Investigation of Organizational Responsibility and Satisfaction Level of the Cattle Producers in Turkey
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Abstract

The aims of this study were to determine organizational responsibility and satisfaction levels of cattle producers according to different organizations and geographical regions of the Turkey, and to analyze the relationship between socioeconomic variables and above mentioned levels. The study was conducted with a total of 197 randomly sampled producers living in six different regions of the Turkey, between the years of 2013 and 2014. For overall Turkey, median responsibility and satisfaction values were found to be 2 (0–6) and 42% (20-100), respectively. Responsibility and satisfaction levels of the East–Southeastern region and the Milk Producers Association were significantly lower than other groups (<0.01). Only eleven percent of the producers know important laws and regulations related to their own organizations. "Visiting frequency" and "meeting arrangements" components were given the lowest scores for satisfaction. Seven and four socioeconomic variables out of 11 were significantly positively correlated with the responsibility and satisfaction levels, respectively. In order to change the cattle producers’ perception and attitudes farm visits and regular periodic meetings should be arranged by both livestock organizations and government. Those cattle producers, living in the East and Southeastern regions of Turkey and having low socioeconomic status, should be given priority in training programs.
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INTRODUCTION

Organizations can be defined as a group of people consciously and systematically gathered for collective goals or a particular purpose. In particular, they emerged as a result of the destruction of feudalism, the industrial revolution, and urbanization [1,2]. Many types of agricultural and livestock organizations have been established worldwide to serve the interests of members around the world. They founded by the state or by civil society for social, technical and economic reasons, and have played an important role in sustainable production. Through agricultural organizations, livestock producers increase their competitive power, and are able to provide more healthy...
and sufficient food to customers [3,4]. Also, better integration of the production and livestock-based industries can be achieved by the cooperatives [5].

In Turkey, located in Southeastern Europe and Southwestern Asia, various types of agricultural and livestock organizations have served cattle producers, such as the Cattle Breeders Associations (CBA), Beef and Lamb Producers Associations (BPA), Milk Producers Associations (MPA), Chambers of Agriculture (CA) and Agricultural Credit and Development Cooperatives (C). CBA, BPA, MPA, CA and C have served their members since 1996, 2005, 2007, 1957 and 1860, respectively. The Law of Animal Breeding (No.4631), The Law of Agricultural Producer Unions (No. 5200), The Law of Cooperatives (No. 1163), The Law of Chambers of Agriculture and Unions (No. 6964) constitute legal framework of the above-mentioned organizations [8-10]. In spite of the existence of many livestock organizations for producers in Turkey, they have not been regarded to be successful in terms of economics and policy point of view. It is pointed out that some of the important reasons for these failures are managerial weaknesses in organizations, lack of collaborations and organizational awareness amongst the members. Moreover, low levels of organizational commitment and responsibility among producers have been considered other possible reasons that may adversely affect their products quantity and quality [7,8].

Producers’ organizational responsibility and their satisfaction about the services provided by the different organizations should be evaluated to better understand the current problems in a national-scale. Until now, there is no nationwide study in the literature, despite the well-known economic and political importance of the livestock organization. Previously, a similar study regarding small ruminant producers was performed by Can [8] in Hatay, Turkey. The present study is clearly different from the previous one due to following reasons: (I) it was conducted in national level, (II) it was focused on the cattle producers, and (III) its methodology was slightly changed.

The aims of the study were to determine organizational responsibility and satisfaction levels of cattle producers according to different organizations and geographical regions of the Turkey, and to analyze the relationship between socioeconomic variables with responsibility and satisfaction levels. The results of the study would be useful for the livestock organizations and policymakers in the Ministry of Agriculture when investigating the problems and seeking the solutions about the issue.

**MATERIAL and METHODS**

**Study Area, Sample Size and Data Collection**

This study was conducted in six different geographical regions (Marmara-I, Aegean-II, Central Anatolian-III, Black Sea-IV, Mediterranean-V and East and Southeastern Anatolian-VI Regions) of the Turkey. There were a total of 12 cities (Edirne, Kırklareli, Denizli, Isparta, Hatay, Amasya, Samsun, Sinop, Çankırı, Ankara, Malatya and Gaziantep) which were represented the socioeconomic characteristics of the above mentioned regions. The minimum number of sample size [11-13] was calculated as follows;

\[
    n = \frac{N \, t^2 \, p \, (1-p)}{d^2 \, (N - 1) + \, t^2 \, p \, (1-p)}
\]

where \(p\) = possibility of the events’ occurrence of 85%, which was obtained from the from the pre-questionnaires and previous studies, \(N\) = total number of livestock enterprises in Turkey (nearly 3 million), \(t = 1.96\) for a 95% confidence interval, \(d = 0.05\) sampling error. Using the formula, the minimal estimated sample size was found to be 196. Then, the calculated sample size was distributed according to the number of livestock enterprises in above mentioned regions [7,8,13].

Before starting the field work, the questionnaire was pre-tested in order to remove some of the possible deficiencies and revise of the questions. Data were obtained via a questionnaire completed by 197 producers between May 2013 and November 2014.

**The Items Used to Determine Producers’ Satisfaction and Responsibility**

The items used to determine producers’ satisfaction and responsibility were modified from the study of Can [8]. Currently, Turkish livestock organizations have been working in different fields of the livestock sector and, therefore, some of the satisfaction items regarding the services were differ from each other according to the organizations. In the current study, 8 satisfaction items were expanded to 11, but nevertheless all of the six responsibility articles were same with the above mentioned study.

**Data Evaluation and Statistical Analyses**

In this study, commitments of the cattle producers were evaluated with the responsibility items. Each question about responsibility was answered as either “yes” or “no”, and total responsibility level ranged from 0 to 6 point. Cattle producers’ organizations were evaluated by their services and each question about satisfaction was ranged from 1 to 5 point. Each individual score was divided by the maximum possible level of satisfaction.

Test of normality was performed using Kolmogorov-Smirnov test. Results were analyzed using Kruskal-Wallis H test and Mann-Whitney U-test. Scatter diagrams were used to investigate the possible relationship between variables. The relationship between responsibility and satisfaction
levels with the producers’ socioeconomic/demographic characteristics were analyzed using Spearman’s rho \[8,11,12\]. All of the statistical analyses were performed with the aid of the SPSS-15.0 statistical software.

**RESULTS**

The distribution of the cattle producers according to different livestock organizations were presented in Table 1. It was found that only 15% of the producers were not member of any organization. According to the findings; majority of the producers were member of only one organization, however, very small number of producers were member of four organizations. CBA was still the most preferred occupational institution (29.95%) and has the largest share of members.

In the present study, primary reason for “being a member of any organization” was asked to livestock producers. It was found that the most important factors affecting the producers’ participation to any organization were “economic reasons” (54%) and “bureaucratic reasons” (23%), respectively. Other factors were as follows: “breeding and artificial insemination services” (11%), “occupational information” (7%), and veterinary services (5%). On the other hand, the reasons for “not being a member of any organization” were as follows: “to be seen as useless” (42%), “there is no sufficient information available” (37%) and “to be seen as expensive” (21%). Another finding of this study was that producers who are members of organizations had a significantly higher education level, income class, herd size and agricultural area (P<.01) compared to non-members.

A total of six responsibility components and their frequencies for five different organization are given in Table 2. It is understood that the majority of the producers have sufficient information about the management boards of their organizations. However, interestingly, only eleven percent of the producers know important laws and regulations related to the livestock organizations.

As it can be seen from the Table 3, none of the producers was “very satisfied” or “satisfied” about services provided by their organizations. The worst satisfaction scores were observed in following items: (X) “visiting frequency” and (XI) “meeting arrangements”.

Producers’ responsibility and satisfaction levels are summarized in Table 4. Considering the different organizations and regions in respect of responsibility and satisfaction levels, all of the differences are statistically significant. These levels were found to be lowest in Milk Producers Associations group and East-Southeastern region group. As a result of the statistical analysis, low level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Distribution of the Producers</th>
<th>Frequencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Producers who are members of “one” organization</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Cattle Breeders Associations</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Chambers of Agriculture</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Agricultural Credit and Development Cooperatives</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Milk Producers Associations</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Beef and Lamb Producers Associations</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Producers who are members of “two” organizations</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Producers who are members of “three” organizations</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Producers who are members of “four” organizations</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Producers who are “not members of any organization”</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All of the producers (the sum of the above numbers)</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsibility Components Taken into Account</th>
<th>Producers who Answered “Yes” to the Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CBA (N=110) CA (N=74) ACDC (N=50) MPA (N=13) BLPA (N=14) All Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. No. of producers knowing important laws related to their organization</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. No. of producers reading the agreement or contract</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. No. of producers regularly vote in elections</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. No. of producers became candidate in the elections</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. No. of producers having sufficient information about management boards</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI. No. of producers being aware of the debate topics and decisions taken</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of responsibility and medium-low level of satisfaction were found for overall Turkey.

Correlations between socioeconomic variables with the responsibility and satisfaction levels along with p-values were presented in Table 5. Seven and four socioeconomic variables out of 11 were significantly positively correlated with the responsibility and satisfaction levels, respectively. Additionally, there was a significant relationship between responsibility and satisfaction at the level of p<.01.

**DISCUSSION**

Organizational behaviors of the livestock producers are complex and multidimensional concept. In order to demonstrate organizational effectiveness of the producers
and to understand which individual factors are correlated with the membership relations, a total of 6 responsibility and 11 satisfaction components and 9 socioeconomic variables were taken into consideration in the present study. The findings indicated that Turkish producers’ responsibility and satisfaction were low and medium-low levels, respectively. It is clearly understood that responsibility of the producers is quite far from the desirable level. That is to say, they have behaved irresponsibly. Nevertheless, it should be indicated that, low level of responsibility can be also affected by the poor management and/or poor services provided by the livestock organizations.

In Turkey, majority of the producers still believe that organizational activities have not been performing effectively except providing some official documents or bureaucratic issues. In the current study, economic and bureaucratic reasons were found to be the most important factors affecting producers’ decision whether membership participation in organizations or not. Indeed, the result is not surprised because producers’ main purpose is already to make money and sustainable production. This result also consistent with the study of Can [8] who worked on the sheep breeders. Özüdoğru and Tatlıdil [14] determined that 93% of the farmers in member farms believe that the Cattle Breeders Association has a role in increased incomes. Another study was also reported that the most important expectations to be a member of the cooperatives were “economic reasons”. Besides this, “reliable and accessible managers” was found to be important factor [15]. In the present study, nearly one-tenth of the producers were not want to be a member of an organization. The main reasons of that is the beliefs that livestock organization are not useful or required. This small proportion of producers may be underestimated or even ignored. However, it should not be forgotten that, they can be convinced with the effective training programs and/or small amount of financial support. Another finding of the study was that non-member producers had significantly lower socioeconomic status (p<0.01) compared to member producers. Conversely, Can [8] did not report significant differences between members and non-members with respect to income and education levels. Alambeigi et al. [16] reported that the leading factors deterring farmer’s participation were determined as lack of partnership culture and a lack of sufficient power in the cooperatives. Another noteworthy finding of the study is a lack of harmony between the objectives of villagers and the cooperatives [16]. It is indicated that without compulsory membership, organizations must appeal to members and provide valued services and opportunities [17].

The findings regarding the responsibility level clearly indicate that producers have not fulfilled their legal, democratic and/or social responsibilities. Considering the overall Turkey, forty-six percent of satisfaction may be seen as medium-low or moderate level for the organizations. Because of the fact that “visiting frequency” and “meeting arrangements” are the most negative aspects of the livestock organizations, the quantity and/or quality of these two services should be increased as much as possible. It was reported that nearly 53% of the producers were satisfied from extension services of the Livestock and Dairy Development Department, however, a majority of them indicated that extension workers never visited farms, which is the most important reason for dissatisfaction [18]. In a study, professional competency rates of Extension Agents were found to be 2.26 and 2.99 (1=very low and 4=very high) from the view of farmers and Extension Agents’ perspectives, respectively [19]. Although it is indicated that agricultural organizations are not effective [9], however, according to seventy percent of the Turkish producers agricultural cooperatives are successful in their activities [15]. Another study indicate that the activities of Cattle Breeder’s
Association of Manisa are generally good, but price and support policies are not sufficient [20].

It is a well-known reality that still East and Southeastern regions of Turkey has the lowest socioeconomic status and this study findings support this argument. The lowest responsibility and satisfaction levels were observed for these regions and differences were found to be significant. Although these levels are close to each other for the other five regions, it is remarkable that Marmara, Central Anatolian and Black Sea regions have the highest levels. MPA has the lowest score both for responsibility and for satisfaction. This may be due to small number of producers in this group. Another reason could be that MPA is a much younger organization than the others.

In this study, almost all of the socioeconomic variables except producers’ age and occupational experience were significantly correlated with the responsibility level. Interestingly, only income class and total agricultural area were significantly correlated with satisfaction level. In general, it is normally expected that there are no close relationship between socioeconomic parameters and satisfaction because satisfaction are generally influenced by the services. Österberg and Nilsson [21] report that farmers’ age has a significant effect on the organizational commitment and trust of the older producer less than younger ones. Producers who are satisfied with the profitability in their organization have a higher score than others. Didier et al. [22] point out that there is a relationship between member producers’ commitment and their trust which plays an important role in successful membership. According to Fulton and Giannakas [23] member commitment is linked to the cooperative’s ability and there is a feedback relationship between them. Gedara et al. [24] indicated that the most influential factors of technical efficiency are membership of farmer organizations and the participatory rate in collective actions organized by farmer organizations. Ozctalbas et al. [25] reported that there was a relationship between family sizes, experience in dairy farming, raising high yielding dairy cows with the daily milk yield, among the variables considered social factors.

Although the results of this study and official statistics clearly reveal a great number of producers are members of any professional organization in Turkey, but livestock organizations’ management and financial problems could not be solved properly until now [7]. There are many different types of conflicts in economic and political areas that have been observed amongst them. In order to achieve the desirable performance, they need to be complementary to each other, rather than serving as an alternative. Can [8] indicated that high rate of member’s democratic participation can help to solve current marketing problems in the sector. Idrees et al. [18] suggested that frequency of farm visits should substantially be increased and model dairy farms should be organized among the producers.

Training of the organization managers are also suggested both for management skills and for pedagogical skills [21].

Basing on the findings of the present study, following recommendation can be made; (i) to change the livestock producers’ perception and attitudes farm visits and regular periodic meetings should be provided by both livestock organizations and government, (ii) both member and non-member producers should be encouraged to participate in seminars and workshops, (iii) those producers living in East and Southeastern regions of Turkey and having low socioeconomic status should be given priority in training programs.
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