



A STUDY ON IMPACT OF COOPERATIVE FARMING SOCIETIES TOWARDS AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO COIMBATORE

Dr. P.Jayasubramanian¹, N.Kesavi², Dr. A. Rajamani³

¹Professor, Department of Commerce (CA), Dr.N.G.P. Arts and Science College, Kalapatti, Coimbatore, Tamilnadu

²II M.Com(CA), Department of Commerce (CA), Dr.N.G.P. Arts and Science College, Kalapatti, Coimbatore, Tamilnadu

³Associate Professor, Department of Business Management, Rathnavel Subramaniam College of Arts and Science, Sulur, Coimbatore, Tamilnadu

ABSTRACT

Agriculture is one of the oldest occupation of the country and backbone of our country. Agriculture is the prime and traditional occupation for the people of Tamil Nadu. About 56% of the people of Tamil Nadu are farmers. It contributes nearly 50% of the national income. Agriculture provides livelihood to about three quarter of the population and also supplies raw materials for a large section of industry. An agricultural cooperative is also called as a farmers' co-operative where farmers pool their resources in certain areas of activity. It allows little farms to do what big farms can do, like buy inputs at bulk rates, increase volume to open new markets and lower the per-use cost of equipment. Government of India is giving top priority to the agriculture sector. Governments are expected to provide a supportive policy, legal and institutional framework, provide support measures based on activities, provide oversight on terms equivalent to other forms of enterprise and social organization, adopt measures to improve access to finance for disadvantaged groups, and topically, for the agricultural development. This will ensure that agricultural sector remains viable and caters to the country's needs.

KEYWORDS: Tradition, Livelihood, Population, Farmers, Government

INTRODUCTION OF THE STUDY

1.1 INTRODUCTION

Agriculture is one of the oldest occupation of the country. Hence agriculture is the backbone of our country. Agriculture is the prime and traditional occupation for the people of Tamil Nadu. About 56% of the people of Tamil Nadu are farmers. It contributes nearly 50% of the national income. Agriculture provides livelihood to about three quarter of the population and also supplies raw materials for a large section of industry. Agriculture is both the basic and principal industry of the country. In India, nearly 75 percent of the people are engaged in agricultural work directly. Agriculture provides employment for more than 70 percent of the working population. All sectors of the economy in India depend on agriculture. Agriculture sustains a

large economic infrastructure in the shape of marketing, warehousing and processing centers. The agricultural sector feeds the millions of people in all sector.

Cooperatives play an important role in the socio-economic development of the people of our country. The cooperative movement in India, particularly in Tamil Nadu, has taken deep roots in various sectors and is making a significant contribution towards economic development and social progress of the people. Tamil Nadu occupies an important place in the history of cooperatives since the first cooperative societies for agricultural Loan and consumer stores were established in Tamil Nadu. The cooperative societies play a vital role not only in Agricultural development and consumer service, but also in sectors such as housing, textiles, dairy and fisheries which



contribute significantly to the economic development of the state.

Various farmers in a village pool their land together and agree to treat the pooled piece of land as one big farm for the purpose of cultivation, purchase the necessary inputs for the cultivation, and market the crops jointly, they are assumed to have formed a cooperative farming society. Such a society, for its proper working elects its office bearers on the basis of one member-one-vote. The ownership of the land still lies with the respective members of the society and they withdraw from the society whenever they so like. Besides land the farmers also contribute various productive assets as well as their labour for the purpose of cultivations. Whereas they get rent for their land and productive assets, they get wages, for their labour.

1.2 STATEMENT OF PROBLEM

Cooperative farming society has been regarded as one of the main institutional machineries for empowering the economically weak member of the society. With this official recognition and the determination of government to transform agricultural production and raise the standard of living in the rural areas many agricultural cooperative societies have been formed all over the country. Despite the efforts or contribution made by the cooperative societies towards agricultural development this effort has not been evenly known and it was in an attempt to address such problem that this study was designed.

1.3 OBJECTIVE OF THE STUDY

- To study the socio-economic characteristics of the farmers
- To determine farmer's involvement in cooperative farming societies
- To study the problems faced by the farmers in cooperative farming societies
- To assess the performance of Cooperative farming societies in development of agriculture
- To find out measures for more efficient functioning of cooperative farming societies

1.4 SCOPE OF THE STUDY

This study is embarking upon to determine the impact of cooperative societies on agricultural production in Coimbatore knowing the contribution of the impact of cooperative societies will encourage farmers and enlightened on the important of this society. This study will also revealed the solutions to the problem militating against the participation of farm in cooperative activities in the study area. The studies will emphasis the importance of cooperative societies in financing farmers in rural areas.

1.5 RESEARCH DESIGN

The study undertaken was descriptive in nature as it provides description of the state of affairs, as it exists at present "A study on impact of cooperative farming societies towards agricultural development with special reference to Coimbatore".

1.6 TOOLS FOR ANALYSIS

It is carried out in the following ways.

Simple percentage method, Ranking analysis and ANOVA

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Ibitoye, Stephen Jimoh(2021)¹ made study on "Survey of the Performance of Agricultural Cooperative Societies". This study deals with the performance of agricultural cooperative societies in kogi state of Nigeria. A simple random sampling technique was used in the selection of 28 Agricultural cooperative societies and 280 members. The study reveals that cooperative societies in the area engaged in crop, livestock, processing and storage enterprises. The farm produce of the societies include: Rice, maize, yam, cassava, and livestock and farm inputs procured are: improved seeds, fertilizers, agro-chemicals and farm implements. It is suggested in the paper that government should increase the supply of credit to cooperative farmers and embark on enlightenment campaign to increase the participation of rural farmers in cooperative activities.

Aditya Shehrawat, Nidhi Sharma, Pardip Shehrawat and Sandeep Bhakar(2020)² made study on "Awareness and Performance of Agricultural Development Schemes in Context of Farmers Welfare". The Government of India have introduced the innovative schemes of crop insurance however; most of the farmers are unaware of it. The study revealed that 86 percent of the farmers were found aware about the crops included under

¹Ibitoye, Stephen Jimoh(2021)" survey of the performance of agricultural cooperative societies in kogi state of Nigeria" European Scientific Journal October edition vol. 8, No.24 ISSN: 1857 – 7881 (Print) e - ISSN 1857- 7431

²Shehrawat, A., Sharma, N., Shehrawat, P. and Bhakar, S. (2020). Awareness and performance of agricultural development schemes in context of farmers' welfare in Haryana. *Economic Affairs*, 65(2): 167-172.



Pradhan MantriFasalBeemaYojana followed by premium paid for insurance of the crops (72%). The data regarding awareness of Pradhan MantriKrishiSinchaiYojana showed that more than half of the respondents had aware about PMKSY. Majority of respondents (64%) were found not aware about subsidy and benefits for small farmers. Performance of agricultural development schemes predicts that majority of the respondent (87%) viewed that is performing well. It is concluded that majority of the respondents were of view that Pradhan MantriFasalBeemaYojana, Pradhan MantriKrishiSinchaiYojana (Per Drop More Crops) is performing good.

M.O Olojede, W.A. Rasaki, A. Adeoye, O. Amoo, A.I. Olayanju (2020)³ made study on “Impact of Farmers' Cooperative Society Membership on Rural Household Livelihood Development”. The study explains that one of the fundamental constraints is the peasant nature of the production system, with its low productivity, poor response to technology adoption strategies and poor returns on investment. The study revealed that 99.33% of the respondents were full time farmers and that farmers' cooperative was their main source of agricultural credit. Membership of cooperative society have a positive significant effect on livelihood development of cooperators. It concludes that Members of cooperative societies demonstrated the attainment of higher food crop yields to meet household needs and had capacity to utilize more capital for production than non-members. This indicates that membership to a cooperative society enables members to access credit, which becomes useful in improving agricultural production.

C.Prasannakumaran, Dr.V.Rajeswari, Dr.P.Ganapathi(2018)⁴ made study on ”Farmers' Constraints Towards Agriculture”. It is examined that agriculture sector is the basic entity in an economy on which the activities of other sectors are determined. In this backdrop, agriculture is beleaguered by challenges like enigmatic weather, uncertainty in rainfall, slumping land area, plummeting water resources, deteriorating soil fertility, growing unrestrainable pests & diseases, increased costs of inputs, residual effects of chemicals, labour scarcity and vacillating market prices. Government of Tamil Nadu is taking sincere efforts to overcome these challenges. It concludes that marketing of agriculture can be made effective if it is looked from the collective and integrative efforts from various quarters by addressing to farmers, middlemen, researchers and administrators. It is high time we brought out significant strategies in agricultural marketing with innovative and creative approaches to bring fruits of labor to the farmers.

³M.O Olojede, W.A. Rasaki, A. Adeoye, O. Amoo, A.I. Olayanju “Impact of Farmers' Cooperative Society Membership on Rural Household Livelihood Development in Oyo State”: International Journal of Research and Scientific Innovation (IJRSI) | Volume VII, Issue V, May 2020 | ISSN 2321–2705 www.rsisinternational.org Page 60

⁴ C. Prasannakumaran, Dr. V. Rajeswari, Dr. P. Ganapathi “A Study On Farmers' Constraints Towards Agriculture With Special Reference To Salem District”; International Journal Of Current Engineering And Scientific Research Issn (Print): 2393-8374, (Online): 2394-0697, Volume-5, Issue-5, 2018 78



ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION- SIMPLE PERCENTAGE

TABLE 4.1

CRITERIA	OPTIONS	NO OF RESPONDENTS	Percentage
Age	Below 25 years	35	17.5
	26 -35 years	29	14.5
	36 - 45 years	43	21.5
	Above 45 years	93	46.5
Gender	Male	115	57.5
	Female	85	42.5
Educational qualification	Upto school level	77	38.5
	Graduate	44	22
	Professional	16	8
	No formal education	63	31.5
Hectare of land	Below1 hectare	69	34.5
	2 hectares	66	33
	2 -5 hectares	41	20.5
	Above 5 hectares	24	12
Monthly Income	Upto Rs15000	103	51.5
	Rs.15000 to Rs.25000	53	26.5
	Rs.25000to Rs.35000	39	19.5
	Above Rs.35000	5	2.5
Period of involvement in agriculture	Recently	71	35.5
	Long period	77	38.5
	5 years	17	8.5
	More than 5 years	35	17.5
Frequency of visit	Once a week	50	25



	Two weeks once	35	17.5
	Monthly once	62	31
	Rarely	53	26.5
Years of Membership	1 to 5	134	67
	6 to 10	40	20
	11 to 20	10	5
	Above 20	16	8
Time	Yes	134	67
	No	66	33
Crop Cultivation	Vegetables	122	61
	Fruits	16	8
	Grains	41	20.5
	Pulses	21	10.5
Difficulties in agriculture	Lack of current facility	16	8
	Failure of rain	57	28.5
	Unable to control insects	61	30.5
	Lack of water facility	66	33
Harvesting methods	Self	68	34
	Machineries	28	14
	Daily wages people	87	43.5
	Leasing	17	8.5
Storage	Godown	94	47
	Simple field Warehouse	72	36
	Pit storage	24	12
	Clamp storage	10	5
Place of Selling the Products	Daily market	73	36.5
	Weekly market	36	18
	Farmers market	42	21
	Through brokers	49	24.5
Way of Selling the Products	Tender sale	36	18
	Wholesale	89	44.5
	Retail sale	58	29
	Any other specify	17	8.5
Services to be added	Effective soil testing	54	27
	Helps in fixing the sale price	77	38.5



	Technical services (mobile services)	25	12.5
	Use of local resources	44	22
Satisfaction in facilities offered	Strongly agree	34	17
	Agree	72	36
	Neutral	74	37
	Disagree	16	8
	Strongly disagree	4	2
Level of Improvement	Improved significantly	49	24.5
	Improved	98	49
	Remained the same	44	22
	Declined	9	4.5

INTERPRETATION

The above table shows that 47% of the respondents are above 45 years of age group and gender of the respondents were 58% are male. It indicates that 39% of the respondent's education level is upto school level. It reveals that 35% of the respondents are cultivating in below 1 hectare of land. It shows that 52% of the respondent's income is upto Rs15000 per month. The involvement in agriculture indicates that 39% of the respondents are involved for long period of time and 27% of the respondents are visiting cooperative farming society rarely. It reveals that 67% of the respondents are 1 to 5 years of members and 67% of the respondents are receiving

their seeds and fertilizers in time from cooperative farming society. The harvesting of 44% of the respondents are by daily wages people and 47% of the respondents are storing their products in godown. It indicates that 37% of the respondents are selling their products in daily market and 45% of the respondents are selling their products in whole sale and 39% of the the respondents are asking the cooperative farming society to help in fixing the sale price. The satisfaction towards cooperative farming societysays 36% of the respondents are agreeing the facilities offered and 36%of the respondent's agriculture are improved after using the resources offered by cooperative farming society.

TABLE 4.2
TABLE SHOWING AWARENESS FOR SCHEMES OFFERED BY COOPERATIVE FARMING SOCEITY

AWARENESS	RANK					TOTAL	AVERAGE	RANK
	1	2	3	4	5			
Kissan credit card scheme	73 (365)	28 (112)	25 (75)	28 (56)	41 (41)	649	3.25	I
Crops loans	34 (170)	57 (228)	34 (102)	41 (82)	44 (44)	626	3.13	II
Short, medium, long term loan	24 (120)	36 (144)	75 (225)	43 (86)	30 (30)	605	3.03	III
National agricultural insurance scheme	34 (170)	42 (168)	42 (126)	52 (104)	23 (23)	591	3	IV
Wavier of cooperative agricultural loans	35 (175)	37 (148)	24 (72)	36 (72)	62 (62)	529	2.64	V

INTERPRETATION

From the above table, it is clear that Kissan credit card scheme ranks First, followed by Crops loan ranks Second, Short, medium, long term loan Ranked

Third, National agricultural insurance scheme holds Fourth ranks and wavier of cooperative agricultural loans ranks fifth.



TABLE 4.3
TABLE SHOWING PURPOSE OF USE OF LOAN MONEY OFFERED BY COOPERATIVE FARMING SOCIETY

PURPOSE	RANK								TOTAL	AVERAGE	RANK
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8			
Purchase of seeds	73 (584)	15 (105)	22 (132)	27 (135)	13 (52)	10 (30)	9 (18)	35 (35)	1091	5.46	II
Purchase of fertilizers	28 (224)	56 (392)	32 (192)	56 (280)	18 (72)	4 (12)	22 (44)	21 (21)	1237	6.19	I
For drip irrigation	30 (240)	28 (196)	50 (300)	18 (90)	14 (56)	27 (81)	19 (38)	14 (14)	1015	5.06	III
Wages for harvest	12 (96)	24 (168)	26 (156)	49 (245)	39 (156)	16 (48)	13 (26)	19 (19)	914	4.57	V
For storage of finished goods	3 (24)	17 (119)	15 (90)	43 (215)	56 (224)	36 (108)	8 (16)	18 (18)	814	4.07	VI
Purchase of livestock	8 (64)	13 (91)	30 (180)	13 (65)	24 (96)	62 (186)	34 (68)	14 (14)	764	3.82	VII
Pay off other debts	18 (144)	28 (196)	15 (90)	40 (200)	15 (60)	32 (96)	66 (132)	17 (17)	935	4.68	IV
Personal / household expenses	28 (224)	19 (133)	10 (60)	20 (100)	21 (84)	13 (39)	29 (58)	62 (62)	760	3.8	VIII

INTERPRETATION

From the table, it is clear that Purchase of fertilizers ranks 1, followed by Purchase of seeds ranks 2, for drip irrigation Ranked 3, for storage of finished

goods ranked 4, Wages for harvest ranked 5, for storage of finished goods ranked 6, Purchase of livestock holds the 7 rank and Personal / household expenses ranks 8

TABLE 4.4
ANOVA TABLE SHOWING SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE BETWEEN YEARS OF MEMBERSHIP AND OPINION OF THE RESPONDENTS

Null Hypothesis (H0):

There is no significance different between the age and perception.

Alternative Hypothesis (H1):

There is significance different between the age and perception.



ANOVA						
		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Convenient location of society	Between Groups	3.062	3	1.021	1.035	.378
	Within Groups	193.333	196	.986		
	Total	196.395	199			
Quick process of loan application	Between Groups	4.154	3	1.385	1.789	.151
	Within Groups	151.721	196	.774		
	Total	155.875	199			
Low interest rate	Between Groups	1.814	3	.605	.940	.423
	Within Groups	126.141	196	.644		
	Total	127.955	199			
Convenient repayment period	Between Groups	3.848	3	1.283	1.853	.139
	Within Groups	135.672	196	.692		
	Total	139.520	199			
Quality of service of society staff	Between Groups	3.112	3	1.037	1.186	.316
	Within Groups	171.483	196	.875		
	Total	174.595	199			

INTERPRETATION

Based on the result of the above table, the significant value is greater than 0.05 so null hypothesis

is accepted. Hence there is no significance difference between opinions of respondents and years of membership in cooperative farming society.

TABLE 4.5
ANOVA TABLE SHOWING SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE BETWEEN AGE AND PARTICIPATION IN COOPERATIVE FARMING SOCIETY

Null Hypothesis (H0):

There is no significance different between the age and participation.

Alternative Hypothesis (H1):

There is significance different between the age and participation.

ANOVA						
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regular presence in meetings held by the cooperative farming society	Between Groups	1.738	3	.579	.720	.541
	Within Groups	157.762	196	.805		



	Total	159.500	199			
Participation in training courses organized by cooperative farming society	Between Groups	.298	3	.099	.155	.926
	Within Groups	125.382	196	.640		
	Total	125.680	199			
Participation in promoting agricultural products	Between Groups	.403	3	.134	.215	.886
	Within Groups	122.317	196	.624		
	Total	122.720	199			
Collaboration with board of directors	Between Groups	.191	3	.064	.092	.964
	Within Groups	135.964	196	.694		
	Total	136.155	199			
Participation in decision making about productive activities	Between Groups	.789	3	.263	.380	.767
	Within Groups	135.591	196	.692		
	Total	136.380	199			

INTERPRETATION

Based on the result of the above table, the significant value is greater than 0.05 so null hypothesis is accepted. Hence there is no significance difference between age of the respondents and participation in cooperative farming society.

FINDINGS, SUGGESTIONS AND CONCLUSION
FINDINGS

- Most 47% of the respondents are above 45 years of age group.
- Majority 58% of the respondents are Male.
- Most 39% of the respondent's educational level are upto school level.
- Most 35% of the respondents are cultivated in below 1 hectare of land.
- Majority 52% of the respondent's income is upto Rs15000 per month.
- Most 39% of the respondents are involved in agriculture for long period of time.
- Most 27% of the respondents are visiting cooperative farming society rarely.
- Majority 67% of the respondent are 1 to 5 years of members in cooperative farming society.
- Majority 67% of the respondents are receiving their seeds and fertilizers in time from cooperative farming society.

- Majority 61% of the respondents are cultivating vegetables.
- Most 44% of the respondents are harvesting their crop by daily wages people.
- Most 47% of the respondents are storing their products in godown.
- Most 36.5% of the respondents are selling their products in daily market.
- Most 45% of the respondents are selling their products in whole sale.
- Most 39% of the respondents are asking the cooperative farming society to help in fixing the sale price.
- Most 36% of the respondents are agreeing their satisfaction towards the facilities offered by cooperative farming society.
- Most 36% of the respondent's agriculture are improved after using the resources offered by cooperative farming society.

RANK ANALYSIS

- The majority of the respondents gave Kissan credit card scheme has a highest awareness in cooperative farming society.
- The majority of the respondent's purpose is Purchase of fertilizers in cooperative farming society.



ANOVA

- There is no significance difference between years of membership in cooperative farming society and opinions of respondents.
- There is no significance difference between age and participation in cooperative farming society.

SUGESSTIONS

Awareness should be given to youngsters that can motivate them to join as a member of cooperative farming society. The cooperative farming society can implement the technical skills and regular trainings about marketing their products that can help them to gain a better understanding about marketing in agriculture. The Government must fix minimum prices for all commodities including perishable vegetables like tomatoes and fruits to prevent distress selling. Cooperative farming society should arrange Storage facilities to boost the small cold storage at village level. Cooperative farming society has to provide some facilities to motivate the organic farming.

CONCLUSION

A cooperative farming society is a unique form of business used by people and business for their mutual benefit. Co-operative societies assume greater significance and scope. Co-operative societies are institutions organized under the principles of co-operation set up for saving the poor's by extending financial support to rejuvenate their occupation. Small farmers who are especially vulnerable to the monsoons are focused and services like credit and crop insurance which makes more accessible through cooperative farming society. Cooperative farming society can conduct agri.camps for youngsters and people with lack of awareness about subsidies, schemes and facilities offered by cooperative society. This will ensure that agricultural sector remains sustainable and serve to the country's needs.

BIBLIOGRAPHY REFERENCES

1. P.Saravanavel, *Research Methodology* 2001, Pub:Keshavprakashan ,Allahabad.
2. S.P.Gupta, *Statistical Method* 1992, pub: Sultan Chand & Sons, New Delhi-110002.
3. Henry E.Garrett, *Statistics in Psychology and Education*, 2004Vakils, Feffer and Simsons, Bombay.
4. Kothari C.R, *Research Methodology-Method & Techniques*, Wishwa, Prakashan(India),Edition-2,PP-23.1.
5. S.C Gupta, *Fundamentals of statistics*, 2007 Himalaya Publishing House, New Delhi, PP-23.1.

JOURNALS

1. *International Journal Of Research*,2016
2. *International Journal Of Research In Social Sciences*, Sept 2017
3. *Journal of Agricultural Science*, 2018
4. *International Journal of Environment and Climate Change*, 2019
5. *International Journal Of Scientific & Technology Research*, March 2020
6. *Economic Affairs*, 2020
7. *European Scientific Journal* Oct 2021

WEBSITES

1. https://agritech.tnau.ac.in/agricultural_marketing/agrimark_Cooperatives.html
2. https://agritech.tnau.ac.in/banking/crbank_cooperative_bank_schemes_implemented_by_cooperative_credit_structure_1.html
3. <https://www.farmbers.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/03/agricultural-research.pdf>
4. <https://www.agrifarming.in/cooperative-farming-features-of-cooperative-farming>
5. <https://www.netexpress.co.in/yellowpages/display-l-case/societies/cooperative/kovai-tamil-nadu/coimbatore/1/display.aspx>
6. https://www.az-india.com/company/sulur_primary_agricultural_co-operative_bank-coimbatore_in-chairman_karuppanna_devar_street_sulur
7. <https://www.economicdiscussion.net/agricultural-economics/cooperative-farming-society-meaning-and-variants/21411>