

## **COMPARATIVE PROFILE OF MEMBERS AND MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE MEMBERS OF MILK COOPERATIVES OF HARYANA AND GUJARAT**

**A.K. Singh<sup>1</sup> & K. C. Tyagi<sup>2</sup>**

With aim of replicating success of milk cooperatives of Gujarat 'Anand Model' milk cooperatives were replicated to different states of India under Operation Flood-I (1970-1980), Operation Flood-II (1980-1985) and Operation Flood-III (1986 onwards). Sidhu and Sidhu, 1990 reported that 'Anand Model' milk cooperatives, which were highly successful in Gujarat, could not prove so successful in Punjab due to different socio economic conditions. There are reports that milk cooperatives have done remarkably well in Gujarat (6.5% of total milk production in 1989-90) as compared to other states (Bhanja, 1981; Subramanian, 1982; Dabas, 1984; Singh, 1987). Milk cooperatives could not prove their mettle when introduced in other states of the country, especially major milk producing states like Uttar Pradesh (17.8% of total milk production in 1989-90), Punjab (9.7% of total milk production in 1989-90), and Haryana (6.1% of total milk production in 1989-90). Performance of VMPCSs was 60.29% in Haryana and 72.62% in Gujarat (Singh, 1995).

According to Khandwalla (1977), "Organizational Performance is a net result of the combined efforts of all individuals and groups in the Organization". Performance of milk cooperatives depends on the characteristics (profile) of members, management committee members, and other traits like, village infrastructure, population characteristics, organizational culture, organizational efficiency, and social system support. Poor performance of milk cooperatives in many states of India could be attributed to reasons, such as: disloyalty of members (Kohli, 1978), factionalism in the village (PEO, 1960; Dubey et.al,

1978; Vithol, 1986; Singh, 1987), domination of higher caste people (PEO, 1960; Vithol, 1986), dishonesty of office bearers (Dubey et.al, 1978; Singh, 1987) etc. Major attributes for good performance of milk cooperatives has been reported as: aged and mature members (Patel, 1980), managing committee members from lower castes (Srivastava, 1969), loyalty of members of VMPCS (Singh, 1987), high mass media exposure and extension contact (Patel, 1980), larger family size (Bhanja, 1981), positive attitude of members towards VMPCS (Verma, 1993), knowledge about cooperative rules and regulations by members (Singh, 1987), high economic motivation of members (Krishnaraj, 1981), programme based on human resources of the area (Korten, 1980), industrious villagers (Ulrey, 1966) etc. Success of VMPCS largely depends on traits (profile) of the member farmers and management committee members. Thus, it is important to find out differential traits of member farmers and management committee members.

### **METHODOLOGY**

Gujarat and Haryana states were purposively selected for the study. Gujarat state was selected being pioneer in the milk cooperative sector and Haryana representing a state with high milk production potential, but where milk cooperatives are said to be not working well. Moreover, milk cooperatives are based on buffalo milk in both states,

From each state (Milk Cooperative Federation), one milk union with best performance (as rated by the Milk federation) was selected. Accordingly

1. Scientist, IARI, Regional Station-Indore, 2. Former Head, Division of Dairy Ext., NDRI, Karnal-132001, Haryana

Mehsana union from Gujarat and Ambala union from Haryana were selected. From each selected District Milk Producer's Union (DCMPU), one revenue unit (Block / Taluka) was selected randomly. Thus, Visnagar Taluka of Mehsana and Barara block of Ambala were selected.

Village Milk Producer's Cooperative Societies were ranked by rating all VMPCSs of selected block / taluka registered between 1985 to 1998 (in order to select VMPCSs of similar age for comparison) and which remained functional till data collection (September 1993) without break were ranked on the basis of Performance Index (prepared on the basis of performance of different VMPCSs; considering indicators of performance, Singh, 1995). Then on the basis of performance score, the VMPCS with median performance was identified, dividing selected VMPCSs in two strata i.e. one above median and other below median. From each stratum, 3 VMPCSs were selected randomly for detailed study.

Farmer members from selected VMPCS were categorized into low, medium and high milk suppliers using cumulative square root technique. A total of 180 farmer members (90 from each state were selected) using probability proportional to size technique, with condition that a minimum of 20 member farmers get selected from each category.

From each selected functional VMPCS five management committee members were selected randomly. A total of 60 (30 from each state) management committee members were selected as respondents.

Respondents were categorized in three categories viz. low, medium, high/ young, middle, old/small, medium, large/unfavourable, neutral, favourable on the basis of mean and standard deviation as follows :

- Category-I (low, young, small, unfavourable) :  
Less than (Mean - S.D.)  
Category-II (medium, middle, neutral) :  
Between (Mean - S.D.) to (Mean + S.D.)  
Category-III (high, old, large, favourable) :  
Above (Mean + S.D.)

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This part has been presented under following sub-heads:

### 1. Comparative Profile Of The Member Farmers of VMPCSs

#### 2. Comparative Profile of the Management Committee Members.

**1. Comparative Profile Of The Member Farmers of VMPCSs**—As given in Table-1, most of the member farmers in both states were of : middle age (30-56 years), having medium herd size (2-8 animals), producing (3.5-14.0 liters); consuming (0.25-5.5 liters); and selling (1.75-9.75liters) medium quantities of milk per day, having medium value of assets (Rupees 3,90,740 to Rupees 9,88,565), medium economic motivation (30-40), possessing neutral attitude towards VMPCS (21-35), medium mass media exposure (5-14), and medium extension contact (7-13). Important member farmers traits differing in two states were: more farmers (17.77% farmers) with high milk sale (above 9.75 liters daily) in Gujarat than in Haryana (13.33% farmers), more farmers (33.33% farmers) with high economic motivation (above 40) in Gujarat than in Haryana (22.22% farmers), more farmers (33.33% farmers) with favourable attitude (above 35) in Gujarat than in Haryana (28.88 farmers), more farmers (22.22% farmers) with high mass media exposure (above 14) in Gujarat than in Haryana (18.88 farmers), and less farmers (8.88% farmers) with low extension contact (below7) in Gujarat than in Haryana (30.00% farmers).

**2. Comparative Profile of the Management Committee Members**—It is evident from Table-2 that, most of the management committee members in both states were of: middle age (30-56 years), having medium value of assets (Rs.3,90,740-Rs.9,88,565), medium level of commitment towards VMPCS (61-72), medium political knowledge and affiliation (8-15), possessing neutral attitude towards VMPCS (21-35), having medium mass media exposure (5-14), and medium extension contact (7-13). Management committee members traits differing in two states were: more members (30.00% members) with high commitment towards VMPCS (above72) in Gujarat than in Haryana (16.16% members), more members (16.16% members) with high political knowledge and affiliation (above15) in Gujarat than in Haryana

Table 1. Comparative Profile Of The Member Farmers of VMPCSs (N=90):

Sl. No.	Traits	Categories	Range	Haryana		Gujarat	
				Frequency	%	Frequency	%
<b>I Socio-Economic</b>							
1.	Age (Years)	Young	Below30	15	16.66	12	13.33
		Middle	30-56	63	70.00	65	72.22
		Old	Above56	12	13.33	13	14.14
2.	Herd Size (Number)	Small	Below2	10	11.12	10	11.12
		Medium	2-8	67	74.44	67	74.44
		Large	Above8	13	14.14	13	14.14
3.	Milk Production (Liters)	Low	Below3.5	7	7.77	12	13.13
		Medium	3.5-14.0	68	75.55	66	73.33
		High	Above14.0	15	16.66	12	13.13
4.	Milk Consumption (Liters)	Low	Below0.25	0	0.00	0	0.00
		Medium	0.25-5.50	69	76.66	79	87.77
		High	Above 5.50	21	23.33	11	12.22
5.	Milk Sale (Liters)	Low	Below1.75	7	7.77	8	8.88
		Medium	1.75-9.75	71	78.88	66	7p.pp
		High	Above 9.75	12	13.33	16	17.77
6.	Value Of assets (Ru ees)	Low	Below p90740	p4	p7.77	18	20.00
		Medium	p90740-988565	p0	pp.pp	65	72.22
		High	Above 988565	26	28.88	7	7.77
<b>II. Psychological</b>							
1.	Economic Motivation (Score)	Low	Below p0	17	18.88	10	11.12
		Medium	p0-40	5p	58.88	50	55.55
		High	Above 40	20	22.22	30	33.33
2.	Attitude Towards VMPCS (Score)	Unfavourable	Below 27	2p	25.57	20	22.22
		Neutral	27-p5	41	45.55	40	44.44
		Favourable	Above p5	26	28.88	p0	pp.pp
<b>III. Communicational</b>							
1.	Mass Media Ex osure (Score)	Low	Below 5	12	1p.pp	14	15.55
		Medium	5-14	61	67.77	56	62.22
		High	Above 14	17	18.88	20	22.22
2.	Extension Contact (Score)	Low	Below 7	27	p0.00	8	8.88
		Medium	7-1p	5p	58.88	7p	81.11
		High	Above 13	10	11.12	9	10.00

Table 2. Comparative Profile of the Management Committee members (N=30)

Sl. No.	Traits	Categories	Range	Haryana		Gujarat	
				Frequency	%	Frequency	%
<b>I Socio-Economic</b>							
1.	Age (Years)	Young	Belowp0	4	1p.pp	5	16.66
		Middle	p0-56	16	5p.pp	17	56.66
		Old	Above56	10	pp.pp	8	26.66
2.	Value of Assets (Rs.)	Low	Below p90740	15	50.00	11	6.66
		Medium	p90740-988565	7	2p.pp	16	5p.pp
		High	Above 988565	8	26.66	3	10.00
<b>II. Psychological</b>							
1.	Commitment Towards VMPCS (Score)	Low	Below 61	8	26.66	6	20.00
		Medium	61-72	17	56.66	15	50.00
		High	Above 72	5	16.66	9	30.00
2.	Political Knowledge & Affiliation (Score)	Low	Below 8	5	16.66	9	p0.00
		Medium	8-15	22	7p.pp	16	5p.pp
		High	Above 15	3	10.00	5	16.66
<b>III. Communicational</b>							
1.	Mass Media Ex osure (Score)	Low	Below 5	8	26.66	6	20.00
		Medium	5-14	17	56.66	18	60.00
		High	Above 14	5	16.66	6	20.00
2.	Extension Contact (Score)	Low	Below 7	6	20.00	2	6.66
		Medium	7-1p	22	7p.pp	21	70.00
		High	Above 1p	2	6.66	7	2p.pp

(10.00% members), more members (20.00% members) with high mass media exposure (above 14) in Gujarat than in Haryana (16.66% members), and more members (23.33% members) with high extension contact (above 13) in Gujarat than in Haryana (6.66% members).

## CONCLUSION

Traits crucial for performance of milk cooperatives were prominent in Gujarat in comparison to Haryana, such as: more member

farmers with high milk sale; high economic motivation; favourable attitude towards VMPCS; high mass media exposure, and less farmers with low extension contact. Crucial management committee members traits were also prominent in Gujarat in comparison to Haryana, such as: more members with high commitment towards VMPCS; high political knowledge and affiliation, high mass media exposure, and high extension contact. These traits have played important role in the success of milk cooperatives in Gujarat.

## REFERENCES

1. Bhanja, S.K. (1981) : A study of socio-economic and psychological correlates in organization and functioning of dairy co-operatives. Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, Kurukshetra University, Kurukshetra.
2. Dabas, J.P.S. (1984) : An evaluative study of Operation Flood Programme in India. Unpublished M. Sc. Thesis, Kurukshetra University, Kurukshetra.
3. Dubey, V.K., Ram, K. and Sagar, S. L. (1978) : Dynamics of Dairy Co-operatives-Case Studies. Division of Dairy Extension, NDRI, Karnal.
4. Khandwalla, P. N. (1977) : The Design of Organizations. ISBN, Delhi.
5. Kohli, P. A. (1978) : Dairy Co-operatives. Indian Co-operative Review, 15 (4):
6. Mescarenhas, R. C. (1988) : A strategy for rural development Dairy Co-operatives in India. Sage Publications, New Delhi.
7. Korten, D. C. (1980) : Community organization and rural development-A learning process approach. Public Administration Review, 40.
8. Krishnaraj, R. (1981) : An analysis of organizational efficiency of milk producers' co-operative society-A system approach. Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, Kurukshetra University, Kurukshetra.
9. Patel, B.T. (1980) : A study of factors influencing successful functioning of village milk producers' co-operative societies in Kaira district of Gujarat. Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, IARI, New Delhi.
10. PEO (1960). Evaluation Report of Operation Flood. Planning Commission, Govt. of India, New Delhi.
11. Sidhu, J. S. and Sidhu, R. S. (1990) : Case studies of successful and unsuccessful primary co-operative service society and milk producers' co-operative societies in India. Indian J. Agric. Econ. , 45(p): p67-p78.
12. Singh, A. K. (1995): Performance of milk co-operatives in Haryana and Gujarat-A comparative study. Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, NDRI, Karnal.
13. Singh, S. (1987) : Functional efficiency of milk producers' co-operative societies in Bhiwani district of Haryana (Case Studies). Unpublished M. Sc. Thesis, Kurukshetra University, Kurukshetra.
14. Srivastava, R. M. (1969) : Factors affecting functioning of village milk producers' co-operative societies of Kaira district, Gujarat State. Unpublished M. Sc. Thesis, Vallabh Vidyanagar, Sardar Patel University.
15. Subramanian, R. (1982) : A study of technological and socioeconomic impact of milk co-operatives in Erode district (Tamilnadu). Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, Kurukshetra University, Kurukshetra.
16. Ulrey, O. (1966): The co-operative an agency for rural development (The Kaira District Co-operative Ltd., Anand Gujarat State, India). Agricultural economics report No.42.
17. Verma, O. P. (1999) : A study of impact of milk co-operative societies in Upper Gangetic Plains. Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, NDRI, Karnal.
18. Vithol, C.P. (1986) : Factors affecting milk co-operatives in Anantapur district of Andhra Pradesh-A case study. Indian Co-operative Review, 2p (4).

