



ISSN: 0975-833X

RESEARCH ARTICLE

VICTOR VROOM'S EXPECTATION THEORY: APPLICATION IN GOAT SMALLHOLDER FARMERS IN INDONESIA

^{*1}Budi Guntoro and ²Saisakul Fongmul

¹Faculty of Animal Science, Universitas Gadjah Mada, Jl. Fauna 3 Bulaksumur, Yogyakarta, Indonesia

²Faculty of Agricultural Production, Maejo University, Sansai District, Chiang Mai, Thailand

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:

Received 18th December, 2015

Received in revised form

31st January, 2016

Accepted 20th February, 2016

Published online 16th March, 2016

Key words:

Vroom's Expectation Theory,
Goat farmers, Motivation.

ABSTRACT

This research aimed to analyze the motivation of goat smallholder farmers joined the farmer group using Vroom's Expectation Theory. Vroom's expectancy theory differs from the content theories of Maslow, Alderfer, Herzberg, and McClelland in that Vroom's expectancy theory does not provide specific suggestions on what motivates organization members. Instead, Vroom's theory provides a process of cognitive variables that reflects individual differences in work motivation. The sample used in this study was goat farmers in Yogyakarta Province. A total number of respondents was 162 farmers. Using the survey method, the result showed that farmers' participation motivation category in the group housing was intermediate. The average value of valence was intermediate, expectancy was high, and instrumentality was intermediate. The average total score for motivation joining the group was intermediate. It can be concluded that farmers' motivation joining group was in the intermediate category. The rank of the components underlying farmers' motivation in group from the lowest to the highest was expectancy, instrumentality and valence.

Copyright © 2016 Budi Guntoro and Saisakul Fongmul et al. This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Citation: Budi Guntoro and Saisakul Fongmul, 2016. "Victor Vroom's Expectation Theory: Application in Goat Smallholder Farmers in Indonesia", *International Journal of Current Research*, 8, (03), 27718-27724.

INTRODUCTION

Motivation can be defined as the reasons for doing things or power that make things materialize. According to Luthan (1998), motivation can be defined as, "a process that starts with a physiological deficiency or need that activates a behavior or a drive that is aimed at a goal incentive. Olatidoye (2008) asserted that it is motivations that make farmers to contribute effectively to the progress of agriculture, thereby enhancing food security. Among motivational issues raised by the researchers which are related to farmers participation and performance are creation of farmers awareness at the on-set of agricultural development programmes; credibility of extension agent; timely supply of agricultural inputs and provision of physiological needs of farmers as motivating incentive. The issue of job security in farming as a strong motivation for farmers when it is place on the same scale with civil service where job security is gradually being eroded. Also, the practice of given agricultural loan to peasant farmers is also regarded as motivating incentives. Akintoye (2000) asserted that money remains the most significant motivational strategy.

Akintoye (2000) said that money possesses significant motivating power in accomplishing a task. People will be motivated if they believe that strong effort will lead to good performance and good performance will lead to desired rewards (Lunenburg, 2011). Vroom (1964) was the first to develop an expectancy theory with direct application to work settings, which was later expanded and refined by Porter and Lawler (1968) and others (Pinder, 1987). Vroom's (1964) Valence - Instrumentality - Expectancy Model (VIE model), in particular, has been the subject of numerous empirical studies. It has served as a rich source for theoretical innovations in domains such as organizational behavior (Naylor et al., 1980), leadership (House, 1971), and compensation (Lawler, 1971). Many different interpretations, operationalizations, application purposes, and methods of statistical analysis have been used. To make a comparison and combination of the results possible, we referred to Vroom's basic models and their components (van Eerde and Thierry, 1996). Expectancy theory is based on four assumptions (Vroom, 1964). One assumption is that people join organizations with expectations about their needs, motivations, and past experiences. These influence how individuals react to the organization. A second assumption is that an individual's behavior is a result of conscious choice. That is, people are free to choose those behaviors suggested by

***Corresponding author: Budi Guntoro,**

Faculty of Animal Science, Universitas Gadjah Mada, Jl. Fauna 3 Bulaksumur, Yogyakarta, Indonesia. (E-mail: bguntoro@gmail.com)

their own expectancy calculations. A third assumption is that people want different things from the organization (e.g., good salary, job security, advancement, and challenge). A fourth assumption is that people will choose among alternatives so as to optimize outcomes for them personally. Vroom suggests that motivation, expectancy, instrumentality, and valence are related to one another by the equation $Motivation = Expectancy \times Instrumentality \times Valence$. The multiplier effect in the equation is significant. It means that higher levels of motivation will result when expectancy, instrumentality, and valence are all high than when they are all low. The multiplier assumption of the theory also implies that if any one of the three factors is zero, the overall level of motivation is zero. (Lunenburg, 2011). Miner et al. (1995) state that in a system sense, motivation consists of three interacting and interdependent elements, that is, needs, drives, and incentives Fashola et al. (2006). Likewise, Miller (1992) asserts that knowledge of the motivations of adult learners in a specific programme may provide valuable insight into the kinds of learners the program attracts. According to Obaniyi et al (2014) farm sizes, their ownership status and levels of awareness among farmers, extension agent contact with farmers and their sources of information may effect the motivational levels of farmer. Farmers motivations for continuing what they are doing, and for changing what they are doing, are not simply economic or financial. Their decisions cannot be predicted on the basis of simplistic notions of economic rationality (Garforth, 2010)

Traditional pattern in raising goats is characterized by its housing location near or even integrated with the owner's residence, low productivity, and did not implement a good maintenance management in goat raising. This condition can cause pollution to farmers and impact on health problems. The absence of the organizational systems make it difficult to deliver a range of innovations or technological information from extension agents to farmers, interaction among the farmers were less intensive, hence the competition among farmers to increase productivity is also low. One of the goat raising development models to be applied currently in various regions is group housing systems. According to Guntoro and Sulastri (2000), the group housing system is a model of farmers group that maintain animal in a particular location separate from the settlements. The establishment of farmer group is one of the efforts to achieve environmental sustainability and hygiene as well as facilitate the inclusion of education about the technology and its spread in one group. Group housing systems in Yogyakarta that is widely applied is a commodity of beef cattle, dairy cattle and goats. This is related to the multi function of the animal for daily life and many groups of beef cattle and dairy goats farmers that have been formed. Institutional farmer groups of Ettawa crossbreed goat housing system was first developed in Yogyakarta since 1991. It was developed in the hamlet of Nganggring, Kemirikebo, Ngandong, Sukorejo, Kloposawit and Girikerto in Babadan village, Turi district, Sleman Regency, Yogyakarta Province. The use of group housing system has many benefits, but it requires a lot of sacrifice from each of the member. The form of this sacrifices are, for example, sacrificing time for the night shift, additional land rental costs, and bound to various groups' regulatory. The emergence of various rules in the group did not

reduce the farmers' intention to join the group housing systems. This is showed by the number of groups housing system formed, as well as the number of farmers who wish to register as a member of a farmer group. The high interest and willingness of farmers to participate in the maintenance of the group housing system is an interesting phenomenon to examine further. Based on the above description, it was expected that this research can answer the following research questions: How high is the level of farmers' motivation to join the goat farmer group in Yogyakarta by Vroom's expectation instrument?

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The research was conducted in Yogyakarta, Indonesia. The material used in this study was the Ettawa crossbred goats farmer groups, namely: Pangestu, Mandiri, Sukerejo I, Adijaya, Usaha Mandiri, and Ettawa Lestari Groups, with a total number was 162 farmers. The instrument used in this study was a questionnaire with several questions related to motivation in joining the group. The method used in this research was a survey. Criteria used in the sampling are farmers who still raise Ettawa crossbred goats and join in the group housing as well as still active as a member within the group housing. The next phase was the implementation phase that was conducted to collect primary data and secondary data related to the research. Primary data is the data that were obtained by direct interviews with farmers using a questionnaire that had been prepared previously. Secondary data is supporting data that were obtained from agencies and related literature. Supporting data consists of general condition, topography, and the number of goat population.

The analysis used in this research was descriptive. Descriptive analysis was used to describe the farmers' characteristics. Motivation of farmers joining in the group housing was analyzed by Vroom's Expectancy Theory, namely the multiplication of three categories: valence, expectancy and instrumentality against each questionnaire statement. Prior to the research, the validity and reliability of the questionnaire was tested first. Results of the questionnaire validity test of motivation in raising Ettawa crossbred goat consisted of 20 statements and the questionnaire validity test of farmers' participation motivation in the group housing resulted 29 statements with significant at level $P < 0.05$ and $P < 0.01$. All of the statements were valid because it has the value of the correlation coefficient above r table (0.3). The coefficient ranging from 0.3 to 0.5 have been able to give a good contribution. If the validity coefficient was less than 0.3, it is considered unsatisfactory. The validity test results showed that the value of the correlation coefficient (r) was more than 0.3, so that all statements were declared as valid questionnaires. According to Vroom's expectancy theory, motivation is the consequence of a result to be achieved and estimation that one actions would lead to the desired results. Thus, if someone really wants something, and the way seemed open to get it, then he will try to get it. Just the opposite will happen if the expectation to obtain the desired thing by someone is that thin, then the motivation to try to get a desirable thing would be low (Vroom, 1964). According to Vroom, the motivation level of an activity is determined by the multiplication of three components, namely: valence (value), expectancy

(expectation), and instrumentality (attainment tool). From the stacking sequence, it can be in the following formula:

$$M = V \times E \times I$$

Remarks:

M : Motivation (power/motivation level)

V : Valence (value)

E : Expectancy (expectation)

I : Instrumentality (attainment tool)

The formulation of the above explains that motivation was determined by multiplying the interaction of three components, namely valence, expectancy and instrumentality. The motivation is explained by combining the three components. One will be motivated when he believes that:

- 1) A certain behavior will obtain certain result,
- 2) The result has a positive value for him, and
- 3) Those results can be achieved by his efforts.

Valence: Several authors have compared the operationalizations empirically (Ilgen et al., 1981; Pecotich and Churchill, 1981; Schwab et al., 1979; Tubbs et al., 1991). The results of their studies show that the differences in the operationalizations do not always cause consistent effects. Insofar as the effects are consistent, valence operationalized as attractiveness, desirability, or anticipated satisfaction explains more variance than valence operationalized as importance. Valence is the meaning, value or something that reflects usability. Valence in this research was measured by the statement by joining the farmer group they will get the attention from the Livestock Agency, could put the animal in the animal group housing, easy to obtain credit, increase prosperity, obtain additional capital, determine the level of livestock prices, livestock revitalized group, group housing management system is better than individual systems, easily cooperate with other farmers and gained a lot of friends. Categorization for valence motivation component was based on the group assessment towards the results obtained by participating in the group housing.

Table 1. Percentages of valence scores

	Uninterested ←————→ Fully interested				
Original	-1	-0.5	0	0.5	1
Transformed	0%	25%	50%	75%	100%

Adopted from Caulfield (2007)

Table 2. Percentage of the expectancy score

	No expectation ←————→ Full of expectation				
Original	0	0.25	0.50	0.75	1.0
Transformed	0%	25%	50%	75%	100%

Source: adopted from Caulfield (2007)

The minimum score is -1 (uninterested) and the maximum score is +1 (fully interested). Motivation scale categories were determined by a range of first level minimum and maximum scores that was divided into five points, namely: -1, -0.5, 0, +0.5, +1. Motivation scale categories were determined by the

range of the second level minimum and maximum score that was divided into percentages as follows: 0%, 25%, 50%, 75% and 100%. The percentages of valence scores are presented in Table 1. Value of -1 means that farmers have no desire to get rewards, for example something that they desired someday. Value of +1 means that the farmer wishes to obtain a full reward. The more positive value approach, the more they are interested to obtain a reward, instead, closer to the negative, and then they have no desire to earn rewards.

Expectancy: Although Vroom (1964) conceptualized expectancy as having more than one level, we decided to include the measurement of one level of expectancy because this type of measurement was a rule rather than an exception. Summated expectancy scores, however, were not included because we considered these as too distant from the original conceptualization. Expectancy is an expectation to get results of all that they do. Expectancy in this study was measured by the statement by joining the farmer group, they will get counseling from the Livestock Agency periodically, know the various information of Ettawa crossbred goats so that their businesses can get ahead, their income from farming can be increased, share variety of knowledge and ideas with other members, increase livestock management, groups system can help to solve problems in animal husbandry, can improve the lives of members, receive help from members to take care of livestock, easy to sell livestock manure to increase revenue, and make the environment around the house does not smell of goat manure. Categorization for expectancy motivation component was based on a minimum score and maximum score. The minimum score was 0 (no expectations) and the maximum score is +1 (full of expectation). Motivation scale categories were determined by a first level range of minimum and maximum scores which was divided into five points: 0, 0.25, 0.5, 0.75, +1. Motivation scale categories were determined by the second level range of the minimum and maximum score that was divided into percentages as follows: 0%, 25%, 50%, 75% and 100%. Percentage of the expectancy score is presented in Table 2.

Instrumentality: In Vroom's view, an irrelevant outcome should have an instrumentality score of 0, and therefore it should have no effect on the relationship with the criterion. However, a large number of outcomes tends to decrease the prediction of the criterion (Mitchell, 1982), possibly because outcomes that have gone unnoticed previously introduce measurement error (Parker and Dyer, 1976). Instrumentality is equipments or facilities that support the achievement of objectives.

Table 3. Level of motivation joining the group

Value of motivation categories	Level
0.00 – 0.33	Low
0.34 – 0.66	Intermediate
0.67 – 1.00	High

Instrumentality in this research was measured by the statement instrumentality would raise livestock production facilities, easy to get goat feed, easy to buy medicines and vitamins at a low price, easy to get help from the agency, easy to get a credit with low interest rate terms, easy to obtain good offspring, easy

Table 4. Valence motivation component statements

No	Statements	SA	A	H	D	SD
		%				
1.	By joining in the group housing, then I will get attention from the Livestock Agency	24.69	53.70	18.52	3.09	0.00
2.	By joining the group housing, I was able to put the cattle in the group housing	38.27	61.73	0.00	0.00	0.00
3.	By joining the group housing i will be easily obtain credit	25.31	54.32	20.37	0.00	0.00
4.	By joining in the group housing, I joined the government program is improve prosperity	22.84	52.47	22.84	1.85	0.00
5.	By joining in the group housing, I will be easily to get additional capital	37.65	55.56	6.79	0.00	0.00
6.	By joining in the group housing, I know the price level of Ettawa crossbred goats	26.54	73.46	0.00	0.00	0.00
7.	By joining in the group housing, the group can be developed	32.72	49.38	17.90	0.00	0.00
8.	Management systems in the group housing is better than the individual system	30.25	48.15	21.60	0.00	0.00
9.	By joining in the group housing, I can work with other farmers	62.96	37.04	0.00	0.00	0.00
10.	Joining the group housing allowed me to gain a lot of friends	75.31	24.69	0.00	0.00	0.00

Source: Primary data processed

Remarks:

SA: Strongly Agree; A: Agree; H: Hesitate; SD; D: Disagree; SA: Strongly Disagree.

Table 5. Expectancy motivation components statements

No	Statements	SA	A	H	D	SD
		%				
1.	By joining the group housing, I'll get guidance or counseling from Livestock Agency periodically	43.21	56.79	0.00	0.00	0.00
2.	By joining the group housing, I can find various information about Ettawa crossbred goat so that my business I could go forward	33.95	58.02	8.02	0.00	0.00
3.	By joining the group housing, the income from raising Ettawa crossbred goats can be increased	79.63	20.37	0.00	0.00	0.00
4.	By joining the group housing, I can share knowledge and ideas with other members to improve livestock production	74.07	25.93	0.00	0.00	0.00
5.	By joining the group housing, I will be able to improve the livestock management	33.95	58.02	8.02	0.00	0.00
6.	By joining the group housing, then the group system will help to solve the financial problems in livestock maintenance	26.54	62.96	10.49	0.00	0.00
7.	By joining the group housing, it will improve the lives of the group members	77.16	22.84	0.00	0.00	0.00
8.	By joining the group housing, then I will be helped by the group member to take care of my Ettawa crossbred goat if I was get sick/being sick	27.78	58.02	14.20	0.00	0.00
9.	By joining the group housing, I would easily sell livestock waste (feces) so that it can increase my income from farming	24.69	72.22	2.47	0.62	0.00
10.	By joining the group housing, then the environment around the house does not smell of goat manure and it can maintain environmental health	23.46	52.47	20.37	3.70	0.00

Source: Primary data processed

Remarks:

SA: Strongly Agree, A: Agree; H: Hesitate; D: Disagree; SD: Strongly Disagree

Table 6. Instrumentality motivation component statements

No	Statements	SA	A	H	D	SD
		%				
1	By joining the group housing, it will increase the supply of livestock production facilities	36.42	54.94	8.64	0.00	0.00
2	By joining the group housing, it will facilitate the feed availability	52.47	22.84	20.99	3.70	0.00
3	By joining the group housing, it will be easy to buy medicines and vitamins at a low price	52.47	29.01	18.52	0.00	0.00
4	By joining the group housing, then I will easily get help from Livestock Agency	19.14	55.56	25.31	0.00	0.00
5	By joining the group housing, it will be easy to get a loan with low interest requirement	21.60	52.47	22.22	3.70	0.00
6	By joining the group housing, it would be easy to get a good Ettawa crossbred goat offspring	45.06	54.94	0.00	0.00	0.00
7	By joining the group housing, it will be easy to check the Ettawa crossbred goats when it is sick	75.93	24.07	0.00	0.00	0.00
8	By joining the group housing, it would be easy to guard the goat	78.40	21.60	0.00	0.00	0.00
9	By joining the group housing, it would be easy to sell goats and obtain a high price	30.25	54.94	14.81	0.00	0.00

Source: Primary data processed

Remarks:

SA: Strongly Agree; A: Agree; H: Hesitate; D: Disagree; SD: Strongly Disagree

check the sick animal, easy to keep the goat, and easy to sell the goat at a high price. Categorization for instrumentally motivation component was based on the group members' assessment towards the results obtained by participating farmer group and group housing. The minimum score is -1 (no attainment tool) and the maximum score is +1 (full of attainment tool). Motivation scale categories were determined by the first level range of minimum and maximum scores that was divided into five points, namely: -1, -0.5, 0, 0.5 +1.

Motivation scale categories were determined by the second level range of the minimum score maximum score percentage: 0%, 25%, 50%, 75% and 100%. A value of -1 means the farmer showed perception that there are no facilities that support to achieve the goal. The value of +1 means that farmers showed a perception they have full of tools to support the achievement of the goal. The more positive value was approach, there are fuller of tools that support the goals achievement, and vice versa. Participation motivation

categories was based on the Vroom Motivation formula = Valence x Expectancy x Instrumentality. Valence and expectancy categories respectively consisted of 10 statements and instrumentality category consisted of 9 statements. Participation motivation category was the result of the multiplication of Vroom motivation components. The minimum score was 0 and the maximum score was 1. Participation motivation categories was determined based on the range of minimal and maximal scores that were divided into three levels (namely: low, medium and high. Participation motivation categories can be seen in Table 3.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Farmers' motivation in the group housing was divided into three levels, namely low, intermediate and high. It was based on three components, valence, expectancy and instrumentality.

Valence

Respondents who were included in the high category were 162 farmers (100.00%) and none of them were included in the intermediate and low category (Table 4). This suggests that the farmer group has something that reflects the value or usefulness for the respondents (farmers) so that they joined the group. The type of valence motivation to join a farmer group is high, meaning that valence motivation is one of the driving forces for farmers to come in and join the group. Valence motivation component statements can be seen in Table 4. Point statement of "Joining the group housing allowed me to gain a lot of friends" is the most strongly agree answered statement (75.31%) and statement of: "By joining in the group housing, I can work with other farmers" is the second most strongly agree answered statement (62.69%). These factors were the farmers' reasons to participate of in the group housing (the highest factor). This suggests that the participation motivation in a farmer group constituted by social motivation, which is to gain a lot of friends. Reason for someone to come in and get involved in a group is because of social motivation. Another reason for the farmer to participate in the group housing was because they can put their goat in the group housing. A total of 38.27% of respondents were strongly agreed with the statement "By joining the group housing, I was able to put the goat in the group housing". Another factors encouraged farmers to participate in the group housing was that they can easily obtain additional capital, management systems in the group housing is better than the individual system, know the price level of Ettawa crossbred goats and they believe that by joining the group housing, the group can be developed.

Expectancy

Expectancy is an expectation that comes with every individual in doing anything activities. Respondents who were included in the high category were 161 farmers (99.38%), and 1 farmer was in the intermediate category (0.62%) and no respondent was in the low category (Table 5). Farmers participate in the group housing because they expected that raising Ettawa crossbred goat business can go forward. The highest factor in the expectancy motivation component is the statement point of "By joining the group housing, the income from raising Ettawa

crossbred goats can be increased". A total of 79.63% of the respondents were strongly agreed and 20.37% of respondents were agreed with the statement. The second highest factor was in statement point of "By joining the group housing, it will improve the lives of the group members" with the number of respondents who stated strongly agree were 77.16% and the number of respondents who agree was 22.84%. This is consistent with Mardikanto (1993) who stated that the primary participation motivation of the farmer group members was mainly driven by a desire for improving the ability to farm and meet the primary needs (mainly in the form of agricultural inputs) so that the involvement of the members of farmer groups was based on the calculation of profit or losses. Expectancy motivation components statements can be seen in Table 5. Other factors that included in the high category were the expectation to share knowledge and ideas that can improve livestock production and management. The farmers' participation in group housing in order to get guidance or counseling from Livestock Agency periodically is also a factor that included the high category. This is related to the farmers' expectations to get more related information to increase the maintenance of Ettawa crossbred goat business to increase earnings.

Instrumentality

Farmers' intention to participate in the farmer groups was that they may easily get the means or tools that support their livestock business. Respondents who were included in the high category were 159 farmers (98.15%), 3 farmers were in the intermediate category (1.85%) and no respondent was included in the low category. The highest factor of instrumentality motivation components contained in statement point of "By joining the group housing, it would be easy to guard the goat". A total of 78.40% of the respondents were strongly agreed and 21.60% of them were agree (Table 6). In the group housing systems, the members were given the task of keeping the cattle in turns. The second highest factor was the statement point of "By joining the group housing, it will be easy to check the Ettawa crossbred goats when it is sick ". There are 75.93% of the respondents answered strongly agree and 24.07% answered agree. Instrumentality motivation components statement can be seen in Table 6. Other top factors were the ease of getting a good Ettawa crossbred goat offspring, the ease of buying medicines and vitamins, the convenience and ease of getting animal feed and livestock production facilities.

Table 7. Farmers' participation motivation in the group housing

Motivation Components	Number of respondents	Percentage (%)
<i>Valence</i>		
High	162	100.00
Intermediate	0	0.00
Low	0	0.00
Total	162	100.00
<i>Expectancy</i>		
High	161	99.38
Intermediate	1	0.62
Low	0	0.00
Total	162	100.00
<i>Instrumentally</i>		
High	159	98.15
Intermediate	3	1.85
Low	0	0.00
Total	162	100.00

The main members' participation motivation of the farmer group was primarily driven by the desire to improve the ability to farm and meet the primary needs of (mainly in the form of agricultural inputs) (Mardikanto, 1993).

Farmers' Participation Motivation Categories in the Group Housing

Farmers' participation motivation categories in the group housing were a result of the multiplication of the motivation components according to Vroom as the following:

Motivation = Valence (V) x Expectancy (E) x Instrumentally (I).

The number of respondents in valence motivation component was in the high category of 100% (162 farmers) and no respondents in the intermediate and low categories. The number of respondents in expectancy motivation component was the high category of 99.38% (161 farmers), as much as 0.62% (1 farmer) was in the intermediate category and low category did not exist. The number of respondents in instrumentally motivational component included in the high category 159 farmers (98.15%), 3 farmers (1.85%) were in the intermediate category, and low category did not exist. Farmers realized that motivation is one of the critical success factors in the business development of raising Ettawa crossbred goat. Farmers' participation motivation in the group housing can be seen in Table 7.

The result shows that farmers' participation motivation category in the group housing is intermediate. The average value of participation motivation is 0.36. The average value of valence was intermediate (0.63), expectancy was high (0.84) and instrumentally was intermediate (0.66), so the average total score for the participation motivation was intermediate. The average value of the participation motivation was intermediate (0.36). It is because there was a mismatch between the expectations desired by farmers with the means of achieving or facilities that promote the goals and values or meanings of the farmer group did not reflect the usefulness for farmers yet. The results showed that the farmers' expectation (expectancy) to participate in group housing is high, but the value or meaning of the group (valence) and equipment or facilities that support the objectives achievement (instrumentality) is classified, so the overall farmers' motivation in participating in the group housing become intermediate. In order to increase the farmers' participation motivation in the group housing, it is expected that the board of the cage housing maximize the potential benefits of the groups such as: ease in obtaining capital or credit to develop Ettawa crossbred goat livestock business, conduct regular meetings with members of the group, ease in obtaining medicine, and ease to get Ettawa crossbred goat checked.

Conclusion

Based on the research results, it can be concluded that the motivation in raising Ettawa crossbred goat in Yogyakarta was in the high category. Farmers' motivation participation in the group housing was in the intermediate category. The rank of the components underlying farmers' participation motivation in

group housing from the lowest to the highest were expectancy, instrumentality and valence. Motivation in the expectancy theory is the decision to make an effort. Farmers' participation motivation in the group housing is an urge within them who want and are willing to exert effort, thought, capital, and time to participate in the group housing that was measured with the three motivation components of valence, expectancy and instrumentality.

REFERENCES

- Akintoye, I.R. 2000. The place of financial management in personnel psychology. A Paper Presented as Part of Personnel Psychology Guest Lecture Series. Department of Guidance and Counselling, University of Ibadan, Nigeria.
- Caulfield, J. 2007. What motives students to provide feedback to teachers about teaching and learning? An Expectancy Theory Perspective. *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, Vol.1(1):1-19.
- Fashola, O.O., Oladele, O.I. Aliyu, J. and Wakatsuki, T. 2006. Dissemination of sawah rice technology to farmers cultivating inland valleys in Nigeria. Proceedings of the Asian Pacific Extension Network, 6-8th March 2006, Australia.
- Garforth, C. 2010. Motivating farmers: insights from social psychology. NMC Annual Meeting Proceedings: 60-65.
- Guntoro, B. and E. Sulastrri, 1998. Dinamika kelompok tani-ternak Sapi Potong Sistem Kandang Kelompok di Kabupaten Bantul. Fakultas Peternakan UGM, Yogyakarta.
- House, R.J. 1971. A path goal theory of leader effectiveness. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 16, 321-328.
- Ilgen, D. R., Nebeker, D.M. and Pritchard, R.D. 1981. Expectancy theory measures: An empirical comparison in an experimental simulation. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 28, 189-223.
- Lawler, E. E. 1971. *Pay and organizational effectiveness*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Lunenburgh, F.C. 2011. Expectancy Theory of motivation: motivating by altering expectations. *International Journal of Management, Business, and Administration*, Vo. 15 (1): 1-6.
- Luthans, F. 1998. *Organisational Behaviour*. 8th ed. Boston: Irwin McGraw-Hill.
- Mardikanto, T. 1993. *Penyuluhan Pembangunan Pertanian*. Sebelas Maret University Press. Surakarta.
- Miller, B.E. 1992. Participation motivation in off-campus agricultural credit programmes: *Journal of Agricultural Education*. (Summer 1992):1-9.
- Miner J.B., Ebrahimi, B. and Wachtel, J.M. 1995. How deficiency in motivation to manage contributes to America's competitiveness problem and what can be done about it? *Human Resource Management*, Vol 34(3): 363-387.
- Mitchell, T.R. 1982. Expectancy-value models in organizational psychology. In N. R. Feather (Ed.), *Expectations and actions: Expectancy-value models in psychology* (pp. 293-312). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Naylor, J. C., Pritchard, R.D. and Ilgen, D.R. 1980. *A theory of behavior in organizations*. New York: Academic Press.

- Obaniyi, K.S., Akangbe, J.A., Matanmi, B.M. and Adesiji, G.B. 2014. Factors motivating incentives of farmers in rice Production training programmes(A case study of Olam/USAID/ADP/First Bank Programme). WebPub Journal of Agricultural Research Vol. 2(5): 74-81.
- Olatidoye, G.B. 2008. Resource mobilization and motivation of rural farmers for agricultural production: Agricultural Extension A Comprehensive Treatise with Model Questions and Glossary: 117-119
- Parker, D.E. and Dyer, L. 1976. Expectancy theory as a withinperson behavioral choice model: An empirical test of some conceptual and methodological refinements. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 17, 97-117.
- Pecotich, A. and Churchill Jr., G.A. 1981. An examination of the anticipated-satisfaction importance valence controversy. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 27,213-226.
- Pinder, C.C. 1987. Valence-instrumentality-expectancy theory. In R. M. Steers & L. W. Porter (Eds.), *Motivation and work behavior* (4th ed.) (pp. 69-89). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Porter, L. W., and Lawler, E. E.1968. Managerial attitudes and performance. Homewood, IL: Irwin.
- Schwab, D. P., Olian-Gottlieb, J.D. and Heneman, H.G. 1979. Between-subjects expectancy theory research: A statistical review of studies predicting effort and performance. *Psychological Bulletin*, 86, 139-147.
- Tubbs, M.E., Boehne, D.M. and Paese, P.W. 1991. An empirical comparison of several commonly used measures of valence. *Journal of Psychology*, 125, 707-721.
- Van Eerde, W. and Thierry, H. 1996. Vroom's Expectancy models and work-related criteria: a meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol 81 (5):575-586.
- Vroom, V.H. 1964. *Work and motivation*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
