

1
2 **Analysis of Determinants of Household Economic Sustainability of Members of**
3 **Agricultural Cooperatives in West Shoa Zone, Oromia Regional State**
4
5

6 **ABSTRACT**

7 *This is an Analysis of determinants of Household Economic Sustainability of Members in*
8 *Agricultural Cooperatives in West Shoa Zone, Oromia Regional State. The study units and the*
9 *sampled respondents were 1112 and 294 respectively. The study units were selected purposively.*
10 *To address the objective of this study, both qualitative and quantitative data were used. For the*
11 *data analysis SPSS (version 20) was used. Based on this, the outcome of the study showed that*
12 *(62.6%) were economically unsustainable; at 95% confidence level. Large family size, inefficient*
13 *use of family labor, less saving habit, less members' education and training were found to be*
14 *determinants of household economic sustainability.*

15 **Key words:** Agricultural Cooperatives, Economic Sustainability, House Hold
16 -----

17 **Introduction**

18 Cooperatives have been established mostly because of socio-economic issues that have been
19 existed and still remained unresolved of their members. Cooperatives have been around the
20 world for many years, have made and continued to make tremendous contributions to social and
21 economic development of members and for the countries in which they operate (Develtere,
22 2007).

23
24 The concept of human being, even though they are often overshadowed by market mechanisms,
25 technological development, is the prime determinant of economic systems and is hardly new. To
26 this point, Menger (2009) clearly expressed that man is the beginning and the end of every
27 economy.

28 Economic value is not intrinsic in things, but results from the way people react to conditions in
29 their immediate environment. Education may affect economic growth not merely the private
30 returns to individuals' greater human capital, but also a variety of externalities. The most
31 frequently discussed externality is education investments' fostering technological innovation,
32 thereby making capital and labor more productive, generating income growth. There is enormous
33 interest in the relationship between education and growth. Countries that are richer, faster
34 growing, or have better institutions probably find it easier to increase their education spending.
35 Thus, there is a distinct possibility that correlations between education and investments and
36 growth are due to reverse causality (Aghion et al, 2009).

37

38 The same author complains that researchers most often study education and growth, neglecting
39 intermediating variables that are likely to reveal the mechanisms at work. To be more clear with
40 education, it is useful to highlight both high brow and low brow education. High brow education
41 fosters technological innovation and invention, while low brow education fosters technological
42 imitation, which is to mean relying more on combining physical capital with less educated labor.
43 Hence, in cooperative atmosphere, the low education seems appropriate because of its proximity
44 to technological frontier that immediately benefits members through increased income. More
45 importantly, education is used for people (members' education) to adopt and preserve the values
46 of sustainability. Education is a vehicle through which sustainability more easily to be utilized.
47 The ultimate aim of focusing on education is to create behavior, transform people and internalize
48 sustainability concepts in the everyday routine works of members (Basu & Palazzo, 2008).

49

50 Financial status to cope with fast changing of economic conditions through the intensification of
51 traditional crop production, diversification into new high value crops, and off-farm activities
52 would result in economic sustainability of the entities in focus members (**Drafor 2014**).

53 **Statement of the problem**

54 The important point worth noting about economic sustainability of agricultural cooperative
55 members is that there should exist a balanced integration and interaction among economic,
56 social, and environmental factors effectively and sufficiently (**Osuntogun, 2005**).

57 The most readily available opportunity by which the masses can escape the corporate power is
58 through vibrant cooperative societies that are well managed and economically sustained
59 (**Dayanandan, 2013**).

60 **Objective of this study**

61 To analyze determinants of household economic sustainability of members in the study area

62 **Materials and methods**

63 **Description of the study area**

64 West Shoa Zone is one of the zones of Oromia Regional State located between Latitude of 8°36'
65 North and Longitude of 39°11'57"East. It is situated in the central part of the Regional State
66 bordering in the South with South West Shoa Administrative Zone, in the West with Jimma and
67 Wellega Zones, in the North with North Shoa Zone, and in the East with special Oromia
68 Finfinnee surrounding Zones.

69

70 Ambo Town is the Town of the Zone with the 2nd Towns status of the country. It is located along
71 Addis Ababa- Nekemte Road having pleasant climate and attractive scenery covered with small
72 discrete bushes spread all over the areas.

73

74 There have been 78,684 primary registered Agricultural Cooperatives in Oromia Regional State
75 with 14,902,340 total numbers of members, FCA (2008), out of the 26,993,933 total population

76 of Oromia Region (CSA, 2010). West Shoa Zone alone has the population of 2,058,676 of all
77 ages that accounts for 7.63% of the population. The cooperative members account for (3.25%) of
78 the total population of the Region. Besides this very small percentage of established Agricultural
79 Cooperatives out of the given population, Agricultural Cooperatives in the Region still are at a
80 cross-road because of the ever increasing stiff competition facing them from globalization,
81 challenges of forthcoming technologies, and lack of appropriate and sufficient support from the
82 government agencies. Notably, nearly all cooperatives found in the Region have been ill-formed
83 without fulfilling the necessary prerequisites such as initiation, attraction, training on cooperative
84 matters, conducting need assessment, and voluntarism of members to work together in a group
85 for more advantages.

86 **Research Design**

87 The study captures both quantitative and qualitative research design for the fact that economic
88 sustainability captures quantitative data of environmental, some managerial factors and social
89 aspects while most aspects of sustainability need qualitative data to be analyzed.

90 **Sampling Methods and Techniques**

91 Through multi-Stage Sampling techniques, the Zone is selected purposively for the study.
92 Sampled respondents were selected from the randomly selected five districts (Woredas) of the
93 Zone as each Primary Farmer Society has its own cooperative. The sample frame (1112)
94 benchmark was 3-5 years of establishment and membership respectively. Sample (294) selection
95 employed Yamane (1967) formula taking precision level at, 95% confidence level. Probability
96 Proportional to size (PPS) was employed in drawing respondents through systematic random
97 sampling techniques; $N/n=k$ to draw total sample from list of members as follows:

$$98 \quad n = \frac{N}{1 + N(e)^2} = \frac{1112}{1 + 1112 * 0.005} \approx 294; \text{ Yamane (1967)}$$

99 **Data sources, types and the instrument used for the data collections**

100 To attain the objectives of this study, both primary and secondary data were collected; the
101 primary data were collected by using the questionnaire, for further triangulation purpose FGD
102 and KIIs were conducted; and the secondary data were collected through the document review
103 methods and these have been collected from the report, published and unpublished articles
104 related to the economic sustainability of the members and were collected from the audit reports,
105 minutes of the societies, etc.

106 **Methods of data analysis**

107 The data required for the study were collected using questionnaire that were distributed to
108 statistically selected respondents, semi-structured interview was conducted to collect relevant
109 and missed information from management and audit committee members and focus group
110 discussion (FGD). The collected data were analyzed with support of the Statistical Package for
111 the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 20.

112

113 **The specification of analytical model adopted in this study was depicted as follows:**

114 $Y_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \beta_3 X_3 + \beta_4 X_4 + \beta_5 X_5 + \beta_6 X_6 + \dots + \beta_k X_k + \varepsilon$

115 Where;

116 Y_i = dependent variable (household economic sustainability of members)

117 β_0 = Baseline (constant term) of economic sustainability (i.e., initial capital of members without membership)

118 β_1, \dots, β_n were parameters and coefficients of attributes of independent variables and coefficient of estimation

121 X_1 = sex of household head

122 X_2 = Age of household head

123 X_3 = educational level of household head

124 X_n = attributes of different independent variables

125 ε = error terms at 0.05 confidence level

126 Demographic factor data were interpreted using descriptive statistics such as percentage, frequencies, mean and standard deviation as shown below.

128 **Table 1: Sex of the respondents**

Sex of the respondents	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Male	277	94.2	94.2	94.2
Female	17	5.8	5.8	100.0
Total	294	100.0	100.0	

129 Source: Survey data, 2018

130 Sex of respondents revealed from the above table that most (94.2%) of the household member respondents were male which indicated only male household heads were joining the societies and this practice affected the household income negatively which otherwise increased the income of the same. The male membership practice in Agricultural Cooperatives in these study areas reflected the traditionalistic of the practice that inhibited harnessing of the productive labor that could contribute to the economy of household members for better lifestyles.

136 **Table 2: Age of the respondents**

Respondents age category	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 20-30 years	19	6.5	6.5	6.5
31-40 years	101	34.4	34.4	40.8
41-50 years	90	30.6	30.6	71.4
51-60 years	63	21.4	21.4	92.9
More than 60 years	21	7.1	7.1	100.0
Total	294	100.0	100.0	

137 Source: Survey data, 2018

138 The above table depicts the age structure of the household member respondents which is essential in this study that it has direct linkage with economic sustainability of members in terms of material production that contributes to the economic sustainability of member respondents.

140

141 Most (71.4%) of the respondents in the cumulative percentage were in the age range of
 142 productive (20-50) force that could uphold their family members to live in relatively decent
 143 lifestyles (i.e. better nutritional food, comparatively better housing with reference to their
 144 inhabitants, better clothing, affordability of their children education, obtaining better health
 145 services, going for savings and investment to earn more returns).

146

147 **Table 3: Educational level of the household member respondents**

Educational level	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Illiterate	81	27.6	27.6	27.6
1-6 Grade	98	33.3	33.3	60.9
Valid 7-8 Grade	64	21.8	21.8	82.7
9-12 grade	51	17.3	17.3	100.0
Total	294	100.0	100.0	

148 Source: Survey data, 2018

149 As it is understood from the above table, (72.4%) of the respondents have acquired educational
 150 level ranging from grades 1-12 that indicated that most of the household member respondents
 151 were considered to have the knowledge that could help them understand the concepts and
 152 importance of group efforts to overcome their socio-economic problems encountering them in
 153 life. In particular, those member respondents in the educational range between grades 9-12 which
 154 constituted, (17.3%) were expected to play greater roles in the improvement of their living
 155 conditions more than the rest, even though individuals, by nature, strive to live better life, by
 156 developing their societies in order to derive benefits by leading, managing, introducing
 157 appropriate technologies into their societies and controlling the affairs of their societies
 158 effectively..

159

160 **Table 4: Marital Status of the respondents**

Marital Status	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Married	274	93.2	93.2	93.2
Divorced	18	6.1	6.1	99.3
Valid Widowed	2	.7	.7	100.0
Total	294	100.0	100.0	

161 Source: Survey data, 2018

162 The marital status of the households, indicated that the majority of the respondents (93.2%) were
 163 married and assumed permanently living in the study areas doing their economic activities
 164 regularly it was predicted that they made location advantages of the institution for business
 165 transactions such as purchasing agricultural inputs, getting market information, selling products
 166 on their own preferences, and getting extension services along with appropriate technologies.

167 **Results**

168 From this study it can be summarized that the majority of the sampled households 184(62.6%)
 169 lived below poverty line and thus, they are economically un-sustainable; only 37.4% of the

170 sampled households were economically sustainable. The mean per capita income differences
171 between those who live below poverty and above poverty line are statistically significant at
172 0.000. The major determinants of the household economic sustainability were found to be large
173 family size, inefficient use of family labor, less saving habit, less members' education and
174 training.

175

176 **Conclusion:**

177 The outcome of the study showed that (62.6%) were economically unsustainable; at 95%
178 confidence level. Large family size, inefficient use of family labor, less saving habit, less
179 members' education and training were found to be determinants of household economic
180 sustainability.

181

182 **References**

183 **Basu, K. & palazzo, G.(2008)** corporate social responsibility: press model of sense making.
184 *The academy of management review*, 33(1), 122-136.

185 **CSA (2010)** federal democratic republic of Ethiopia, population census commission
186 central statistical agency: the 2007 population and housing census of Ethiopia, results for
187 Oromia region: statistical report on population size and characteristics

188 **Develtere, P. (2007)** "renaissance of African cooperatives in the re-inventing the wheel."

189 African cooperatives in a liberalized economic environment in the 21st century: lessons from the
190 field", in deviltry,(ed) cooperating out of poverty: the renaissance of the African cooperative
191 movement,

192 **ILO & the World Bank Institute**, Geneva difference. Review of international co-operation,
193 vol.100, no. 1/2007

194 **Dayanandan, R. (2013)** *good governance practice for better performance of community*
195 *development: IOSR journal of business and management (IOSR-JBM) E-ISSN*

196 **Drafor,I. (2014)** *gender and small farmers commercialization: the case of two farming*
197 *education*

198 and employment division, march. 2014

199 **Menger, c. (2009)** *on the origins of money*; Ludwig von Mises Institute: Auburn, al, USA, p. 8.

200 **Osuntogun, C.A. (2005)** *country report on the status of sustainable development in Nigeria*

201 **Yamane, Taro. (1967)** *statistics: an introductory analysis*, 2nd ed., New York: