factors, the mean of student than another groups and in the way of managing and the mean of employees than other groups are different.

Table 4.

*LSD post hoc test*

Dependent variable	(I) Job	(J) Job	The mean difference (I-J)	Standard error	Significant Level	Confidence interval 95%	
						Lower bound	Upper bound
Organizational Culture	Employee	Student	0.45295 *	0.13224	.001	0.1932	0.7126
		Professor	0.01061	0.13749	0.939	- 0.2594	0.2806
	Student	Employee	- 0.45295 *	0.13224	.001	- 0.7126	- 0.1932
		Professor	- 0.44234 *	0.07165	.000	- 0.5830	- 0.3016
	Professor	Employee	- 0.01061	0.13749	0.939	- 0.2806	0.2594
		Student	0.44234 *	0.07165	.000	0.3016	0.5830
Environmental conditions	Employee	Student	0.21700	0.13029	0.096	- 0.0389	0.4729
		Professor	0.11489	0.13546	0.397	- 0.1511	0.3809
	Student	Employee	- 0.21700	0.13029	0.096	- 0.4729	0.0389
		Professor	- 0.10211	0.07059	0.149	- 0.2407	0.0365
	Professor	Employee	- 0.11489	0.13546	0.397	- 0.3809	0.1511
		Student	0.10211	0.07059	0.149	- 0.0365	0.2407
Empowerment	Employee	Student	0.53043 *	0.13280	.000	0.2696	0.7912
		Professor	0.40664 *	0.13808	.003	0.1355	0.6778
	Student	Employee	- 0.53043 *	0.13280	.000	- 0.7912	- 0.2696
		Professor	- 0.12379	0.07195	.086	- 0.2651	0.0175
	Professor	Employee	- 0.40664 *	0.13808	.003	- 0.6778	- 0.1355
		Student	0.12379	0.07195	.086	- 0.0175	0.2651
Motivational Factors	Employee	Student	0.40018 *	0.10835	.000	0.1874	0.6130
		Professor	0.00459	0.11275	0.968	- 0.2168	0.2260
	Student	Employee	- 0.40018 *	0.10835	.000	- 0.6130	- 0.1874
		Professor	- 0.39560 *	0.05888	.000	- 0.5112	- 0.2800
	Professor	Employee	- 0.00459	0.11275	0.968	- 0.2260	0.2168

		Student	0.39560 *	0.05888	.000	0.2800	0.5112
Management practices	Employee	Student	0.39306 *	0.12489	.002	0.1478	0.6383
		Professor	0.12399	0.12985	0.340	- 0.1310	0.3790
	Student	Employee	- 0.39306 *	0.12489	.002	- 0.6383	- 0.1478
		Professor	- 0.26907 *	0.06767	.000	- 0.4020	- 0.1362
	Professor	Employee	- 0.12399	0.12985	0.340	- 0.3790	0.1310
		Student	0.26907 *	0.06767	.000	0.1362	0.4020

\*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

The results of *LSD* test show that there is disagreement difference between the staff and faculty in the field of organizational culture. Staff and faculty about management practices and motivational factors also have had disagreements. Interestingly, there are differences between students and faculty about the effectiveness of empowerment factors on their effectiveness. Perhaps, the lack of sufficient knowledge of the students about capabilities of teachers, also student assessment based on output of teachers activities cause these differences or adequate understanding of the teachers about students considered criteria has created these differences. But all parties involved in the investigation of the influence of environmental factors, have been unanimous. Teachers and staff disagreements in three dimensions of the dimensions proposed in the research indicate the gap between executive body and support of academic units investigated.

### TOPSIS technique

In this study, to rank the factors affecting the productivity of faculty members, among methods of *MCDM*, *TOPSIS* technique has been chosen, the results are given in Table 5. As can be seen, Empowerment factor has most impact and management method has the least impact on faculty productivity of Ardabil.

Table 5.

*Ranking of factors affecting on productivity of faculty members*

Factors affecting on productivity of faculty members	Distance from the positive ideal	Distance from the negative ideal	CL	Rank
<b>Empowerment</b>	0.003	0.018	0.86	<b>1</b>
<b>Environmental conditions</b>	0.014	0.014	0.50	<b>2</b>
<b>Organizational Culture</b>	0.012	0.0098	0.44	<b>3</b>
<b>Motivational Factors</b>	0.012	0.0092	0.43	<b>4</b>
<b>Leadership style</b>	0.017	0.01	0.37	<b>5</b>

### Discussion and conclusions

Productivity model of faculty members at the University of Islamic Azad University and Mohagheghe Ardebili University has five components, among these factors, the empowerment with  $CL=0.86$  has most impact and management method with  $CL=0.37$  has least impact on productivity of faculty members in terms of three groups. In this regard, a research which is conducted by NASIRI POUR and his

colleagues entitled "the evaluation of the relationship between organizational culture and human resources in Education hospital of Iran university of Medical Sciences, found that there is positive and significant relationship between organizational culture and human resource productivity (Nasiri Pour, Amir Ashkan, Mehrabian, Fardin, Mohamadian, Sakineh, 2011). In the present study, the second hypothesis was rejected, But Spence studies in 2002 showed that improving the work environment conditions has a positive impact on staff and they will commit to making a greater effort to perform tasks in an organization. (Spence, K. 2002). Scott, in his studies has been introduced empowering employees as a major factor to improve productivity (Scott, P. 2000). According the perspective of faculty members and Training experts of University of Medical Sciences of GILAN, motivational factor after organizational culture is most important for improving the productivity of labor (Nasiri Pour, Amir Ashkan, Mehrabian, Fardin, Mohamadian, Sakineh, 2011). The findings of Roger's research also imply that leadership and communications manager with team members improve the productivity significantly (Roger, M. 1996). Therefore, managers should attempt to promote productivity culture and strengthen it and by providing field of creativity and innovation, they can create the moral and material incentives in faculty members. Also they can create appropriate field for improving productivity of university by using the appropriate style according to university status and environmental conditions, providing the appropriate conditions for open discussion and exchange between employees, allocate sufficient funds for the grant award to the research findings, holding conferences, adequate funding for research, make connections with other scientific organizations, creating networks of decentralized decision-making.

Although this research is somewhat similar to model of Nasiri Pour and colleagues, but this research includes the perspective of three groups and their comments have been incorporated, not just a comment of a group is used. Although the results of *TOPSIS* method show prioritization of the elements, but look at the *LSD* test results show that, despite the position taken by environmental factors, due to no disagreements between the parties involved, this criteria can leads to faster effectiveness than other criteria. On the other hand, disagreement between employees and professors illustrates the importance of more coordination, and perhaps can be considered as one of the factors affecting possible defects of empowerment policies performing which the schools are run. Lack of proper implementation of the management activities can be observed with perspective difference these two groups regarding the impact of management activities. Furthermore, according to the correlation between leadership style and organizational climate are known the next works (Koene, Bas. A. S.; Vogelaar. Ad. L. W. & Soeters. Joseph. L. 2002). The impact of perspective difference of staff and faculty will be more obvious. Because one of the factors shaping organizational climate is leadership style (Implementation of management policies). The results indicate that to eliminate the gap between the three groups, and the importance of empowering professors as output of the system, the university management structures and operating methods of university policies have to change and patterns of decision-making and management mechanisms should be specified.



### References

- Abdollahi B.B., Abdorrahim A., 2006, *Empowerment golden, Golden key for HRM*, Tehran (In Persian).
- Verdi A., Farah Abadi M., Mohammad Ehsan S., Haniyeh S., 2010, 'Prioritize the factors affecting the efficiency of human resources in terms of middle managers of Isfahan University of Medical Sciences', *Hospital Quarterly*, no. 3-4, pp. 81. (In Persian).
- Alvani, M., Ahmadi, P., 2001, 'Designing a model for human resources productivity by using management productivity approach', *Journal Research Scientific*, vol. 5, pp. 19-27.
- Barandak M., 1997, *Measure of research productivity in Engineering universities, Proceedings of the First Seminar of Higher Education in Iran*, Allameh Tabatabaei University Press Tehran (In Persian).
- Barr, R.B., Tagg, J., 2008, *From teaching to learning a new paradigm for undergraduate education U.S.A.*, Palomar College, San Marcos.
- Chang, L.-C., Liu, C.-H., 2008, 'Employee empowerment, innovative behavior and job productivity of public health nurses: A cross-sectional questionnaire survey', *International Journal of Nursing Studies*, vol. 45, no. 10, pp 1442-1448.
- Doellefeld, S., 1998, *Faculty Productivity: A Conceptual Analysis & Research Synthesis*, thesis, State University of New York, U.S.A.
- Ellis, S., Dick, P. 2003, *Introduction to Organizational Behavior*, 3<sup>rd</sup> edn., McGraw Hill.
- Ghanei R., Amin M. and Ghazi Pour, F., 2002, 'Normative and institutional factors affecting the productivity of faculty', *Research Letters*, year VII, no. 4. (In Persian).
- Hersey, P., Blanchard, K., 1983, *Management of organizational Behavior*, New Jersey Prentice -Hall.
- Bas. K., Vogelaar. Ad. L.W. & Soeters J.L., 2002, 'Leadership effects on organizational climate and financial performance: Local leadership effect in chain organizations', *The leadership quarterly*, vol. 13, no. 3, pp.193-215.
- Loke, C., 2001, 'Leadership behaviors: effect on job satisfaction, productivity and organizational commitment', *Journal Nursing Management*, vol. 9, no. 4 pp. 191-204.
- Moghimi Z., SM., 2006, *Organization and management; research approach*, 4<sup>rd</sup> edn., Termeh, Tehran. (In Persian).
- Morris, III., Richard M., 1992, 'Effective organizational culture is key to a company's long- term success', *Industrial Management*, vol. 34, no. 2, p. 28.
- Pour N., Mehrabian A.A., Sakineh F.M., 2011, 'Evaluation the importance of the factors identified for labor productivity in terms of staff and faculty members of Gilan University of Medical Sciences', *Research - Sciences Journal of Zanjan University of Medical Sciences*, vol. 19, no. 75, pp. 106-94. (In Persian).
- Poole, W., 2005, *Improving productivity in higher education* Webster University. St. Louis.
- Porter, S., Umbach, P., 2001, 'Analyzing Faculty Workload Data Using Multilevel Modeling' *Research In Higher Education*, vol.42, no2, pp. 171-196.



- Roger, M., 1996, Pulling through with productivity; leadership and cooperation are teamwork traits that let productivity grow to full potential, *Transportation and Distribution*, September, 36.
- Scott, P. 2000. Higher education reformed. London, Falmer press.
- Spence H.K., Laschinger J., Shamian J., 2002, 'The impact of workplace empowerment, organizational trust on staff nurses' work satisfaction and organizational commitment', *Advances in Health Care Management*, vol.3, pp. 59-85.
- Stooner and Vankle., 1985, *Organizational Behavior*, Willey Anderson Inc.
- Bahman V., 1991, *Evaluation of role importance of productivity and ways of improving emphasizing the public sector*, PBO, Economic Affairs Bureau, Population and Manpower Bureau. (In Persian).
- Weiss, D. 1998, *The relationship between faculty group development & faculty productivity in higher education*, Doctoral dissertation Temple University.
- Wright, R.E, 2006, 'Student Evaluations of Faculty: Concerns Raised in the Literature and Possible Solutions, *College Student Journal*, vol. 40, no. 2, pp. 417-422.

## ИСПОЛЬЗОВАНИЕ МУЛЬТИКРИТЕРИАЛЬНОГО МЕТОДА РЕШЕНИЙ ОБ ОСНОВНЫХ ФАКТОРАХ, ВЛИЯЮЩИХ НА ПРОИЗВОДИТЕЛЬНОСТЬ СОТРУДНИКОВ ФАКУЛЬТЕТА И ИХ РЕЙТИНГ (НА ПРИМЕРЕ УНИВЕРСИТЕТОВ И ВЫСШИХ ОБРАЗОВАТЕЛЬНЫХ ЦЕНТРОВ АРДЕБИЛЯ)

Ширин Делшад Намин<sup>1</sup>  
Шахрам Мирзаеи Дариани<sup>2</sup>  
Фарзад Саттари Ардабили<sup>3</sup>

Исламский университет Азад, Научно-исследовательский филиал Ардебиля<sup>1</sup>  
Исламский университет Азад, филиал в городе Ардебиль<sup>2,3</sup>  
(Иран)

**Аннотация.** Представленное исследование направлено на изучение различий между факторами, влияющими на производительность сотрудников факультетов университетов и высших учебных центров Ардебиля на основе трех групп, участвующих в исследовании: преподаватели, сотрудники образовательных и научно-исследовательских подразделений и студенты, а также рассматриваются основы рейтингования. На основе компонентов модели Насери Пур (2011) и с помощью дисперсионного анализа исследовано единодушие по различным аспектам, влияющим на эффективность с точки зрения трех групп исследуемых. В связи со значительными различиями в значениях, использовался метод группирования выборок с наименее значимой разницей и было определено, что организационная культура значимее для студентов, расширение возможностей важнее сотрудникам, мотивационные факторы – студентам, способы управления – сотрудникам. Наконец, используя технику определения порядкового номера (ранга) близостью к идеальному решению, были ранжированы факторы, влияющие на производительность факультета. Результаты показали, что компоненты расширения прав и возможностей, экзогенных условий, организационная культура, методы руководства (управления) и мотивационные факторы являются наиболее важными в повышении эффективности профессорско-преподавательского состава университетов Ардебиля.

**Ключевые слова:** производительность факультета; развитие человеческих ресурсов; расширение прав и возможностей; мотивационные факторы; Метод определения порядкового номера (или ранга) близостью к идеальному решению.