

The Effects of Demographic Characteristics on Employees' Motivation to Participate in the In-Service Training Courses based on the Modified Expectancy Theory

LES EFFETS DES CARACTÉRISTIQUES DÉMOGRAPHIQUES SUR LA MOTIVATION DES SALARIÉS À PARTICIPER À DES COURS DE FORMATION CONTINUE BASÉE SUR LA THÉORIE DE L'ESPÉRANCE DE MODIFICATION

Mohammad Reza Jalilvand¹

Farhad Ebrahimabadi²

Abstract: Modified expectancy theory provided a useful framework for assessing employee behavior in learning, decision-making, and motivation. The purpose of current study is to determine the effects of demographic characteristics on employees' motivation based on the modified expectancy theory. Population was the employees of National Iranian Oil Products Distribution Company in Isfahan and Kurdistan. Multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was used for data analysis. Finding reveals that the type of employment influences expectancy, intrinsic instrumentality, extrinsic valence, and motivation of employees for participating in the in-service training courses in the oil industry setting. Additionally, employee's education influenced widely extrinsic instrumentality.

Key words: Modified expectancy theory; Demographic characteristics; Motivation

Résumé La théorie de l'espérance de modification/de la mise à jour a fourni un cadre utile pour évaluer le comportement des employés dans l'apprentissage, la prise de décision, et la motivation. Le but de l'étude présente est de déterminer les effets des caractéristiques démographiques sur la motivation des salariés fondée sur la théorie de l'espérance de modification. Les sujets d'étude sont les employés de la Compagnie nationale iranienne de la distribution des produits pétroliers à Isfahan et Kurdistan. L'analyse multivariée de la variance (ANMDVA) a été utilisée pour l'analyse des données. Le résultat révèle que le type d'emploi influe sur l'espérance, l'instrumentalité intrinsèque, la valence extrinsèque, et la motivation des employés à participer aux cours de formation en service dans le cadre de l'industrie pétrolière. De plus, la formation des employés a une grande influence sur l'instrumentalité extrinsèque.

Mots clés: Théorie de l'espérance de modification; Caractéristiques démographiques; Motivation

DOI: 10.3968/j.css.1923669720110703.024

INTRODUCTION

From an organizational psychology perspective, theories of motivation have progressed from static, content-oriented theories to dynamic, process-oriented theories, a framework suggested by Campbell et al. (1970). Content theories search for the specific things within individuals that initiate, direct, sustain, and stop behavior. Process theories explain how behavior is initiated, directed, sustained, and stopped. Organizational psychology research focused on developing and testing content (i.e. need) theories of motivation during the 1950s and early 1960s. According to Landy (1989, p. 379),

¹ Department of Management, University of Isfahan, Azadi square, Isfahan, Iran

E-mail: mrjd_reza2006@yahoo.com

² Department of Educational Sciences, University of Isfahan, Azadi square, Isfahan, Iran

E-mail: farhadbrahim2010@yahoo.com

*Received 20 March 2011; accepted 3 May 2011

“data supportive of need theories have been infrequent. Damaging data are commonplace.” In a general sense, focusing on personality profiles of people to explain behaviors, the personological perspective, has fallen out of favor. For over 30 years, psychologists have accepted Mischel’s (1968) explanation that behavior results from the interaction between the person and the situation, a dynamic process (Shaver and Scott, 1991). According to Landy (1989), by the mid-1960s process models were preferred, beginning with Vroom’s (1964) expectancy theory. This was supplanted by Locke’s (1968) goal-setting theory and later by Bandura’s (1977) self-efficacy theory. Expectancy theory provided a general framework for assessing, interpreting, and evaluating employee behavior in learning, decision-making, attitude formation, and motivation (Chen and Lou, 2002). In this paper we employed the modified expectancy theory proposed by Chiang and Jang (2008) to determine the effects of demographic characteristics on employees’ motivation for participating in the in-service training courses. The paper is structured as follows: Section 2 introduces modified expectancy theory; Section 3 outlines methodology. Sections 4 and 5 illustrate results and conclusion.

1. MODIFIED EXPECTANCY THEORY

According to Selden and Brewer (2000), scholars have devoted substantial effort to developing a master theory of motivation, trying to incorporate various characteristics to the concept. In the main, in the fields of human resource management and organisational behaviour, motivation is often described as being “intrinsic” or “extrinsic” in nature (Sansone and Harackiewicz, 2000). Extrinsic motivation occurs “when employees are able to satisfy their needs indirectly, most importantly through monetary compensation” (Osterloh et al., 2002, p. 64). In contrast, intrinsic motivation is apparent when individuals’ behaviour is oriented towards the satisfaction of innate psychological needs rather than to obtain material rewards (Ryan and Deci, 2000). In other words, motivation is intrinsic when people “perform an activity for itself” (Van Yperen and Hagedoorn, 2003, p. 340); trying to experience the satisfaction inherent in the activity or to secure “the obligations of personal and social norms for their own sake” (March, 1999: 377). Intrinsic motivation appears to be self-defined and self-sustained and is fostered by commitment to the work itself, which must be both satisfying and fulfilling for the employees (Loewenstein, 1999). Employees can be motivated by both extrinsic and intrinsic factors that will fulfill their perceptions regarding success, reward and satisfaction. The Vroom’s (1964) theory explains that an individual will choose among alternative behaviors by considering which behavior will lead to the most desirable outcome. Motivation is conceptualized as the product of expectancy, instrumentality, and valence. Expectancy is the perceived probability that effort will lead to good performance; variables affecting the individual’s expectancy perception include self-efficacy, goal difficulty, and perceived control. Instrumentality is the perceived probability that good performance will lead to desired outcomes; trust, control, and policies are variables affecting the individual’s instrumentality perception. Hence, the instrumentality is the belief that if an individual does meet performance expectation, he or she will receive a greater reward. Valence refers the value the individual personally places on rewards: the function of needs, goals, values and preferences. Among the three constructs of expectancy theory, instrumentality and valence were related with outcomes (Tien, 2000). Thus, instrumentality and valence could be divided into extrinsic and intrinsic parts: extrinsic instrumentality, intrinsic instrumentality, extrinsic valence, and intrinsic valence. It is possible to think that instrumentality and expectancy are conceptually equivalent because both refer to a perceived degree of relationship between two variables (Vansteenkiste et al., 2005). Expectancy is the relationship between effort and performance, while instrumentality is the relationship between performance and job outcomes. This conceptual similarity presumably has led some researchers (e.g., Gavin, 1970; Hackman and Porter, 1968; Lawler, 1968; Porter and Lawler, 1968) to combine expectancy and instrumentality into one variable and discuss the relationship between efforts and job outcomes. By combining these, one can consider job outcomes that are a direct function of efforts. Tests of the model by Gavin (1970), Hackman and Porter (1968), Lawler (1968), and Porter and Lawler (1968) have combined expectancy and instrumentality into one measure. House (1971) developed an expectancy model to explain the potential effects of leadership style on subordinate motivation and performance. His framework essentially extended the traditional the expectancy theory by breaking down the original valences and expectancies into variables that had specific relevance for leadership, and his results provided support for the majority of the hypotheses that derived from the extended model. House’s (1971) model was subsequently adopted by Ronen and Livingstone (1975), who used the extended the expectancy framework to reconcile the fragmented research findings on budget and managerial behavior in the accounting literature. The same expectancy model was later employed in a laboratory experiment by Rockness (1977), who found evidence to support the model’s descriptive validity, and a survey-based study by Brownell and McInnes (1986) used the model to examine the effect of budgetary participation on managerial motivation and managerial performance. Jiambalvo (1979) also extended the traditional expectancy model to examine the impact of the performance evaluation process on auditors’ motivation. His framework incorporated expectancies regarding the performance evaluation process in CPA firms, and his empirical findings offered support for the extended model. Chiang and Jang (2008) modified expectancy theory model and examined its validity with three components. They tried to gain more understanding of employees’ motivation and its decision-making process by testing a proposed model that was based on Vroom’s expectancy theory. Their results show that a modified expectancy theory with five components (expectancy, extrinsic instrumentality, intrinsic instrumentality, extrinsic valence, and intrinsic valence) best explains the process of

motivating employees. Their proposed model provided a basis for research research. The majority of previous studies have focused on identifying the factors that motivate employees. However, there is no study about the impact of demographic characteristics on motivation based on the modified expectancy theory. Demographic characteristics including age, gender, education, marital status, job category, employment type and length of employment may be associated with employees' motivation for participating in the in-service training courses. Thus, we tested the contribution of these variables by using multivariate analysis of variance analysis.

2. METHODOLOGY

2.1 Measurement Items and Analyses

The constructs used in this study are expectancy, instrumentality, valence, and motivation. Measurement items for all the constructs were drawn from the literature and all the items (46 items) were used to gauge each respondent's expectation of training outcomes on a 7-point scale ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree. Five measurement items were used for expectancy. Seventeen items of instrumentality were drawn from the literature: seven items for extrinsic instrumentality and the rest ten items for intrinsic instrumentality. For valence, 17 items were used: 7 extrinsic valence and 10 intrinsic valence. Work motivation is defined as the act or process of an employee being moved to work. Seven items were adapted to measure work motivation (in this study work motivation is the motivation of employee for participating in the in-service training). In the second section, demographic characteristics including age, gender, education, marital status, job category, employment type, and length of employment were asked. A pilot test was conducted to fine-tune the survey instrument. Oil Company employees in Isfahan and Kurdistan were asked to participate in the pilot test. Fifty survey questionnaires were distributed, and 35 surveys were returned for pilot test. Wording for the final questionnaire was slightly modified based on the respondent feedback of the pilot test. Cronbach's alpha was used to verify the internal consistency reliability. The results of the pilot study show Cronbach's alphas of 0.93, 0.92, 0.86, 0.89, 0.90, and 0.84 for expectancy, extrinsic valence, intrinsic valence, extrinsic instrumentality, intrinsic instrumentality, and motivation, respectively. Statistical analysis was computed using the Windows versions of Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS 15.0). Multivariate analysis of variance ("MANOVA") was used to analyze expectancy, extrinsic valence, intrinsic valence, extrinsic instrumentality, intrinsic instrumentality, and motivation (dependent variables) using age, gender, education, marital status, job category, employment type, and length of employment by determining the main and interaction effects of the independent categorical variables on multiple dependent interval variables. When calculating MANOVA, rather than a univariate F value, a multivariate F value is reported and considered the most appropriate for this factorial design (Hair et al. (1998). *Post hoc* pairwise comparison testing was performed if any of the ANOVAs were significant using the Scheffe method which tends to give narrower confidence limits and is therefore the preferred method and the most conservative with respect to type I errors (Hair et al., 1998).

2.2 Data Collection

To achieve research goal, a field survey was used at Isfahan and Kurdistan. The target population was employees of Iran's Oil Company in the mentioned states. A confidence interval approach was used to determine the sample size. The sample size was set at 175 at the 95% confidence level (Burns & Bush, 1995). We used cluster sampling plan to achieve estimated sample. Surveys with cover letters were delivered to managers in the selected Iran's Oil Company agencies in Kurdistan and Isfahan. The managers distributed the surveys to their employees. A total of 250 surveys were distributed to employees in these participating agencies, and 175 were returned.

3. RESULTS

3.1 Sample Profile

Of the 175 respondents, the majority were male employees (80.6%, n=141). Respondents who were 41–50 years old (30.9%) comprised the largest age group. In addition, the majority were married (89.7%, n=157). One-third of the respondents (32.6%) had bachelor's degree, and 77 of the respondents (44%) had high school degrees. One hundred and fifteen employees (65.7%) were in Isfahan, and 34.3% worked in Kurdistan. In terms of their job category, most respondents worked in official (40%) and operational (28%) departments. In terms of the length of employment, most of employees were in the range of 1-10 years (33.7%) and 21-30 years (40.1%). Finally, the majority of the respondents (81.1%) were formal employees. Descriptive statistics are displayed in Table 2.

Table 1: Demographical Characteristics of Respondents

Characteristic	Frequency	Percentage	CF (%)
Age group			
30 or Under	36	20.6	20.6
31-40	36	20.6	41.1
41-50	54	30.9	72
Above 50	49	28	100
Gender			
Male	141	80.6	80.6
Female	34	19.4	100
Marital status			
Single	18	10.3	10.3
married	157	89.7	100
Education			
Below high school	7	4	4
High school	77	44	48
Degree	22	12.6	60.6
Bachelor's degree	57	32.6	93.2
Postgraduate	12	6.9	100
Employment type			
Formal	143	81.1	81.1
Temporary	32	18.9	100
Length of employment			
1-10 years	59	33.7	33.1
11-20 years	23	13.1	46.9
21-30 years	71	40.1	87.4
31-40 years	22	12.6	100
Job category			
Financial	18	10.3	10.3
Official	70	40	50.3
Engineering	22	12.6	62.9
Marketing	16	9.1	72
Operational	49	28	100

3.2 Multivariate Analysis of Variance

A factorial multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was used to analyze how respondents expectancy, extrinsic valence, intrinsic valence, extrinsic instrumentality, intrinsic instrumentality, and motivation (the dependent variables) are influenced by using age (four levels), gender (two levels), education (five levels), marital status (two levels), job category (five levels), employment type (two levels), and length of employment (four levels), collectively the independent variables. The results are presented bellow.

Age. As illustrated in Table 2, there were no significant differences found among age groups on the dependent measures including expectancy, extrinsic valence, intrinsic valence, extrinsic instrumentality, intrinsic instrumentality, and motivation ($p > 0.05$).

Table 2: MANOVA Analysis for Employees' Age

Statistical index	Groups	Frequency	Mean square	S.D	F	P
Variable						
Expectancy	30 or under	36	21.13	2.6	1.65	0.17
	31-40	36	19.64	3.5		
	41-50	54	20.24	2.8		
	Above 50	49	19.69	3.9		
Extrinsic instrumentality	30 or under	36	14.88	5.6	0.37	0.76
	31-40	36	13.58	3.4		
	41-50	54	13.99	6.2		
	Above 50	49	13.73	6.6		
Intrinsic instrumentality	30 or under	36	43.69	5.4	0.97	0.40
	31-40	36	41.52	5.8		
	41-50	54	41.96	5.6		
	Above 50	49	42.15	6.2		
Extrinsic valence	30 or under	36	27.27	5.8	2.32	0.07
	31-40	36	27	6		
	41-50	54	25.37	6.8		
	Above 50	49	28.58	6		
Intrinsic valence	30 or under	36	43.97	4.8	2.34	0.07
	31-40	36	40.72	6.5		
	41-50	54	41.53	5.9		
	Above 50	49	42.97	6		
Motivation	30 or under	36	30.55	3.3	2.07	0.10
	31-40	36	28.44	5.4		
	41-50	54	28.36	4.2		
	Above 50	49	28.53	4.8		

Gender. As shown in Table 3, there were no significant differences found between gender types on the dependent measures including expectancy, extrinsic valence, intrinsic valence, extrinsic instrumentality, intrinsic instrumentality, and motivation ($p>0.05$).

Table 3: MANOVA Analysis for Employees' Gender

Statistical index	Groups	Frequency	Mean square	S.D	F	P
Variable						
Expectancy	Male	142	19.99	3.4	3.99	0.20
	Female	33	20.82	3		
Extrinsic instrumentality	Male	142	27.02	5.8	1.3	0.43
	Female	33	25.87	5.4		
Intrinsic instrumentality	Male	142	42.20	5.6	5.67	0.71
	Female	33	42.61	6.3		
Extrinsic valence	Male	142	27.07	6.4	1.93	0.73
	Female	33	26.66	5.8		
Intrinsic valence	Male	142	42.30	5.9	5.34	0.89
	Female	33	42.15	6.04		
Motivation	Male	142	28.57	4.4	4.47	0.06
	Female	33	30.18	4.9		

Education. As Table 4 shows, there were no significant differences found among education levels on the dependent measures including expectancy, extrinsic valence, intrinsic valence, intrinsic instrumentality, and motivation ($p>0.05$). Further, significant differences were found among education levels on extrinsic instrumentality (F -value= 3.1, $p= 0.01$). Post hoc analyses to the univariate ANOVA for the extrinsic instrumentality scores on education conducted to find which independent variable (education level), have a most strong impact on the dependent variable (extrinsic instrumentality). Each pairwise comparison was tested using the Scheffe method. For extrinsic instrumentality, there is a significant difference among employees with below high school education ($M = 4.38$, $SD = 10.55$), degree ($M = 4.05$, $SD = 7.6$) and employees with high school education ($M = 3.6$, $SD = 4.9$), bachelor's degree ($M = 3.75$, $SD = 4.9$) and postgraduate ($M = 3.62$, $SD = 4.3$), where respondents with below high school and degree had higher extrinsic instrumentality than others ($F= 3.120$, $p= 0.017$).

Table 4: MANOVA Analysis for Employees' Education

Statistical index	Groups	Frequency	Mean square	S.D	F	P
Variable						
Expectancy	Below high school	7	20.14	2.8	0.43	0.78
	High school	77	19.92	3.8		
	Degree	22	20.59	2.6		
	Bachelor's degree	57	20.21	3.1		
	Postgraduate	12	19.83	2.3		
Extrinsic instrumentality	Below high school	7	19.14	10.55	3.1	0.01*
	High school	77	12.99	4.9		
	Degree	22	16.36	7.6		
	Bachelor's degree	57	14.05	4.9		
	Postgraduate	12	13.16	4.3		
Intrinsic instrumentality	Below high school	7	41.57	5.2	1.27	0.28
	High school	77	42.57	6.2		
	Degree	22	44.09	5.2		
	Bachelor's degree	57	42.42	5.5		
	Postgraduate	12	39.50	4.7		
Extrinsic valence	Below high school	7	27.85	7.1	0.83	0.50
	High school	77	27.39	6.4		
	Degree	22	27.95	7.1		
	Bachelor's degree	57	26.56	5.7		
	Postgraduate	12	24.33	5.9		
Intrinsic valence	Below high school	7	43.85	5.3	0.89	0.46
	High school	77	42.35	6.6		
	Degree	22	44	5.4		
	Bachelor's degree	57	41.45	5.4		
	Postgraduate	12	41.58	4.7		
Motivation	Below high school	7	28.28	2.9	1.00	0.40
	High school	77	28.23	5.4		
	Degree	22	30.18	3.9		
	Bachelor's degree	57	29.15	3.8		
	Postgraduate	12	29.66	3.4		

Note: * $p < 0.05$

Marital status. According to Table 5, there were no significant differences found between marital status on the dependent measures including expectancy, extrinsic valence, intrinsic valence, extrinsic instrumentality, intrinsic instrumentality, and motivation ($p>0.05$).

Table 5: MANOVA Analysis for Employees' Marital Status

Statistical index	Groups	Frequency	Mean square	S.D	F	P
Variable						
Expectancy	Single	18	21.33	2.94	2.54	0.11
	Married	157	10.20	3.37		
Extrinsic instrumentality	Single	18	15.10	6.24	0.7	0.40
	Married	157	13.89	5.69		
Intrinsic instrumentality	Single	18	42.93	6.41	0.24	0.61
	Married	157	42.21	5.75		
Extrinsic valence	Single	18	27.00	6.38	0.00	0.99
	Married	157	27.00	6.31		
Intrinsic valence	Single	18	43.89	6.21	1.46	0.22
	Married	157	42.08	5.92		
Motivation	Single	18	30.66	3.83	3.08	0.08
	Married	157	28.67	4.61		

Job category. According to Table 6, there were no significant differences found among job categories on the dependent measures including expectancy, extrinsic valence, intrinsic valence, extrinsic instrumentality, intrinsic instrumentality, and motivation ($p>0.05$).

Table 6: MANOVA Analysis for Employees' Job Category

Statistical index	Groups	Frequency	Mean square	S.D	F	P
Variable						
Expectancy	Financial	18	19.94	2.7	0.79	0.52
	Official	70	20.58	3.7		
	Engineering	22	19.99	3.6		
	Marketing	16	20.56	3.1		
	Operational	49	19.53	3.3		
Extrinsic instrumentality	Financial	18	12.44	6.11	1.01	0.40
	Official	70	14.84	6.36		
	Engineering	22	14.50	5.10		
	Marketing	16	12.62	3.09		
	Postgraduate	49	13.67	5.59		
Intrinsic instrumentality	Financial	18	42.18	5.2	0.54	0.70
	Official	70	42.73	5.8		
	Engineering	22	40.72	5.6		
	Marketing	16	42.87	5.5		
	Operational	49	42.17	6.2		
Extrinsic valence	Financial	18	25.72	5.3	1.42	0.22
	Official	70	26.40	6		
	Engineering	22	29.45	6.1		
	Marketing	16	25.87	8.7		
	Operational	49	27.59	6		
Intrinsic valence	Financial	18	42.27	4.7	0.13	0.96
	Official	70	42.17	6.3		
	Engineering	22	41.63	6.2		
	Marketing	16	43	5.2		
	Operational	49	42.47	6.1		
Motivation	Financial	18	29.55	4	0.31	0.87
	Official	70	28.68	4.6		
	Engineering	22	28.90	5		
	Marketing	16	29.75	3.3		
	Operational	49	28.61	4.8		

Employment type. As Table 7 shows, there were no significant differences found between the types of employment on the dependent measures including extrinsic instrumentality and intrinsic valence ($p>0.05$). Further, significant differences were found between employment types on expectancy (F -value= 4.06, $p= 0.02$), extrinsic valence (F -value= 8.31, $p= 0.004$), intrinsic instrumentality (F -value= 5.35, $p= 0.01$), and motivation (F -value= 14.88, $p= 0.00$). For expectancy,

there is a significant difference between formal and temporary employees, with temporary employees having higher level of expectancy (M = 4.61, SD = 3.1) compared to formal employees (M = 4.46, SD = 3.3). For intrinsic instrumentality, there is a significant difference between formal and temporary employees, with temporary employees having higher level of intrinsic instrumentality (M = 6.66, SD = 4.8) compared to formal employees (M = 6.46, SD = 5.9). For extrinsic valence, there is a significant difference between formal and temporary employees, with temporary employees having higher level of extrinsic valence (M = 5.46, SD = 4.2) compared to formal employees (M = 5.13, SD = 6.5). Finally, for motivation, there is a significant difference between formal and temporary employees, with temporary employees having higher level of extrinsic valence (M = 5.62, SD = 3.9) compared to formal employees (M = 5.32, SD = 4.4).

Table7: MANOVA Analysis for Employment Type

Statistical index Variable	Groups	Frequency	Mean square	S.D	F	P
Expectancy	Formal	143	19.90	3.3	4.06	0.04*
	Temporary	32	21.21	3.1		
Extrinsic instrumentality	Formal	143	13.90	5.4	0.30	0.58
	Temporary	32	14.53	6.9		
Intrinsic instrumentality	Formal	143	41.80	5.9	5.35	0.02*
	Temporary	32	44.40	4.8		
Extrinsic valence	Formal	143	26.36	6.5	8.31	0.004*
	Temporary	32	29.84	4.2		
Intrinsic valence	Formal	143	41.97	5.9	2.02	0.157
	Temporary	32	43.62	6		
Motivation	Formal	143	28.27	4.4	14.88	0.000**
	Temporary	32	31.59	3.9		

Note: * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.001$

Length of employment. As Table 8 shows, there were no significant differences found among lengths of employment on the dependent measures including expectancy, extrinsic valence, intrinsic valence, extrinsic instrumentality, intrinsic instrumentality, and motivation ($p > 0.05$).

Table 8: MANOVA Analysis for Length of Employment

Statistical index Variable	Groups	Frequency	Mean square	S.D	F	P
Expectancy	1-10 years	59	20.77	2.6	1.5	0.20
	11-20 years	23	19.78	3.2		
	21-30 years	71	20.07	3.3		
	31-40 years	22	19.09	4.6		
Extrinsic instrumentality	1-10 years	59	15.05	5.6	0.98	0.40
	11-20 years	23	13.69	5.02		
	21-30 years	71	13.53	6.08		
	31-40 years	22	13.18	5.4		
Intrinsic instrumentality	1-10 years	59	43.40	5.1	1.21	0.30
	11-20 years	23	41.87	6.7		
	21-30 years	71	41.85	6		
	31-40 years	22	41.10	5.8		
Extrinsic valence	1-10 years	59	27.08	5.8	0.59	0.61
	11-20 years	23	26.30	7.8		
	21-30 years	71	26.67	6.3		
	31-40 years	22	28.54	5.8		
Intrinsic valence	1-10 years	59	43.33	5.3	1.01	0.38
	11-20 years	23	41.34	7.1		
	21-30 years	71	41.93	6.04		
	31-40 years	22	41.50	5.8		
Motivation	1-10 years	59	29.76	4	1.86	0.13
	11-20 years	23	29.56	5.2		
	21-30 years	71	28.32	4.2		
	31-40 years	22	27.59	5.8		

4. DISCUSSION, CONCLUSION, LIMITATIONS, AND FUTURE RESEARCH

This paper aims to determine the effects of demographic characteristics on employees' motivation for participating in the in-service training courses based on the modified expectancy theory. To our knowledge, no study exists in this area that is related to our purpose. Thus, current study is the first paper that investigated the effects of demographic characteristics on the components of modified expectancy theory. The findings suggest the type of employment influences expectancy, intrinsic instrumentality, extrinsic valence, and motivation of employees for participating in the in-service training courses in the oil industry setting. Expectancy led employees to believe their effort will lead to desired performance. Instrumentality is the belief that if an employee meets performance expectations, he or she will receive a greater reward, particularly for intrinsic instrumentality. In addition, employee's education influenced widely extrinsic instrumentality. When employees perform well, expect good pay, monetary bonuses, and pay increases or promotions, the motivation of employees who decreases if they do not receive those extrinsic rewards. Interestingly, managers make mistakes by assuming what motivates employees. Since human beings are of widely varied nature, so are their motivators. Schein (1980) saw human nature as complex; with human needs and motivation varying according to the different circumstances people face, their life experiences, expectations, and age. The staff development plan is expected to motivate them for participating in the in-service training courses, but if it does not, then there is something wrong. Further, good training and subsequently working condition have been widely favored by the employees. An employee's suggestions system is expected to be in place to know their suggestions in order to improve organization's training and working condition. The most important factor is for managers to support employees and recognize them. This study is not free from limitations. First, the findings may not be generalized to all Oil Companies because data were collected from limited agencies of Iran Oil Company in Isfahan and Kurdistan. Second, the questionnaires were distributed by Oil Company managers to their employees and also collected by the managers, which may influence employees' responses. To control and to identify possible effects that were not considered in this study, future study can include more variables, such as environmental variables in examining employee's motivation for participating in the in-training courses.

REFERENCES

- Bandura, A. (1986). *Social Foundations of Thought and Action: A Social Cognitive Theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Brownell, P., McInnes, M. (1986). Budgetary Participation, Motivation, and Managerial Performance. *The Accounting Review*, LXI(4), 587–600.
- Burns, A. C., & Bush, R. F. (1995). *Marketing Research*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Campbell, J.P., Dunnette, M.D., Lawler, E.E., Weick, K.E. (1970). *Managerial Behavior, Performance, and Effectiveness*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Chen, Y., Lou, H. (2002). Toward an Understanding of the Behavioral Intention to Use a Groupware Application. *Journal of End User Computing*, 14, 1–16.
- Chiang, C. F. and Jang, S. C. (2008). An Expectancy Theory Model for Hotel Employee Motivation. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 27, 313–322.
- Gavin, J.F. (1970). Ability, Effort, and Role Perception as Antecedents of Job Performance. *Experimental publication system, manuscript number 190A*. APA, Washington, DC.
- Green, S. and Salkind, N. (2005). *Using SPSS for Windows and Macintosh: Analyzing and Understanding Data* (4th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson/Prentice-Hall.
- Hackman, J.R., Porter, L.W. (1968). Expectancy Theory Predictions of Work Effectiveness. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 3, 417–426.
- Hair, J.F., Anderson, R. E., Tatham, R.L., and Black, W.C. (1998). *Multivariate Data Analysis* (5th ed). Upper Saddle River.
- House, R. J. (1971). A Path Theory of Leader Effectiveness. *Administrative Sciences Quarterly*, 16(3), 321–338.
- Jiambalvo, J. (1979). Performance Evaluation and Directed Job Effort: Model Development and Analysis in a CPA Firm Setting. *Journal of Accounting Research*, 17(2), 437–455.
- Landy, F.J. (1989). *Psychology of Work Behavior* (4th ed.). Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company.

- Lawler, E.E. (1994). *Motivation in Work Organisations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc. Publishers.
- Lawler, E.E. (1968). A Correlational-Causal and of the Relationship between Expectancy and Job Performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 2, 122–142.
- Lawler, E.E., Porter, L.W. (1967). Antecedent Attitudes of Effective Managerial Performance. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 2, 122–142.
- Locke, E.A. (1968). Toward a Theory of Task Motivation and Incentives. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 3(May), 157-189.
- Loewenstein, G. (1999). Because it is there: the Challenge of Mountaining for Utility Theory. *Kyklos*, 52(3), 315-343.
- Mischel, W. (1968). *Personality and Assessment*. New York, NY: Wiley.
- Osterloh, M., Frey, B. and Frost, J. (2002). The Dynamics of Motivation of New Organizational Forms. *International Journal of Economics and Business*, 9(1), 61-77.
- Porter, L.W., Lawler, E.E. (1968). *Managerial Attitudes and Performance*. Homewood, ILL: Irwin.
- Rockness, H.O. (1977). Expectancy Theory in a Budgetary Setting: an Experimental Examination. *The Accounting Review*, 52(4), 893–903.
- Ronen, J., Livingstone, J.L. (1975). An Expectancy Theory Approach to the Motivational Impacts of Budgets. *The Accounting Review*, 50(4), 671–685.
- Rowley, J. (1996). Motivation and Academic Staff In Higher Education. *Quality Assurance in Higher Education*, 4, 11-16.
- Ryan, R.M. and Deci, E.L. (2000). Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivations: Classic Definitions and New Directions. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 25(1), 54-67.
- Sansone, C. and Harackiewicz, J.M. (2000). *Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivation: The Search for Optimal Motivation and Performance*. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Schein, E.H. (1980). *Organizational Psychology*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Selden, S.C. and Brewer, G.A. (2000). Work Motivation in the Senior Executive Service: Testing the High Performance Cycle Theory. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 10(3), 531-550.
- Shaver, K.G. and Scott, L.R. (1991). Person, Process, Choice: the Psychology of New Venture Creation. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 16(2), 23-45.
- Simons, T., Enz, C.A. (1995). Motivating Hotel Employees. *The Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, 36(1), 20–27.
- Siu, V., Tsang, N., Wong, S. (1997). What Motivates Hong Kong’s Hotel Employees? *The Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, 38(5), 44–49.
- Tien, F.F. (2000). To What Degree does the Desire for Promotion Motivate Faculty to Perform Research? Testing the expectancy theory. *Research in Higher Education*, 41(6), 723–752.
- Vansteenkiste, M., Lens, W., De Witte, H., Feather, N.T. (2005). Understanding Unemployed People’ S Job Search Behavior, Unemployment Experience and Well-Being: a Comparison of Expectancy-Value Theory and Self-Determination Theory. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 44(2), 268–286.
- Van Yperen, N.W. and Hagedoorn, M. (2003). Do High Job Demands Increase Intrinsic Motivation or Job Strain or Both? The Role of Job Control and Social Support. *Academy of Management Journal*, 46(3), 339-348.
- Vroom, V.H. (1964). *Work and Motivation*. New York: Wiley.
- Wong, S., Siu, V., Tsang, N. (1999). The Impact of Demographic Factors on Hong Kong Hotel Employees’ Choice of Job-Related Motivators. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 11(5), 230–241.