
Challenges and training needs to primary Agricultural Marketing Cooperative Societies (AMCOS) in marketing of non-coffee produce in Tanzania

Gratian Cronery Rwekaza^{1*} and Christina M Maeda²

^{1*}Moshi Co-operative University (MoCU), Tanzania, email address:

gratiancronery@gmail.com

²Moshi Co-operative University (MoCU), Tanzania, email address:

maedachristina@gmail.com

Abstract

Marketing challenges in agricultural cooperatives affects marketing advantages; in turn affects benefits to members. These challenges need solutions that were found to be addressed by education and training; that needs training assessments. Training on cooperative business can become a strategic for recovery planning building back better the cooperative societies. This research was done based on survey design based on a qualitative design. Data were collected using 19 focus group discussions and 5 key informant interviews. The findings on the challenges indicated that; production capacity was found not meeting market requirement. The reliable markets for farmers were found not to be feasible. Middle men were found to be the controller of the markets. Marketing of none-coffee produce were found to require specified training requirements especially on meeting the market requirements. Also, the measurement in terms of selling the produce has become a stumbling block in developing a win-win situation among the producers and buyers. On the training needs the findings indicates that; the mixed crop marketing was found to be among the component that needs training. Training on the quality maintenance of produce from production to marketing and training on contract and business negotiation; the negotiation capacity among farmers were found to limit business performance. The study concludes that, the performance of cooperative in alleviating marketing challenges were found to be the stumbling block for agriculture cooperatives to meets the markets requirements. The study recommends that; Primary AMCOS to solicit training on production increase by farmers in primary AMCOS to curb marketing demands. Local government and the ministry responsible for trade and marketing to provide regulation on how middlemen can venture fare in agricultural business marketing to moderate business practices. The cooperative department and cooperative commission should empower primary cooperatives on marketing non-coffee by capacity building.

Keywords: Challenges and training needs; Primary AMCOS; Marketing; None-coffee produce.

AJCDT, Vol. 8 No. 1 (December, 2023), pp. 114 – 130, © 2023 Authors

INTRODUCTION

Background: The agricultural Cooperatives globally have been facing the marketing

challenges, these challenges are characterized by different factors including natural and human factors (Anania, *et al.*,

2020; Kimario, 1992; ICA and ILO, 2014). In European and Northern American cooperatives, most agricultural cooperatives operate in a form of a company where farmers are the investors. In those model business operations becomes effective (Buchafwe, 2011; FAO, 2018). In cooperatives, the agricultural mode of cooperatives was found to be characterized by mono-prototype business marketing. This is where the agricultural cooperatives are characterised by single crop business marketing (Kassanga and Jovin (2021). Such business trading were found to be characterised by several risks, including but not limited to; price fluctuation, change in production volumes, unstable government policies governing agriculture, change in other factors of economic production, geographical factors and other dilemma (Eskola, 2005; Mhando, 2005; Rwekaza and Anania, 2021). That calls for diversification of crop marketing business that is supposed to be done by the cooperatives. Among the coffee prime buyers is European Countries (EC) with an average of 43% of total global imports between 2015 and 2018, followed by the Russian Federation (22%), United States (18%), the Japan (6%), China (5%) the rest take the remaining percentages (6%) according to FAO reports of 2019. The demand of coffee had been increasing, despite of the decrease in coffee production. In less developed countries, agriculture is characterised by less government funding and un-focused policies that govern agriculture sector (Rwekaza *et al.*, 2019; Theron, 2010). The agriculture cooperatives are found to be in the hands of unprotected policies to enrich its objectives towards advancing its members (ICA and ILO, 2014; Mruma, 2014; Sizya, 2001). Single crops marketing business which had for century

remained the practice will not sustain the cooperatives, hence leads to member economic development to remain backward. In Africa, the farmers market their produce through cooperatives, over 70%, they are in the group of smallholder farmers that depends on the subsistence agriculture by growing cash, food crops and spices including coffee as one of the cash crops (Anania and Bee, 2018; ICA and ILO, 2014; Rwekaza *et al.*, 2018). This subsistence farming needs specified training programs to curb with economic shocks that can be caused by marketing of single crops at their marketing institutions, cooperatives being among them. In Tanzania, like other African countries, the agriculture cooperative society's business practice is not apart from single crop marketing. The mono-crop business market risks had been the leading pandemics that make these cooperative remain not sustainable when the production and marketing business shake arises (Anania and Rwekaza, 2016; Ellis 2014). The Tanzania cooperative societies acts as from independence has opened the door for cooperative to indulge into agricultural marketing without closing the limits for the crop business (Garrido-Prada, *et al.*, 2019; Rwekaza and Anania, 2018). It is on the base of practice that has made cooperatives to remain in single crop business cooperative model where members of the same grows diverse produce. Basing from the practice of the Tanzania agricultural cooperatives, unions market the primary cooperative members produce (Rwekaza, 2021). Before, the cooperative apex, that is unions of cooperative with the same crops were championing search for markets and charged to deliver agro inputs to unions and primary cooperatives; which by the current scenario are not in existence (Tonya, 2021).. The apex

makes cooperatives to remain with single crop imprints that bounds cooperative business. Since the cooperative unions that had formed the apex markets primary cooperatives member produce, the question of single crops characterizes the primary cooperative business markets that necessitates a special training to avail the monocarp business. According to Adu (2014) argued that, primary cooperatives had remained single crop business dominance that donor diversify markets to primary cooperative members. On the global prominence, cooperatives had been identified as the best model to market rural production produce by having a stable marketing systems; on the other hand can raise the sustainable economic growth that had becomes the targets of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) of 2030 (Rwekaza *et al.*, 2020). In the production side, on addressing the challenges facing agricultural cooperatives, the Tanzania agriculture sector has proposed and developed different actors that ventured into training on expanding production with standardized agricultural practices. These developed institutions include; these institution includes, Sokoine university of agriculture, Tanzania coffee research institute, Kagemu research institute and Non-Governmental Organisations that ventured in coffee seedling production. On the other hand the introduction of Tanzania Agricultural Research Institute (TARI) which was established in 2016 to enhance the strengthening of agricultural research systems. Not only that, farmers had given access to the established Tanzania Official Seed Certificate Institute (TOSCI). Also, establishment of the Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) which are Tanzania Horticulture Association (TAHA), Research,

Community and Organizational Development Associates (RECODA), International Institute of Tropical Agriculture (IITA), World Vegetable Centre, Rural Initiatives for Participatory Agricultural Transformation (RIPAT) and many others. In aspect of investments farmers were given access to Tanzania Agricultural Development Bank (TADB) to lead capacity-building strategies and programme to strengthen the agriculture financing and rural lending. The government of Tanzania and the cooperative unions has employed number of extension offices to nature smallholder farmers in expanding their production capacity. However, primary AMCOS are still facing marketing challenges from marketing arrangements to market non-tradition crops that for years has been marketed through cooperatives. The study was based in two specific objectives which were to assessing the challenges experienced by primary AMCOS members in attempt to market none coffee by using available cooperative models. Also, assessing training needs for marketing non-coffee produce for effective diversification market opportunity. The paper is in line with Tanzania by 2025 development vision seeks to convert a robust and resilient middle-income economy that competes favorably in global competition. The findings will help the primary AMCOS members and the institutions to understand different crops that are suggested by members to market alongside their traditional coffee so as to enhance competitiveness in the market and advance their incomes. Also, it will help the government agricultural development stakeholders such as training and research institutions in developing programmes to strengthen the agriculture sector for increasing the smallholder farmers. Similarly, the findings will assist in

attainment of the African development agenda 2063 goals which focuses on ending poverty and hunger, achieving food security, promoting sustainable agriculture and decent work and economic growth by increasing farmer's income.

METHODOLOGY

Survey design was used where two regions of Kagera and Kigoma were surveyed. These regions are among the leading in the production and marketing of coffee, also, they have good climatic condition on heavy rains, fertile soil and moderate temperature that allow multiple crops. In these regions, two districts were chosen from each of the regions purposively. In Kagera region, Karagwe and Muleba districts were selected, while in Kigoma region, Buhigwe and Kigoma districts were selected as a study

area. The choice of the districts also considered high production of multiple crops that can be traded alongside coffee. Also, the selection of the region and districts was due to the fact that, these areas are the leading in the production and marketing of coffee in Tanzania. But also, they have similar geographical characteristics where crops of the same can be grown long side with coffee that can be marketed in the cooperative societies. A total of 19 primary AMCOS were visited that formed a focus group discussion in each of the AMCOS. In Kigoma district all the 4 AMCOS were selected while in Buhigwe district 5 AMCOS of higher coffee sales were purposively sampled. In Kagera region, five primary AMCOS were purposively selected based on their coffee sales volumes.

Table 1: Surveyed AMCOS by district of their establishment

Name of AMCOS	Region	District	Ward	Reg Year
Runyaga	Kagera	Karagwe	Chanika	1984
Bisheshe			Nyakaho	1975
Kamahungu			Bugene	1987
Nyabwegira			Nyabwegira	1977
Ndama			Ndama	1994
Tukutuku		Muleba	Muleba +Bulleza	1987
Kibanga			Kibanga	1984
Kabutaigi			Kabutaigi	1973
Mubunda			Mubunda	1993
Kasharunga			Kasharunga	1975
Kibigwa	Kigoma	Buhigwe	Kibigwa	2008
Manyovu			Manyovu	2007
Mahwenyi			Mwayaya+ Myanila	2003
Nakimuhe			Mnanila	2007
Mwayaya			Mwayaya	2002
Rumaku		Kigoma Dc		1994
Kalinzi			Kalinzi	1994
Mkibanda				1996
Mkigu			-	-

The data collection methods included the FGDs at the primary AMCOS. In each sampled primary AMCOS members were invited by the board and management; that forme an FGD groups. In the FGDs, it constituted of board members, management

and ordinary members which were invited by the board members at the meetings. The discussions involve the average of 7 members to 10 members who attended the meetings. The number of participants was determined by the board based on member's

activeness in cooperative business. According to Creswell and Poth (2016) this is the optimal number for the FGD. The Key Informant Interviews (KII) was conducted with regional cooperative registrars, district cooperative officers, union managers, registrar of cooperatives and agricultural traders. Key Informant Interview was conducted with Karagwe District Cooperative Union (KDCU), Kagera Cooperative Union (KCU), District Cooperative Officer and with Tanzania Cooperative Development Commission (TCDC). The selection of the Key informants was based on their knowledge on cooperative marketing business. As the study was qualitative, thee content analysis were analyzed using Atlas. These data were transcribed using content analysis where, themes and sub themes was developed based on the study objectives (Flick, 2015; 2009). The qualitative analysis

was used in this study, quotations and transcriptions were used to generate the findings of the study.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

The study was conducted in two regions as explained earlier, on the same four districts were surveyed from the two regions. In the discussions it was identify that, the challenges as well as training needs were important in ensuring primary AMCOS to market the none-coffee produce, since, most of their AMCOS had a tradition of marketing coffee produce from AMCOS

The identified non-coffee producers to be marketed alongside coffee: The member in their cooperative societies was interviewed and identified what possible crops that they grow and they were of the opinion that, they are capable in trading with them through their cooperative societies.

Table 2: Percentage by Suggested crops by district

Suggested crops	Percentage of acceptance by district				
	Karagwe	Muleba	Buhigwe	Kigoma	Total
Crops					
Beans	5	5	4	3	17
Maize	5	3	4	1	13
Cassava	2	1	1	1	5
Bananas (matoke)	2	5	1	1	9
Irish potatoes	1	1	1	1	4
Vanilla	2	1	0	0	3
Chia Seeds	3	1	0	0	4
Sunflower	2	3	1	3	9
Groundnuts	1	3	0	0	4
Soy beans	1	0	0	0	1
Pineapples	2	0	1	1	4
Avocado	0	2	2	0	4
Cotton	0	1	0	0	1
Pigeonpee	0	1	3	2	6
Hot chill	0	0	5	4	9

Basing from the Table 2 indicates that, in each district the respondents indicated presence of different crops. However, beans, maize, banana and hot-chill were mostly preferred as crops that can be marketed by primary cooperatives. Despite such choice, marketing arrangements had faced some

challenges as identified by the responses from the FGDs and key informant interviews as indicated based on the given study objectives.

Challenges experienced by primary AMCOS members in attempt to market none coffee by using available cooperative

models: The 19 primary AMCOS in the two regions were interviewed on the possible challenges encountered or expected to be encountered in marketing of none coffee produce; members and other key informant has provided their views. These views were transcribed to ensure it captures these challenges as well as the suggestion possible capacity building requirements in terms of training. The first issue raised was based on the production capacities; where in most areas it was found that, the farmers produce less than what is needed to be marketed. From the information obtained with the members at the FGD with Kamahungu primary AMCOS in Bugene ward of Karagwe district, the researcher found members argument that;

“.....its will be very difficult for the new crops to be sold through primary AMCOS such as Chia, vanilla, sunflower and the like because its production amount is low; may be if the farmers will be emphasized to start in larger amount of production...”

With this information it indicates that, meeting the market demand in terms of production capacities, based on the choice of crops that farmer's needs to be marketed through cooperative, mobilization campaign becomes a requirement. This information had similar concern with Bari (2015) and Johny *et al.*, (2017) with the argument that, production capacities done by agricultural firms do not meet the demand of the markets. Implies that, markets need a constant supply with quality products to satisfy business operational, locally and international. Similarly, the reliable market was a stumbling block as the farmers attempted to indulge into other crops to be traded via cooperative societies. From the information obtained in Kigoma region, indicates that, the aspect of reliable markets of agricultural

produce affects the morale of farmers to engage effectively in production of the anticipated crops for marketing. In an FGD conducted, farmers provided their opinion that; inability to identify the reliable market and this discourage famers from producing more (Kibwigwa primary AMCOS (Buhigwe district) and in Rumaku primary AMCOS of Kigoma district farmers pinpointed that they had even attempted to produce other crops like sunflower but they failed to get a market and they have remained with their produce without knowing where to sell. This indicates, production for marketing should starts from the demand side, buy having strong commitments which is bound by contracts. Acorind to Heien (1977) and Komba *et al.*... (2019) contend that, sometimes farmers produce without taking into account the market demands, that in turn lads to having produce that differs with market demands. Production in business needs to start from the markets that direct, what needs to be produced at what standards and quantity. In some places, cooperative were found to face challenges of price control, middle men dictates the business. The claims went to seek government control by calling the order to market the selected crops using the cooperative models. This was evidenced by the statements provided by two cooperative members during the FGD, with a statement that;

“...we don't have a proper system in place to buy and market other crops than coffee, may be if the government will direct the farmers to sell their produce through primary AMCOS... (Rumaku AMCOS, Kigoma DC)”. “....farmers having no control over the price of their produce this partly because we do not have the same voice, therefore middle men benefits more on our produce while we continue to remain poor...” (Kasharunga

primary AMCOS Muleba DC. “....no formal pricing structure for other crops and middle men uses this gap to take advantages of us...”. (Ndama primary AMCOS in Karagwe DC).“....obstacles from buyers that are operating currently as they were used in initiating prices without thinking about the efforts that we used in production...”. (Kabutaiga primary AMCOS in Muleba district). From this quote, it indicates that, governments and other stakeholders have the key role to direct farmers and buyers to use the cooperative models in marketing of none coffee produce for effective business markets. Kweka. (2018). Msaki *et al.*, (2014) Magigi (2013) argued that cooperatives are the driving engine for rural and urban development, marketing of the marginalized group in terms of their produce needs to be done by the cooperative societies. These are member based institutions within which, decisions are made by themselves (Rwekaza *et al.*, 2018). Decision the price margins and control of the product quality and volumes can become feasible based on these member based institutions (Rwekaza *et al.*, 2021; Rwekaza and Anania (2021). The agricultural marketing cooperatives when diversifies crops, can render a sustainable marketing solutions to rural based population, what is needed is a sound policy that are practical to protect these members based institutions. In other places, the question of storage to none coffee produce becomes a stumbling block as farmers’ attempts to market these crops. From the information obtained from different primary AMCOS, they were of the opinion that; “Storage facilities may be a challenge because the storages we have now is used for coffee but also it is worth thinking on proper arrangement on crops such as beans as it required not to stay in the storage for long

time” (Kasharunga primary AMCOS of Muleba District). “ on the other hand, small spacing on the available storage were found to limit the extent of collection and storage advantages among primary AMCOS as it was reported that; “Few storage facilities which will make collection to be complicated” (Mahwenyi primary AMCOS of Buhigwe district). This implies the motivating factors of advancing and building these storage facilities would stimulate the business performance among. According to Lwezaula (2013), Ngaruko . and Sen *et al.*, (2017) and Sumelius *et al.* (2014) argued that for cooperatives to becomes business potential, the need to build strong and modern storage facilities based on specified crop and its required component is the best strategy to develop market potential. Cooperatives need these facilities to enhance business infrastructural development. On the other hand the component of business education was also provided by the respondents during the survey. Education on market search, segmentation, pricing, market cycle was among the identified factors that need to be addressed by different stakeholders. From the response obtained in Kamahungu primary AMCOS of Karagwe district provided te argument that; AMCOS boards lacks skills in findings markets for their members’ produce. On the other hand, Nyabwegira AMCOS of Buhigwe district were of the opinion that; limited thinking ability for AMCOS members and management who thinks that it is the duty of union and the government to find market for them. With these two factors, the question of education among leaders and members become of important in driving these primary AMCOS to arrive at a sustainable business of marketing other crops. Based from the aides raised by Mayala and Bamanyisa (2018) and Mhando (2005)

and Ogunsanya (2019) that, education on cooperative governance and business development are important in these member based institutions (cooperative societies) to bust their business management, this in turn will bring building the community production markets potential. The marketing of none-coffee produce was found to require specified training requirements especially on meeting the market requirements. Markets need a continuous supply with specifications. Basing on these facts, it was evidenced by information obtained from primary AMCOS with the comments that “It’s a challenge to locate the special market that needs quality produce. Similar, other respondents’ comments that, “...We once got a seminar on production previously but after producing chia seeds, buyers did not turn up”. In Kishake village they were emphasized to collect beans, but after collection those beans people never come back (Kibanga primary AMCOS). These had been also raised by Mayala and Bamanyisa (2018) with the argument that, sometimes buyers came with different mission; some are of the opinion to sell seeds by creating ghost demands. On the other hand, the manager of the same AMCOS said, “it was found that, those collected beans were found to be of low quality compared to the buyer’s specification, that’s why we lost the market”. On the other hand, other respondents were of the opinion that; “We had tried in collecting some beans once but the buyer did not come back and everything was destroyed....” (Kabutaiga primary AMCOS). This implies, the producers and the buyers need to meet in business negotiations and meeting the demands of each other. On the other hand, the production capacity needs backup of extension service which was found to be efficiently accessed, evidenced by the response from the primary

AMCOS that, “We don’t even have a committed extension officer that visit us in our farms, how would we produce enough to get enough produce to be sold using out primary AMCOS...” (Rumaku primary AMCOS of Kigoma district). Eskola (2005) Lee (2017) and Silayo and Tumsifu (2013) the business traders needs to meet with the producers, the information flows need to be updates in the time of the production value chain to ensure market accessibility. On the other hand, Rwekaza and Mhihi (2016) Rwekaza *et al*, (2018) argued that, regulators and promoters (extension officers and cooperative officers) need to be closer to farmers on their effort to indulge in production and marketing to ensure business sustainability. It was found that, the measurement in terms of selling the produce has become a stabling block in developing a win-win situation among the producers and buyers. From the information obtained from the respondents in the primary AMCOS, members said that; “...presence of unlawful measurement like the use of bowls, buckets etc. which ends up in oppressing the farmer’s efforts...” (Kabutaiga Primary AMCOS). This implies that, farmer’s capacity to raise voice in business markets basing on is its injustice that was found to be minimal. According to URT (2002), the cooperative development policy, requires cooperative with vibrant capacity to make decision. Also, Chambo and Dyamet (2011) and Rwekaza and Anania (2020) argued that, cooperative societies failed in business negotiations since their voice is not protected in business negotiations. Buyers are protected by the business license where farmers don’t have such mandate of knowing what is in the buyer’s business license. This also was evidenced by the respondents with opinion that; “...we have less knowledge on making

contract and negotiations...” (Mubunda primary AMCOS). This implies that, raising the voice of the voiceless who are the farmers is important in cooperative business markets. Cooperative models as the instrument to raise the community incomes, were found to be the needs of the farmers, as it was evidenced by one respondents from the primary AMCOS who provides the opinion that “...people understanding and willingness to sell other kinds of crops through cooperatives” (Kasharunga primary AMCOS of Muleba district). Cooksey (2010) and Chambo *et al.*, (2007) contend that, there should be marketing reforms that have a component of addressing the marginalized group to extend market protection. Farmers in the countryside are not informed of the business marketing and management. According to Chambo and Dyamet (2011), Rwekaza (2021) and Rwekaza *et al.*, (2019) were of the opinion that, the cooperative movement was found to have weaker negotiating power from the primary to federation in protecting the members on business markets. One respondents from Kigoma raised a concern that; “...Cooperative movement is not performing as expected because of weaker cooperative managements found inside the cooperative societies, boards of directors are discouraging us, there is corruption, imbursement and many things which make members to despair from their cooperative societies; if we decide to established other crops to be marketed through these weaker cooperatives, it will remain business as usual....” (Kibwigwa AMCOS of Buhigwe district). The arguments is in line with Anania and Rwekaza (2016) and Cooksey (2010) argued that, the Tanzania federation of cooperative (TFC) has a weak bargaining power, its practical business mandates do not reach the primary cooperatives; the

cooperative unions dictates the primary cooperative business operations. These have made primary cooperatives that do not know business marketing and operations. Low capital base experienced by primary AMCOS were found to limits business markets, most primary AMCOS were found to relay on union funds that makers the business. On the same, capital accumulation were found to be faced by deductions from the government and cooperative movement financing that makes the fear to bring other crops on board. These were raised by the respondents from the primary AMCOS with the allegations that; “... AMCOS have low financial bases something that will hinder the process of collecting and selling the famers produce ...” (Mwayaya in in Buhigwe district). The other said that “...We are currently facing a lot of deduction from selling coffee and this end up overloading the poor farmers so even if we allow selling other crops we might be faced with the same problem (Mwayaya in Buhigwe district). This implies, capital is an important component in developing primary AMCOS capacity to venture in multiple crops that is backed by reducing cases and other deductions to increase Farm Get Price (FGP) as well as building the capital base to these primary AMCOS. The low capital bases was indicated by Anania and Bee (2018), Deng and Hendrikse (2013) Magigi (2013) that, cooperative needs to build its internal capacities on advancing their capital bases. These would have advanced the societies capacity to run business operation cost and capacity to search markets and manage negotiations.

The training needs for marketing non-coffee produce for effective diversification market opportunity: This was the second objective of this paper, the farmers in managing none-coffee business markers,

needs to be training on marketing value chain. That is from production to the markets. Using the FGD conducted in the primary AMCOS, the key informants with cooperative offices and managers at the cooperative unions; the findings were developed. The mixed crop marketing was found to be among the component that needs training. Some crops needs to be collected without mixing with others due to its characteristics, example, coffee cannot be mixed with other crops basing on quality control. This was raised by one key informant with a statement that; "...mixed crops in the cooperatives on how its management is to be done, the training will for sure be important, because this seems to be a new structure which people need to have skills on how to manage it..." (KDCU Manager). Quality control training; maintaining quality of produce from production to marketing needs training from different stakeholders including extension offices, processors, buyers, warehouse managers and others in the produce marketing value chain. From the responses of the interviewed farmers in the primary AMCOS explained that; "...as it is for the coffee, we are usually trained how to assess the quality of the coffee that is brought to the centre, so if we decide adopting a new crop then we shall need to be trained on the quality assessment to gain best produce for the farmers" (Kasharunga primary AMCOS of Muleba). According to Komba (2019), Magigi (2013) and Heien (1977) quality control is important in cooperative produce as a strategy to win the markets. Most agricultural cooperative fails to meet the marketing requirement due to failure to meet the standards. Education on agri-business among farmers; farming needs to be done basing on the best practice that have business component; farming is needed to bring

change to farmers needs to embark on innovative ideas where farmers are entrepreneurs. Basing from the statements raised by farmers in the primary AMCOS, they said "...education on Agri-Business is very low to the famers as well as the cooperatives generally (Kibwigwa primary AMCOS of Muleba). Rwekaza and Anania, (2018) Theron. (2010) were of the opinion that, education on cooperative business management need to be given to all stakeholders, that includes members, management, regulators, promoters so as to build the common understanding on how to leads these members based businesses firms. According to Tonya (2021) argued that, training need to be given to primary AMCOS on how they can manage the marketing by themselves. The current status indicates that, the union manages the business (Bari, 2015). This was evidenced by responses from one of the members during the FGD who said that; "... leadership and Management Training specifically to know how we as AMCOS can manage this diversification without depending on KCU to manage it (Kibanga primary AMCOS of Muleba district). "AMCOs boards should be trained in the whole process of collecting and selling other crops than coffee (Mubunda primary AMCOS of Muleba). This implies that, business management on the component of marketing is important, where boards and managers at the primary AMCOS need to be trained. Adu (2014) provide a concern that, when leaders are trained on management and business operations, it is easier for cooperative societies to go with market demands, hence adopt changes in the markets. Similar concern was raised in almost every place of the survey, from the information obtained in the FGD, farmers indicated that most of the members including

the board, members do not have required skills when it comes to marketing of other crops specifically in finding the buyers, ability to put in proper agreement with the buyers but also managing other crops together with coffee marketing (Primary AMCOS of Manyovu in Buhigwe district; Runyaga in Karagwe, district; Mahwenyi in Buhigwe and at the union of KDCU in Karagwe). Based from that evidence, Anania (2017) and Buchafwe (2011) were of the opinion that, before cooperatives venture into any business operations, training on does and don't needs to be part of the process in cooperative promotion. This will enable the society to do businesses that are of profit to members. The agricultural production training was found to be important as the business marketing in the agricultural sector, markets requires specified products with better production mechanism that needs mechanization. The response from respondents from Kamhungu AMCOS in Kishao ward who were from Karagwe District clearly indicated that they have committed extension officials from KDCU whom train them on coffee production so they advised that the same could be used to train them on other crops so that they can improve on producing other chosen crop that can be marketed through cooperatives. Similar argument was presented in Buhigwe district Mwayaya primary AMCOS that if they are to start selling other crops with coffee then they need extension training. Bari (2015) were of the opinion in beliefs on production diversification to cooperative societies; this would bring the multiplier effects on developing marketing potential that in turn would bring increased income to members. On the other hand, training was mentioned by Kibwigwa primary AMCOS from Buhigwe and Rumaku primary

AMCOS of Buhigwe where farmers were of the opinion that each AMCOS can use the general meeting where members can be educated on how they can market non-coffee through their primary AMCOS after they have extended their production. Adu (2014) and Chambo and Dyamet (2011) argued that, cooperative societies in the third word are basically traditional, they operate on single products without diversifications, policies are made in such a way that, they restrict These cooperative societies from diversifications. Training and awareness on business diversification has become of importance to eradicate such a pandemic. Further, the component of production raises a concern of having researchers to validate what need to be produced given the differences in geographical characteristics. These was raised by respondents from the AMCOS FGDs that; "...We need researchers who will research our soils and tell us what kind of seeds will grow better so that we can have better production and be able to sell through AMCOS..." (Mkongoro- primary AMCOS in Kigoma district). Also, other were of the opinion that; "... other areas are far now because of benefit they got from research, we are requesting you to help us get those researchers who can come and do research on our soil and tell us what kind of crops suits and what will be the best seeds to be grown. (Mkizu primary AMCOS in Kigoma district). Based on the argument raised by Mruma (2014) and Rwekaza *et al*, (2018) that, for the successful cooperatives, the component of Research, Development And Innovation (RDI) is of important, in agricultural cooperative markets, research be done on produce value chain to meet the market requirement. In contract and business negotiation; the negotiation capacity among farmers were found to limit business

performance, farmers wanted to engage into non-coffee marketing, the language of the contracts were not found to be known as well as business terms. This was evidenced by one of the respondents who was a manager of KCU 1990 Ltd with the concern that; “the members of AMCOS admitted to have less skills in making effective contracts with the buyers but also having less negotiation skills. Similarly, one among the respondents from the primary AMCOS with the opinion that; “...we need a seminar to encourage farmers to start producing other crops and sell through our cooperatives (Tukutuku AMCOS in Muleba district). Similarly, it was found that, as the farmer’s makes negation through their leaders at the primary AMCOS, trust among leaders becomes important. This was raised by Assistant Registrar Kagera region who was a key informant with the concern that; “trust among the members is the foremost thing to be done because trust is lost and this affects the operations of AMCOs and if not corrected the diversification to other crops will also suffer it. This implies, for primary cooperative to venture into non-coffee business the aspect of trust as well as having the second eye to see what is in the contract is important before the signing. Also, Eskola (2005) and Kweka (2018) argued that, trust is the basic component for cooperative business success. Trust is the core capital to cooperatives; these need to be inculcated to all levers, members, boards and management.

CONCLUSION

AND

RECOMMENDATIONS

The paper concludes that, the performance of cooperative in alleviating marketing challenges that were found to be the stumbling block for agriculture cooperatives to meets the markets requirements training is

the best solutions. Training be done on all levers of the marketing value chain on the identified non coffee produce to be marketed by the cooperative societies. The paper recommends that; cooperatives were found to depend on one crops business markets (coffee), training to indulge into multiple crops to enlarge market potentials and uplift members’ incomes will become a solution to curative business and community at large. Primary AMCOS to solicit training on production increase by farmers in primary AMCOS to curb marketing demands. Local government and the ministry responsible for trade and marketing to provide regulation on how middlemen can venture fairly in agricultural business marketing to moderate crop business. The cooperative department and commission should empower primary cooperatives on marketing non-coffee by capacity building. Similarly, capacity building in primary cooperative board and management is required on areas of negotiating capacity by cooperative development partner such as training institutions the negotiation capacity among farmers were found to limit business performance.

Relevance and implication of the study:

The primary agricultural marketing cooperatives are led by members; it is a member based organization who manages the cooperative business; few of them employs the management. Running cooperative business needs business training; this can be done after training needs to identify the gaps and develop the training packages. The business challenges that cooperative face in their effort to attain their expected goals, can be solved through having the right training package within which this paper is based.

REFERENCES

- Adu, C. A. (2014). Co-operative Societies in Nigeria: Prospects and Problems. *International Journal of Behavioral Social and Movement Sciences*. 03. 18.
- Anania, P and Bee, F.K. (2018). Emerging Global Trends and the Opportunities for African Co-operatives to Improve Members' Wellbeing. *Journal of Co-operative and Business Studies (JCBS)*. 1(1):1-23.
- Anania, P and Rwekaza G, C. (2016). The Determinants of Success in Agricultural Marketing cooperatives in Tanzania; Experience from Mweka Sungu, Muruwia and Uru North Njari Agricultural Marketing Cooperatives in Moshi Distret, *European Journal of Research in Social Science*. Progressive Academic Publishing. www.idpublications.org
- Anania, P. (2017). The cooperative enterprises and youth employment creation: prospects and challenges: reflection from Tanzania Agricultural Sector. *International Journal of Business Management Research* 1(2) , 55-67.
- Anania, P. and Rwekaza, C. G. (2016). The Determinants of Success in Agricultural Marketing Co-Operatives in Tanzania: The Experience from Mweka Sungu, Mruwia and Uru North Njari Agricultural Marketing Co-operatives in Moshi District. *European Journal of Research in Social Sciences*. 4 (3). 62-75.
- Anania, P., Rwekaza, G. C., Bamanyisa, J, M. (2020). Socio-economic benefits of agricultural marketing co-operatives and their challenges: Evidence from Selected Cases in Moshi District Council (Tanzania) *Revista de Estudios sobre Despoblación y Desarrollo Rural* *Journal of Depopulation and Rural Development and studies* pp 1-50.
- Bari, M. (2015). *Agriculture diversification and its impact on socio economic development in Aligarh district* (Doctoral dissertation, Aligarh Muslim University).
- Buchafwe, P. M. (2011). How to Promote the Development of Co-operatives Self-help Organisations: Case of Peoples Credit SACCOS Fund in Tanzania. KDI: KDI School of Public Policy and Management.
- Chambo, S. and Dyamet, M. (2011). Governance in Co-operatives: A study of Internal Dynamics. *International Co-operative Research Conference in Africa: Prospects and Challenges*, 26th to 28th September 2011. Moshi, Tanzania. 17pp.
- Chambo, S., Mwangi, M. and Oloo, O. (2007). "An analysis of the socio-economic impact of co-operatives in Africa and their institutional context, ICA Regional Office for Africa, Nairobi. 14 pp.
- Cooksey, B. (2010). Marketing reforms? The rise and fall of agricultural liberalization in Tanzania. *Development Policy Review* 29(1) , 57-81.
- Creswell, J. W. & Poth, C. N. (2016). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches*. Sage Publications: New Delhi. 414pp
- Deng, W., & Hendrikse, G. (2013). Product diversification of cooperatives and corporations evidence from the Netherlands. In *Economics and*

- Management of Networks Conference, Proceedings, Agadir* (pp. 21-23).
- DW. (2021, November 29). Utoshelevu wa chakula Tanzania kushuka. Utoshelevu wa chakula unatarajiwa kushuka Tanzania . www.dw.com.
- Ellis, F. (2014). Agricultural marketing and peasant-state transfer in Tanzania. *Journal of Peasants Studies* 10(4) , 214-242.
- Eskola, E. (2005). Agricultural marketing systems and the value chain management in Tanzania. DSM: ESRF Global Economies.
- FAO (2018). Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. Rome. 254.
- Flick, U. (2009). *An Introduction to Qualitative Research*. SAGE Publication Ltd, London. 504 pp.
- Flick, U. (2015). *Introducing research methodology, a beginner's guide to doing a research project*. Sage. Los Angeles. 289pp
- Garrido-Prada, P., Delgado-Rodriguez, M. J., & Romero-Jordán, D. (2019). Effect of product and geographic diversification on company performance: Evidence during an economic crisis. *European Management Journal*, 37(3), 269-286.
- Heien, D. (1977). Price determination process for agricultural sector model. *American journal of Agricultural economics*, 59(1) , 126-132.
- ICA and ILO. (2014). Co-operatives and the Sustainable Development Goals: A Contribution to the Post-2015 Development Debate, A Policy Brief, ICA and ILO. 12-18 pp.
- Johny, J., Wichmann, B., & Swallow, B. M. (2017). Characterizing social networks and their effects on income diversification in rural Kerala, India. *World Development*, 94, 375-392.
- Kassanga, G. A., & Jovin, J. (2021). Effects of coffee prices fluctuation on sustainability of agricultural marketing co-operative in Tanzania: The case of Kilimanjaro Native Co-operative Union. *Business Management and Economics*, 9(4) , 54-65.
- Kimario, A. M. (1992). *Marketing Co-operatives in Tanzania: Problems and Prospects*; Dar es Salaam University Pres. 160pp.
- Komba, N.C., Mlozi, R. and Mvena, S.K. (2019). Demystification of administrative de-linking: Farmers access to agricultural extension information and service delivery in Arumeru District, Tanzania. *International Journal of Agricultural Extension and Rural Development* , 7 (1): 692-700.
- Kweka, G. J. (2018). Welfare effects of eliminating commodity price volatility: Evidence from Tanzania coffee farmers. *African Journal of Agriculture*, 13(35) , 1837-1851.
- Lee, C. Y. (2017). Product diversification, business structure, and firm performance in Taiwanese property and liability insurance sector. *The Journal of Risk Finance*, 9 (1): 94-106.
- Magigi, W. (2013). Putting cooperative development in urban development agenda: An analysis and lessons from cooperative reform and modernization programme impelmentation intervention with case reality in Tanzania. *Journal of Cooperative Studies* 2(2) , 66-75.
- Mayala, N. M. & Bamanyisa, J. M. (2018). Assessment of market options for

- smallholder horticultural growers and traders in Tanzania. *European Journal of Research in Social Sciences*, 6(1): 27-42.
- Mhando, D. G. (2005). *Farmers' Coping Strategies with the Changes of Coffee Marketing System after Economic Liberalisation: The Case of Mbinga District, Tanzania*; Doctoral Thesis, Graduate School of Asian and African Area Studies, Kyoto University, Kyoto, pp 21.
- Moshi Co-operative University (2017) Research Policy and Guidelines, 28 pp
- Moshi Co-operative University (2020) Research Agenda, 23 pp
- Mruma, A. O. (2014). Fifty years of co-operative and economics development in Tanzania 1961-2011. *European Journal of Business Management*, 6(13), 78-89.
- Msaki J, L. Rwekaza G, C. Maleko G, N Mtani B, T. (2014). "The Power of Self Hybridization to Enhance Institutional Competitiveness and Growth: Feedback vis-à-vis Feed-forward Philosophical Re-engineering Process in African Weak Institutions International journal of Development and Social Research, Xavier Institute of Management, Bhubaneswar. India
- Ngaruko, D. D. and Lwezaula, D. D. (2013). Determinants of Farmers' Group Membership Satisfaction in Mbozi District, Tanzania: Exploring Farmers' Options. *International Journal of Economy, Management and Social Sciences*, 2(11):919-923.
- Ogunsanya, O. (2019). Development of Business Theories. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 10 : (12): 1-9
- Rwekaza G, C and Anania, P (2018). Co-operative Decision-Making Structure and Its Effectiveness in Promoting Sustainable Co-operative Organizations in Tanzania: A Case of Selected Agricultural Marketing Co-operatives in Shinyanga Region. *Journal of Arts and Social Sciences* 9:1
- Rwekaza G, C and Anania, P (2021). Promoting micro, small and medium business enterprises by integrating the co-operative and cluster development models; *Journal of Co-operative and Business Studies (JCBS) Vol. 6(1)1-17*
- Rwekaza G, C and Anania, P (2021). The benefits and challenges of Agricultural Marketing Cooperative Societies, in Moshi district Tanzania; evidence from Mweka Sungu, Muruia and Uru North Njari cooperative societies., *Cooperative in the global history*, Lexington books; chapter 12 pg 225-278
- Rwekaza G, C. Kayunze K, A. and Kimaryo L, P. (2018). Accountability of board and management to members in primary agricultural marketing cooperatives societies (AMCOS) in Tanzania: Evidence from selected AMCOS of Bukoba and Moshi Districts. *European Journal of Research and Reflection in Management Sciences*. Progressive Academic Publishing, UK Vol. 6(2) 9-31.
- Rwekaza G, C. Kayunze K, A. and Kimaryo L, P. (2018). Members' participation in decision making in primary agricultural marketing cooperatives in Tanzania: Evidence from Selected Primary Cooperatives of Bukoba and Moshi Districts *European Journal of Research and Reflection in*

- Management Sciences*, Progressive Academic Publishing, UK Vol. 6(2)50-78.
- Rwekaza G, C. Kayunze K, A. Kimaryo L, P (2018). An Analysis of External Interfaces Limiting Co-operative Sustainability in the Primary Agricultural Marketing Co-operative Societies (AMCOS) in Tanzania, Evidence from Selected Coffee Primary AMCOS Of Bukoba and Moshi Districts *European Journal of Research and Reflection in Management Sciences*, Progressive Academic Publishing, 9(1) 50-77
- Rwekaza, G. C. (2021). Colonization and decolonization of co-operatives in Tanzania: An analysis of member ownership and control rights, *East African Journal of Social and Applied Sciences*, 3(1), 103-116
- Rwekaza, G. C. and Mhihi, B. (2016). Co-operative Development in Tanzania: A Tool for Equality and Social Economic Development. *Journal of Economics and Sustainable Development*. 7(6):29-40.
- Rwekaza, G. C., and Anania, P (2020). The power of members in co-operatives: Assessing members' participation in decision making process from selected Agricultural Marketing Co-operatives in Shinyanga region, Tanzania, *Journal of Co-operative and Business Studies (JCBS)* Vol.5, Issue 1, 41-59
- Rwekaza, G. C., Kayunze, K. A. & Kimaryo, L. P. (2019). Members' Views on Ownership and Democratic Sustainability in Primary Agricultural Marketing Co-operatives in Tanzania; Evidence from Bukoba and Moshi District, *East African Journal of Social and Applied Sciences*, 1(2), 70-84.
- Rwekaza, G. C., Kayunze, K. A. & Kimaryo, L. P. (2021). Views on Ownership and Democratic Sustainability in Primary Agricultural Marketing Co-Operatives in Tanzania: Evidence from Bukoba and Moshi Districts, Proceeding of the fourth KENYA Cooperative university annual conference, October 27th -28th, 2020, Theme; cooperative in a changing ecosystem; Members', Vol (4) 121-136.
- Sen, B., Venkatesh, P., Jha, G. K., Singh, D. R., & Suresh, A. (2017). Agricultural diversification and its impact on farm income: A case study of Bihar. *Agricultural Economics Research Review*, 30(conf), 77-88.
- Silayo, E. E., & Tumsifu, E. (2013). Agricultural information needs and source of information for rural famers in Tanzania. *Library Review* 62(9) , 547-566.
- Sizya, M. J. (2001). The role of Co-operative play in poverty reduction in Tanzania. International Day of The Eradication of Povrty (pp. 1-14). Moshi: United Nations.
- Sumelius, J., Tenaw, S., Bee, F. K., & Chambo, S. (2014). Agenda on cooperative for development of cooperative in Tanzania. *Journal of Cooperative Organisation and Management* 28 , 1-3.
- Theron, J. (2010). Cooperative Policy and Law in East and Southern Africa: A Review. DSM: ILO.
- Tonya, E. M. (2021). Pricing Structure of agricultural products and sustainability of farmers in Tanzania: A Literature Review. *East African Journal of Social and Applied Sciences*, 3(1) , 118-130.

-
- URT (2002). Co-operative Development Policy 2002, Ministry of Agriculture, Food Security and Co-operatives, Government Press, Dar es Salaam.
- URT. (1997). Cooperative Development Policy. DSM: Government Printers.
- URT. (2013). Cooperative societies Act no 6. DSM: Government Printers.