
Institutional Arrangements for Marketing Non-Coffee Produce by Primary AMCOS in Tanzania

Gratian Cronery Rwekaza^{1*} and Christina M Maeda^{2*}

^{1*}Department of Business Management, Kizumbi Institute of Cooperative and Business Education (KICoB), E-mail address: gratiancronery@gmail.com

²Department of Management, Faculty of Business and Information Sciences (FBIS), E-mail address: maedachristina@gmail.com

^{1, 2}Moshi Co-operative University (MoCU), United Republic of Tanzania

Abstract

The importance of cooperatives to engage into multiple crop marketing has attracted majority stakeholders on marketing other crops alongside traditional crops. Marketing involves Supply as cooperative options for building resilience to future market shocks resulted by marketing single crop. This paper was based on marketing institutional arrangements in marketing none coffee produce by primary AMCOS in Tanzania, evidence from Karagwe, Muleba, Buhigwe and Kigoma districts. Specifically, the paper was to; examine the possible marketing arrangements in marketing none coffee produce and assess the available stakeholders in marketing of non-coffee produce as market opportunity. The study was based on Resource Based Theory (RBT); where, crops which is farmers resource that for long time, cooperatives has not been utilizing. A total of 19 primary cooperatives were sampled. Focus Group Discussion (FGD) was used to interview members of the primary AMCOS. The findings of this study revealed that; in marketing arrangements on marketing none-coffee produce it revealed marketing strategies which were; Accommodation of Marketing conditions for optimal marketing requirements, the use of locally available materials for storage before selling of produce, controlling middlemen for sustainable marketing and marketing arrangement depending on crops types and requirements. Others were; seasonality marketing based on crop seasons, payment on delivery, marketing through contractual farming and business networks. Also, the study concluded that, each crops needs its own marketing arrangement to expand business markets so as to raise the farm gate price among farmers. The paper recommends to all primary traditional agricultural cooperatives to make assessments of the available crops that can be marketed by these primary cooperatives. Also, the paper recommends to TCDC, and Ministry responsible for cooperatives, to assist agricultural cooperative in business marketing arrangements to venture into multiple crop business.

Keywords: Primary Agricultural cooperative societies; Marketing arrangements; none-coffee produce marketing.

AJCDT, Vol. 8 No. 1 (December, 2023), pp. 58 – 78, © 2023 Authors

INTRODUCTION

Globally, mono-crop business among agricultural cooperatives had been the characteristics rural cooperatives and

sometimes urban cooperatives. The global employment status indicates the, 80 % of the global population are in the agriculture sector (ILO, 2014; Wambugu *et al.*, 2018). Coffee

farmers in some countries like Brazil and Vietnam, have been applying intercropping method as a strategy technique to control weeds in the farms but not as a marketing strategy against mono-cropping (Carter *et al.*, 2010; Chambo, 2007; Lario *et al.*, 2014; Likwata and Venkatakrishnan, 2014; Rwekaza and Mhihi, 2016). Coffee offers the employment to more than 400,000 families and indirect beneficiaries amounting to 2.4 million people. We have however noticed reduced trends of coffee production and market in recent years something that endangers the sustainability of the primary co-operatives that markets coffee where the livelihood co-operative members becomes unpredictable (FAO, 2018). Coffee is the third cash crop in terms of production worldwide which increase the farmers' incomes after rice, wheat and maize production. (FAO, 2019; Rwekaza and Anania, 2020). Among the coffee prime buyers are 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 on coffee production trend. The decrease on coffee production trend hamper primary AMCOS to sustain economic resilience hence necessitates marketing arrangement in their cooperative for business sustainability. On the global prominence, cooperatives had been identified as the best model to market rural produce by having stable marketing systems. It had been noted that, when cooperative markets more crops cooperative members can raise their sustainable economic growth that had becomes the targets of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) of 2030 (Danda

and Bamanyisa, 2011; Rwekaza *et al.*, 2020; Tinzaara *et al.*, 2018; Wambugu, 2018). In countries such as India, Nepal, Vietnam, agricultural production that are done by smallholder farmers through co-operative marketing and had been among the economic practice that raises the individual incomes worldwide (Gebre *et al.*, 2020; Ogunsanya, 2019). Market diversification as a strategy to curb the traditional production of single crop had been studied and suggested by many researchers (Elbers *et al.*, 2015; Kazungu, *et al.* 2014; Wagai *et al.*, 2019). In order to address the marketing problem and bring economic resilience among the rural population, market diversification through marketing arrangement had becomes noticeable as important component in expanding markets niche (Thanasomboon *et al.*, 2020; Obaga and Mwaura, 2018). Diversifying marketing agricultural products and production had become a cornerstone strategy to advance rural livelihood incomes and improving living standards. In Africa, the farmers marketing their produce through AMCOS, 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; Chambo, 2008; ICA and ILO, 2014; Rwekaza *et al.*, 2018). Alongside coffee production, there are other crops that can be marketed alongside coffee farms and that becomes the opportunities on agricultural production that can be marketed through their AMCOS and to increase market portfolios. The African coffee farming prevailing dynamics involved the currently farming methods where the production trend for coffee decreasing year after year (Csikszentmihalyi and Larson, 2014; Kimaro *et al.*, 2013; Ruben and Hoebink, 2014; Wambugu *et al.*, 2018). Therefore, the

question of expanding crop markets in terms of deploying other brand to be marketed by cooperative has become an important component to rescue the problem. In Tanzania, the primary Agricultural Marketing Co-operative Societies (AMCOS) that entails a member-based organisation deals with primary producers (Danda and Bamanyisa, 2011; Rwekaza *et al.*, 2019). For decades AMCOS were practicing mono-crop business markets without taking into consideration of agricultural diversification in their area of production to attract a diversified market potential after redefining marketing arrangement in all products and services that can be produced by members. The Tanzania coffee marketing is done through AMCOS in different regions, the most leading being Kagera, Kilimanjaro, Mbeya, Arusha, Kigoma and Songea; while the lowest producer being Morogoro, and Tanga and Manyara (Edmeades, *et al.*, 2007; Komba, *et al.*, 2019; Olendayai, 2017). In these regions, they share some common characteristics on the districts that produce and market coffee. Alongside this, coffee marketing has tremendously decreased that had an impact on the farmers' employment. These regions through their AMCOS they have potentials of producing other food and cash crops. Addressing poverty can be done by expanding marketing potentials through cooperative model; this needs a marketing arrangement since each crop has its own characteristics that differs from one another. Basing on efforts done by the AMCOS in addressing the rural farmers and their livelihood, with limited opportunities available, together with other development initiatives and strategies, Tanzania Mainland Poverty Assessment (TMPA) (2019) indicates that, the basic needs poverty line for 2018 was TZS 49,320 per adult per month and the meals poverty

line was TZS 33,748. This means that Poverty dropped in rural areas, from 39.1 to 33.1 %. Cooperative had played an important role in marketing efficiently the cooperative members produce through the established cooperatives. The Tanzania extreme poverty dropped from 13.3 to 9.7% in rural areas. On the other hand, the Household Budget Survey of 2017/18 shows that the decrease in the poverty rate continues but has become slower indicating the slower markets opportunities where AMCOS is among them (WBG, 2019). Co-operative have a great role to play if they engage members to utilise the available opportunities on agriculture markets diversification to increase members. Literature indicates that, co-operatives especial the primary AMCOS have a diverse potential in terms of diversifying their quantity and quality of outputs to extend their market portfolio and get access to potential markets (Chambo, 2007; Chambo, *et al.* 2007; Csikszentmihalyi and Larson, 2014; FAO, 2018; Likwata and Venkatakrishnan, 2014; Kimaro *et al.*, 2013; Miho, 2017; Lario *et al.*, 2014; Ruben and Hoebink, 2014 Rwekaza *et al.*, 2019; Rwekaza and Mhihi, 2016; Wambugu *et al.*, 2018). This would increase member incomes and enhance livelihood income satisfaction in rural areas where the majority of the Tanzanians lives. The status of Tanzania cooperatives in shedding the light on the contemporary dynamics in the coffee farming for many years was envisaged that, farmers have continued cultivating coffee despite of decrease in the production trend that brings economic shocks (Chambo, *et al.* 2007; Bamanyisa, 2018). Coffee like other crops marketed through cooperatives, had been affected by urbanisation, disease such as *mnyauko*, fall in price, competition with other coffee producing countries, availability of substitute goods, fall of morale of the

produces, decrease in land size for cultivation and other problems (Creswell and Poth, 2016; Rwekaza 2019). The need for marketing arrangements in cooperative to market diversified crops had been identified to be the best option to expand survival of cooperative business and member's wellbeing. Primary AMCOS had a diverse of opportunity to use the available challenges by diversifying their crop marketing by engaging in other crops which can be done through their co-operative societies since their registration do not

restrict other crops to be marketed alongside coffee (Obaga and Mwaura, 2018; Wambugu *et al.*, 2018). The production trend of coffee in Tanzania as indicated by Tanzania coffee board 2021 May shows in 2013 the production rises to 71,319 metric tons; it continues with a slowdown in coffee production statistics as indicated in Table 1. This call for production integration to increase the employment potential for coffee farmers.

Years	2009/10	2010/11	2011/12	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15
Metric Tons of clean coffee	35,668	56,790	33,087	71,319	48,762	42,768
Years	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/2020	2020/2021
Metric Tons of clean coffee	60,188	46,964	43,872	68,147	60,651.10	68,880.60

Source: TCB, May 2021

On the other hand, the empirical evidence shows that coffee farming and other cash and food crops has attracted serious concern from the Government of Tanzania (Anania and Rwekaza, 2016; Adu, 2014; Chambo and Dyamet, 2011; Ogunsanya, 2019). Marketing of multiple crops would increase capacities of cooperatives to become stronger and economic resilient and sustainable. To sustain cooperative, the use of multiple crop marketing potentials would raise member's incomes, employment and increase on economic growth. Among the efforts done by the government and other stakeholders; the Government of Tanzania has introduced different research institutions. These institution includes, Sokoine university of agriculture, Tanzania coffee research institute, Kagemu research institute and none

governmental organisation that ventured in coffee seedling production. Also, the introduction of Tanzania Agricultural Research Institute (TARI); which established in 2016 to enhance the strengthening of agricultural research system in Tanzania. Not only was that, farmers 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 agricultural and rural lending. The government additionally encouraged quantity of extension offices neighboring smallholder farmers. However, primary AMCOS are still suffering from marketing arrangements to market non-tradition crops that for years through cooperatives. The marketing of more than one crop for cooperative economic sustainability had been not attained by primary AMCOS. According to Mhando, (2005), coffee smallholder farmers are disadvantaged even when opportunities for other food and cash crops price increase demand; either nationally or transnational. Some identified factors of constraints such as lack of information on prices and export opportunities, a strong occurrence of middlemen, un-reachability to credit, poor passage services, and severe safety measures necessities. These compelling factors need a marketing arrangement options to curb these constructs. This study intends to assess co-operatives marketing business arrangement from coffee primary Agricultural Marketing Co-operative Societies (AMCOS) in Tanzania on marketing none-coffee produce alongside coffee business markets. Specifically, the paper was to; examine the possible marketing arrangements in marketing none coffee produce and assess the

available stakeholders in marketing of non-coffee produce as market opportunity. The study 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; this is by extending markets opportunities among rural communities in extending produce markets through cooperatives. The findings will help the primary AMCOS members and the institutions to understand different crops that are suggested by members to be marketed 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 farmer's access to markets. 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 through marketing arrangements that has to be proposed by members of the cooperative societies. The was based on Resource Based Theory (RBT) of diversification; strategic management studies and co-operative strategic management in particular, have focused more

on diversification categories and its influence on firms' attainments of its strategic objectives. The co-operative strategic management approach to diversify its marketing practices lies along the resource-based theory (RBT) which emphasizes on available crops that becomes a resource which can be marketed alongside the traditional crops (Coffee) that can increase the cooperative marketing niche. Algol (2015) raised the argument that, RBT in firms and cooperatives being among those; that firms can take the advantage and marketing opportunities better through the use of its available resources rather than soliciting new resources elsewhere. In areas where coffee is grown there are other crops that can be marketed alongside. What is needed is how these crops can be venture into cooperative markets. Under Resource Based Theory there are three underlying assumptions. The first assumption is that, firms have diverse resources. This assumption ascertain that firms possess diverse concrete and immaterial resources that are unique from other firms and therefore it can diversify the same to promote competitiveness and because the resources are considered to be scarce firms have to find ways to use the resources well to improve its economic levels (Corte and Del 2017; Lee, 2017). In that assumption, there are crops that are available in coffee growing areas that are not marketed by any cooperative societies which becomes

the cooperative marketing potential. The second assumption is that, firms' resources are immovable. Underneath this postulation RBT trusts that firm's resources are non-transferable. There are crops that cannot be grown in other areas than those cooperative operating geographical environments. That's makes firm to enjoy the competitive advantages since the immovable resources such as those crops can be diversified to implement new strategies that can expend marketing potential to that cooperative societies (ibid). In the third assumptions is that, firms resources are valuable since it can be used to produce the customer appealing products and low ability of the resources to be imitated by competing firms increases firm's competitiveness (Ndungu and Wanjira, 2019). Under the assumptions these crops which are unique makes other cooperative not able to cultivate the same; thus increase cooperative competitive advantage. Resource-based theory in agricultural co-operative at primary and unions are taken as one among the most effective business opportunities that needs its marketing arrangements to sharpen businesses' opportunities and expand the employment potential. On the other hand, that enables cooperatives to earn not only profits but also a chance to improve standard of living among communities that deals with coffee marketing and to the contributing to national economic growth.

METHODOLOGY

The Research Approach for this study was based on positivism, and constructivism (Bryman, 2004; Yin, 2014). This is because the study was based on developing the community ideas on their daily farming activities to develop new market potential which will assist in their income and livelihood improvement (Gromen, 2020). On the research design, the study was based on survey research design based on descriptive study approach where, only primary AMCOS dealing with coffee marketing was surveyed to study non-coffee institutional arrangement to market non-coffee crops alongside traditional coffee marketing. This is due to the fact that, coffee in Tanzania is grown in many regions which also have different non-coffee food and cash crops which need to be studied. With that, the study was conducted in the districts of Karagwe and Muleba of Kagera Region, Buhigwe and Kigoma District of Kigoma Region. Primary cooperatives formed the unit of analysis and primary cooperatives were the unit of observations. However, most of the coffee marketing is done by the unions, in Karagwe districts, there were Karagwe District Cooperative Union (KDCU) Limited, in Muleba district there were Kagera Cooperative Union (KCU) Limited while in Buhigwe and Kigoma District, Kanyovu Joint Enterprise Cooperative Union Limited were the one concerned with coffee

marketing. These regions districts are the leading in the production of coffee in Tanzania. The districts bear the same geographical characteristics (weather) in Tanzania (URT 2016/2017). The sampling frame for this study was primary AMCOS dealing with coffee marketing. Purposive sampling was used to select primary AMCOS. In each district five Primary AMCOS was sampled for data collection. In Kigoma district there were only four primary AMCOS dealing with coffee marketing, therefore all AMCOS were sampled. Therefore, a total of 19 primary cooperatives were sampled. The reason for selection was based on volume of coffee that the primary AMCOS markets in previous five years from the data from their presided Union and their proximity to their districts. Also, purposive sampling was used to select key informants who constitute co-operative development department and TCDC and the co-operative movement so as to get information on the possibilities of marketing institutional arrangements to market non-coffee produce. Focus Group Discussion (FGD) was used to interview members of the primary AMCOS in each selected co-operative which were selected. A total number of 19 FGDs was conducted, that is, in each primary AMCOS it formed FGDs. The FGDs constitutes those who had been selling coffee in the AMCOS for the past five years consecutively was sampled and invited in the FGD. During the

FGD each members was given a chance to participate on advising the possible marketing cooperative can use to market the non-coffee produce. A general consensus was done to conclude on one idea that was posed by the FGD on the suggested strategy. Similarly, five Key Informant Interview was conducted with Karagwe District Cooperative Union (KDCU), Kagera Cooperative Union (KCU), District Cooperative Officer and Tanzania Cooperative Development Commission (TCDC). The aim was to obtain information that counter argue or support the information of the members at the primary AMCOS on the available cooperative marketing arrangement to market the non-coffee produce. In data analysis, content analysis was used to analysis descriptive information's whereby opinion gathered from all the objectives was arranged into themes as per objectives. The provided arguments on the possible marketing arrangements to market non-coffee produce were collected and the pride information on how they utilize available markets potentials

from non-coffee produce marketing was transcribed. Reliability of the data was ensured by triangulation where multiple data collection method was used to check its accuracy of the information; FGD, Key informant interviews from different institutions as well as literature was used. In ensuring validity of the instruments, tools were pre-tested through carrying out a pilot test to check the accuracy of the instruments so as to make corrections where necessary (Bryman, 2004; Yin, 2014). The pilot test was done in Rombo district, where it was found that some questions needs some corrections on the language and context.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Surveyed primary AMCOS in Kagera and Kigoma region: The two regions have different cooperative unions, in Kagera there were two vibrant cooperative unions which were KDCU Ltd and KCU Ltd while in Kigoma region there were one which is Kanyovu Cooperative union that deals with coffee marketing.

Table 1. Primary AMCOS surveyed in Karagwe district of Kagera Region

Name of AMCOS	District	Ward	Reg Year	No Of Members	Dates
Runyaga	Karagwe	Chanika	1984	450	2/9/2021
Bisheshe		Nyakaho	1975	518	3/9/2021
Kamahungu		Bugene	1987	676	4/9/2021
Nyabwegira		Nyabwegira	1977	266	5/9/2021
Ndama		Ndama	1994	158	6/9/2021

Table 2. Primary AMCOS surveyed in Muleba district of Kagera Region

Name	District	Ward	Reg Year	No Of Members	Dates Visited
Tukutuku	Muleba	Muleba	1987	560	10/9/2021
Amcos		+Bulleza			
Kibanga			1984	320	10/9/2021
Kabutaigi		Kibanga	1973	346	11/9/2021
Mubunda		Mubunda	1993	382	12/9/2021

Kasharunga	Kasharunga	1975	250	12/9/2021
------------	------------	------	-----	-----------

Table 3. Primary AMCOS surveyed in Buhigwe district of Kigoma Region

Name	District	Ward	Reg Year	No. Members	Dates
Kibigwa	Buhigwe	Kibigwa	2008	485	14/9/2021
Manyovu		Manyovu	2007	366	14/9/2021
Mahwenyi		Mwayaya & Myanila	2003	400	15/9/2021
Nakimuhe		Mnanila	2007	270	15/9/2021
Mwayaya		Mwayaya	2002	380	16/9/2021

Table 4. Primary AMCOS surveyed in Kigoma district of Kigoma Region

Name	District	Ward	Reg Year	No. Members	Dates
Rumaku	Kigoma Dc		1994	2000	18/9/2021
Kalinzi		Kalinzi	1994	400	19/9/2021
Mkibanda			1996	554	20/9/2021
Mkigu			1994	370	21/9/2021

Basing on the visited primary AMCOS, Table 1;2;3 and 4 present a summary of the surveyed primary AMCOS. A focus group discussion was conveyed, the discussion formed a basis of information's that was used for further analysis as presented in the description on section 3.2 to 3.4.

Identified crops per region: Different AMCOS was found to have their own crops

with differing type's that needs its own institutional marketing arrangements. However, in each crops of similar crops, it was found to have similar agreements on its cooperative marketing arrangements. Among the identified crops in the surveyed area was by region was as presented in table 5 below.

Table 5: None-coffee crops grown proposed to be sold through cooperative societies

Kagera	Kigoma
Avocado	Avocado
Cotton	Beans
Groundnuts (Njugu)	Dried Cassava (Kambalanga)
Pineapples	Hot Chill
Soy Beans	Irish Potatoes
Bananas (Matoke)	Maize
Cassava	Pigeonpee
Maize	Pineapples
Vanilla	Sunflower
Groundnuts	
Beans	
Sunflower	
Irish Potatoes	
Chia Seeds	

All these none coffee crops were identified by cooperative members that needs to be marketed by cooperative societies. Each of the 19 surveyed primary AMCOS and their cooperative unions has made suggestions on **Marketing arrangements in marketing none coffee produce:** Primary AMCOS visited has made their suggestions on how they can market the none-traditional crops which was coffee, now they postulated other marketing arrangements that can be used. From the FGD conducted in Karagwe, Muleba, Buhigwe and Kigoma districts, it was identified that, these opinions was categorized as per district that depends on the crops as per district. Basing from the arguments raised by Wagai *et al.*, (2019), food and other cash crop needs specified marketing arrangements that supports the demand from buyers and suppliers of commodities. These considerations make possible for small holder farmers to markets their none-coffee products that attracts win-win situation in business negotiations (Tinzaara *et al.*, 2018; Rwekaza *et al.*, 2018). From Karagwe, members of the primary AMCOS has made the suggestions that, “how to sell through AMCOS depends on availability of markets, the markets have its own conditions so AMCOS and buyers can have agreement on what is the best way to collect the produce”. From these arguments it is evidently that, the marketing will depends from the demand side. Those needs of the produce will provide specifications and marketing agreements that will trigger primary AMCOS to situate themselves on the requirements of the buyers after they have the binding agreements. According to Thanasomboon *et al.*, (2020) and Olendayai (2017) argued that, market arrangement among different crops, needs its own strategies that will benefits producers and

how cooperative societies can market these crops, also they has identified potential stakeholders who can assists in the marketing value chain of these crops.

buyers. Under Resource Based Theory assumptions, firms for that matter, cooperatives, have diverse resources that are unique from other cooperatives; therefore it can diversify the same to promote competitiveness and because the resources are considered to be scare cooperatives have to find ways to use different strategies in marketing to improve cooperative economic levels (Corte and Del 2017; Lee, 2017). In this case, not all the suggested market arrangements fits into all cooperatives, each cooperative can have its own marketing arrangements depending on the requirements of the buyer and the suppliers. However, from the information obtained from Mahwenyi primary AMCOS in Buhigwe district, indicated that, “the arrangement for marketing cereals is much easier than to other non-cereal produce because primary AMCOS can opt to use the storage facilities available, that warehouse can then be cleaned at times when coffee storage seasons becomes available” . This implies that, marketing of cereal crops is easy for primary AMCOS than perishable crops such as banana, pineapple, avocados, iris potatoes that are perishable in nature. Tinzaara, *et al.*, (2018) suggested that, cereal crops are easier for farmers to market them than perishables. Also, Waal (2019) found that, perishables can also be marketed esier with storage and transport facilities being available. This is in line with the arguments raised by one of the respondents during the FGD from Manyovu primary AMCOS in Kigoma district who raised the arguments that, “crops like beans and maize, we can create the temporary

storage using materials we have in place like iron sheet storages”. This implies that, since, coffee needs some attention on their storage and preparation in their production to marketing value chain; other crops need to be stored on the separate place. Different crops need different storage facilities before marketing; therefore, marketing arrangement needs to take into account the storage mechanisms of each crop that need to venture into the markets. Similarly, the component of marketing through the use of middlemen raise a concern to Karagwe respondents; from the FGD done with Kamahungu primary AMCOS of Karagwe district, members were of the opinion that; “... the marketing of other crops like beans is done through the use of middle men who goes around to collect directly from the farmers; if we need to market our crops main through cooperatives these people will be the main obstacle....the government has the responsibility to intervene and put a directive that enables farmers to sell through AMCO otherwise it will very difficult to make business markets”. This implies that, the middlemen who are not regulated were the causative for cooperatives not to be able to market member’s crops due to these middle men. From the arguments raised by a key informant who were the KDCU manager said that; “ the middlemen were found to bring troubles even in the coffee business, these were responsible for *Kangomba* (buying un-ripped coffee from farmers before harvesting) where members at harvest they found to have no crop to sell, and they sell it at a very low price. Basing on the contention from URT (2002), the Tanzania Co-operative Development Policy of 2002, require cooperative to be strengthened and transformed as it is the instrument for community social-economic development;

the presence of middlemen in cooperative marketing business cannot make vibrant cooperative business undertaking. Similarly, Rwekaza and Mhihi (2016) on co-operative development in Tanzania: a tool for equality and social economic development; it was recommended that, cooperatives, needs a government protection and to creates an enabling environment for business prosperity; this call for the mechanism to regulate the middlemen as they affect business sustainability on the effort to raise farmer’s farm gate price. The marketing of crops that can be done via primary cooperatives were found to have a diverse potential due to multiple crops that can be traded through primary cooperatives. However, it was found that, a selection is needed. Basing from the arguments raised by Ndama primary AMCOS of Karagwe district, as argued by one of the respondents that “.....it will be simple if AMCOS decided to choose only one or few crops to be marketed through to be used as the learning point before adding many crops I won’t be easy to manage and deal with the competitions from the farmers”. This implies that, since different primary AMCOS differs in terms of quantity and quality crops to be produced, marketing be done depending on few selected crops where concentration of efforts be done, after studying the marketing demands. Nugusse (2013) found that, rural community has diverse crops, selecting among those basing on marketing demand is important. Also, Maghimbi (2006) suggested the competitive advantage among cooperatives; that needs business concentration on the type of crops that is marketed by the cooperative. Ndungu and Wanjira (2019) using Resource Based Theory, shows differentiated products by firms or cooperatives, basing on differentiated

geographical characteristics, makes cooperatives to enjoy the competitive advantages since some crops act like immovable resources that needs implementation of new strategies that can expend marketing potential to that cooperative societies. The marketing of these non-coffee produce by primary AMCOS and Cooperative unions, was found not to be the new phenomenon, its only that, cooperative were found to be reluctant in marketing of these crops, this argument were presented by all surveyed cooperatives in Kagera region that is KDCU, KCU, Primary AMCOS of Karagwe and Muleba. It was supported by the argument raised by the respondents from Bisheshe primary AMCOS with prepositions that; “previous arrangement on selling beans the farmers contributed shares and we also received some loan from the union so that we can buy crops from farmers and sell to national milling. This implies that, marketing arrangement of cereal crops is possible, what remains is to sharpen how can demand and supply can meet in, marketing of cooperative member produce basing on contractual arrangements between parties. As Mayala and Bamanyisa (2018) noted that, cooperative unions are the available options to market primary AMCOS produce, however, the sustainability of markets were found lacking to ensure sustenance of supply according to the market demand. However, KDCU manager, during the key informant interview, raised that argument that; “... in the beginning cooperatives were emphasized to buy and sell only one crop which is coffee.... so we real need to change in terms of our attitudes as farmers but also our cooperative leaders will need to change their perceptions and bring in new system that will allow the coffee based cooperatives to also sell other produce in their areas.” This

implies that, cooperatives need to go outside this Pandora box where multiple crops will become a solution to employment creation and expand the member’s income wellbeing. Johny, (2017) noted that, networks were important component in business marketing access; buyers are on the community where we live, one knows the buyers can connect to other producers on the available markets through the established networks. Similarly, Anania and Bee (2018) and Miho (2017) argued that, produces are reluctant on searching markets; always food products demand are plenty since the whole population want to be fed by farmers. According to Larioet *al*, (2014) the markets need to be identified by producers, and marketing starts from the demand side, that gives the guarantee for produces to know which products are needed in the markets. The marketing arrangements was found to be done based on seasonality of coffee harvesting and marketing done by the primary cooperatives. The community understands the time within which marketing of other crops to be done. From the response of one respondents during the FGD at Rumaku primary AMCOS of Kigoma district said “...because coffee is seasonal in nature as we sell it from July to Sept, we can use the remaining time to collect and sell other crops as beans and maize because they have a different season” This implies that, members knows the production cycle, that can be used as an important component in making decisions on which time period is for the marketing other non-coffee produce. In Resource Based Theory, on the assumption that, firms or cooperatives resources are valuable and can be seasonal depending on different circumstance such as supply capacity, geographical characteristics at the production side, physical and monetary

policy inflation and other factors (Ndungu and Wanjira, 2019). Under these assumptions these crops which are unique makes other cooperative not able to cultivate the same; thus increase cooperative competitive advantage if cooperative can be able to produce what other cooperative cannot produce by understanding the seasonality on the supply side to sustain the demand (FAO, 2018; Elberset *al.*, 2015).

On the, members of the AMCOS raised a concern for the buyers to pay the farmers on time of product delivery. From the information's obtained from Tukutuku AMCOS in Muleba, the respondents had the following observation. "...farmers want to be paid at produce delivery in the markets, which is when they bring their produce. Basing from the experience from coffee marketing, primary AMCOS provide coffee to unions that do not have money in time, this practice should not be the same to these non-coffee so as to soften marketing procedures". Basing on these arguments, it implies that, member's wants payment on delivery. Similar arguments was provided by Kibanga B AMCOS in Muleba, with the arguments that, 'any structural arrangement that will not involve borrowing from farmers can be workable, because they are already used with it in coffee marketing so coming up with new model may be difficult'. This AMCOS had been practicing an independent primary AMCOS that sells without the use of the Union; therefore, the AMCOS pays the farmers on delivery. However, according to the arguments raised by Adu (2014) and Rwekaza (2018) that, cooperatives primary role is to collect produce and look for markets. This extends the commitments of members and it makes members feels the ownership of their cooperatives. The literature corresponds with the concern of the

farmers from Kabutaiga AMCOS in Muleba, (Kasharunga) with the argument that, "we think we can firstly find the market and then collect farmers crops depending on agreement with the buyer. This implies that, marketing needs to begin from the demand side than the supply side. However, from information provided by registrar of cooperatives said that "cooperative needs a government protection, protection against buyers who have the intention to collude cooperative business marketing by paying less than what the government minimum price". This was contrary from the information provided by members of primary cooperatives in Karagwe and Muleba who contend that, coffee becomes member produce owned during production; after coffee are dried, it becomes the government ownership. This implies that, coffee like any other strategic crops, is a government produce since it has several restriction during marketing. Chambo (2008), Chambo *et al.* (2007) Mhando (2005) provided the argument that, cooperatives need a government protection by creating marketing business environment without controlling business markets of these cooperative enterprises. Contractual farming raised a concern as among the cooperative marketing arrangements. In Kigoma, Kibwigwa primary AMCOS of Buhigwe has the opinion that, "in hot chill farming they are using the contractual farming which guarantee the farmer that there is a ready buyer who will come and collect produce direct form the famers. So, we can modify this so that the buyers can come and take it from us". This implies that, farmers can extend the available marketing strategies used in Chilly to other crops on business marketing. Chambo and Dyamet (2011) and Kazungu *et al.* (2014) found that, institutions, cooperatives being

among them, has internal dynamics which share similar experience and practice. Basing on experience from one crop can be extended to other business crops that share the same marketing arrangements. This information was further ascertained by Kanyovu Joint Enterprise Union chairperson who was based on the availability of experts, during the interview as a key informant said that; “AMCOS do not have special experts needed for this development but us as Union we have a big role to play because we have experts in various crops who will help the farmers to produce quality produce in a required quantity.....as for now there is no an institutionalized system for selling other crops than coffee”. This implies that, the importance of experts on productions side had been solved to some extent, experts on marketing is not yet solved. As noted by Amanto *et al*, (2019) that, contractual arrangements between the demand and supply side have becomes important in advancing farmers access to potential markets. Similar arguments was raised by Chambo (2007) based on cooperative to have a bilateral agreement in markers so as to build a mutual marketing agreements. In all these literature, the component of agreements were identified as an important component in building a win-win situation between the counterparts. On the other hand, the uses of marketing networks were the other areas that can extend the marketing arrangements. Within the farmers, they know the buyers, price and the available marketing contractual arrangements that can be used. This was raised by the respondents in the FGD with Mkongoro AMCOS in Kigoma District with the argument that, “using the network connection of AMCOS Chairpersons, where we can share information on the available markets, and needed crops it might facilitate

the whole process of selling other crops with coffee”. This implies that, forming a network of leaders can be used as a connecting facility in market search as well as business negotiations. Komba *et al*, (2019) and Kimaro *et al* (2013) argued that, network in cooperatives and other community organization uses network in business linkages. Simiraly, Johny *et al*, (2017) contend that, social network are mostly used to maximize market accessibility that in turn increases business performance. Similar concern on the use of networks was raised by Mkibada primary AMCOS of Kigoma districts that respondents were of the opinion that, network of leaders can facilitate to find companies that can bring marketing Linkages, and they had that opinions; “If we get companies who can enter into agreement with us and for that matter, we are sure of the market then we will be encouraged to produce more. This implies that, networks can facilitate marketing. Similar concern was given by one respondent from Mkizu Primary AMCOS of Kigoma district who said that; “I am learning from Burundi people; they find market together; they collect together and sell together in their cooperatives”. This implies that, farmers understand and the role of cooperation, in that farmers were of the opinion that, cooperative can be the best marketing model which can bring advantage to farmers in raising incomes and increase the farm gate price. Similar concern was provided by Miho (2017) Likwata and Venkatakrishnan (2014) and Ngaruko and Lwezaula (2013) where cooperation in business were found to be the core of business performance, working individually were found not to be productive in developing market access for developing institutional profitability.

The available stakeholders in marketing of non-coffee produce as market opportunity: Respondents were interviewed in their focus group discussion to identify the key stakeholders who can assist the marketing arranges of none coffee produce; the provided the roles of each stakeholders in

enabling the marketing. These opinions were from the surveyed 19 primary AMCOS of Karagwe, Muleba, Buhigwe and kigoma districts. The response on the key stakeholders and their roles were presented in Table 6.

Table 6: Stakeholders on crop marketing

Type	Name Of Institution	Roles
Cooperative movement	Primary cooperative	✓ Crop marketing ✓ Negotiation ✓ Business Contract agreements ✓ Collection point ✓ Quality control
	Cooperative union (KDCU,KCU, Kanyovu JEU)	• Organizing and managing AMCOS crop business • Providing technical assistance needed • Financing accessibility • Marketing • Networking
Cooperative development commission	Federation of cooperative	➤ Networking ➤ Market search
	District cooperative officer	✓ Promotion ✓ Contract assessments ✓ Technical assistance ✓ Internal audits
	Regional cooperative assistant registrar	✓ Promotion ✓ Contract assessments ✓ Technical assistance ✓ Business advisor
	Registrar of cooperative	✓ Promotion ✓ Contract assessments ✓ Technical assistance ✓ Business advisor
Buyers	Schools	❖ Buy farmers crops
	Strategic Grain Reserves (SGR)	❖ Provide crop required standards
Crop Research institute and NGO	Processing industries (Crop industries)	❖ Business negotiation and (ToR)
	Crop transporters	❖ Network with business farmers
	❖ Tanzania Official Seed Certificate Institute (TOSCI)	• Provision of quality seeds
	❖ Tanzania Horticulture Association (TAHA)	• Extension service
	❖ Research, Community and Organizational Development Associates (RECODA)	• Business markets networks
	❖ International Institute of Tropical Agriculture (IITA)	
	❖ World Vegetable Centre, Rural Initiatives for Participatory	

Basing from information presented in Table 6, it was identified that, there are a number of stakeholders who are needed in developing a sustainable marketing on non-coffee business marketing. These stakeholders were clustered, and their roles were identified from the responses obtained from the interview done during the FGD done in Kagera and Kigoma regions on the four surveyed districts. Business stakeholder helps in ensuring each role in business markets has the business partner who can assist to attain the required objectives. Cooperative business model were identified as that basic institutions that can uplifts the marketing of farmers crops due to aggregation advantage. Since cooperatives are institutions that are formed by joint efforts of individual with the main of fulfilling group objectives, marketing through the established cooperative was identifies as the best options to market the non-coffee produce through cooperative business model.

CONCLUSION

Non-coffee produce were found to be the best options to make cooperative sustainability in coffee traditional cooperatives. Cooperatives that had been marketing one type of crops were found lacking capacity to deal with other crops, the study conclude that, marketing other types of available crops under best marketing arrangement would expand business opportunity among farmers. Since there emerged different crops in different areas on the studied districts, the study concluded that, each crops needs its own marketing arrangement to expand business markets so as to raise the farm gate price among farmers. Stakeholders in marketing arrangements were found to be

important among farmers since; each stakeholder have the role to play. The study concludes that, involving these stakeholders can strengthen the capacity in production, once extend business volumes to have sustainable markets potentials.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Since agricultural cooperatives were found to deal with one type of crops, these has labeled cooperatives to be traditions, the study recommends to all primary traditional agricultural cooperatives to make assessments of the available crops that can be marketed by these primary cooperatives after they have made the possible marketing arrangement to market the same. Crops identified by agricultural cooperatives were found to be potential in expanding markets portfolio, the study recommends to TCDC, and Ministry responsible for cooperatives, to assist agricultural cooperative in business marketing arrangements so that, these cooperative can be able to venture into multiple crop business. Crating of enabling environments as a responsibility of the said government institutions had seems to be important for developing capacities to cooperative entities to sustain business. Business marketing was found to be controlled by middlemen in most of crop business markets. The study recommends to ministry responsible with cooperative, to find a mechanism of removing middlemen that will expand the financial benefits that shall be obtained by members in the farm gate price. As it was food that, coffee, like other strategic crops marketed in Tanzania through cooperatives, had becomes the government corps due to increasing government control. The study recommend to the government

controlling machinery (local government, crop board, TRA and other) to provide enabling environment than control of the produce markets.

RELEVANCE AND IMPLICATION OF THE STUDY

Marketing in primary and secondary agricultural cooperatives societies had for decades done base on single crop which were traditionally been practiced by the farmers. The registration to these cooperative were done based on the agricultural marketing firms without naming the crops. In all those areas, farmers were engaged in multiple crops that are not marketed through cooperatives. Cooperative has such potential capacity to engage into multiple crop marketing as strategy to expand business and build cooperative resilience to business shock.

REFERENCES

- Adu, C. A. (2014). Co-operative Societies in Nigeria: Prospects and Problems. *International Journal of Behavioral Social and Movement Sciences*. 03. 18.
- Akgül, B. (2015). *Product diversification and profitability a case study: Vestel AŞ* (Master's thesis).
- Amanto, B. S., Umanilo, M. C. B., Wulandari, R. S., Taufik, T., & Susiati, S. (2019). Local Consumption Diversification. *Int. J. Sci. Technol. Res*, 8(8), 1865-1869.
- Amanto, B. S., Umanilo, M. C. B., Wulandari, R. S., Taufik, T., & Susiati, S. (2019). Local Consumption Diversification. *Int. J. Sci. Technol. Res*, 8(8), 1865-1869.
- 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, C. G. (2016). The Determinants of Success in Agricultural Marketing Co-Operatives in Tanzania: The Experience from MwekaSungu, Mruwia and Uru North Njari Agricultural Marketing Co-operatives in Moshi District. *European Journal of Research in Social Sciences*. 4 (3). 62-75.
- Bari, M. (2015). *Agriculture diversification and its impact on socio economic development in Aligarh district* (Doctoral dissertation, Aligarh Muslim University).
- Bari, M. (2015). *Agriculture diversification and its impact on socio economic development in Aligarh district* (Doctoral dissertation, Aligarh Muslim University).
- Bryman, A. (2004). *Social research methods*, (Second Edition). Oxford University Press, Oxford. 592 pp.
- Chambo, S. (2007). An analysis of the social economic impact of co-operative in Africa and their institutional context, "The enabling environment for co-operative", In East and Central and Southern Africa. International Co-operative Alliance (ICA), Canadian Co-operative Association (CCA). 169 pp.
- Chambo, S. (2008). Co-operative Education and Training in Africa: *A Continental Perspective - paper presented at the National Co-operative Conference*, Pretoria, South Africa 2/12/2008. 13 pp.
- Chambo, S. (2008). Co-operatives and Member Empowerment in Tanzania, *REDET University of Dar es Salaam*. 42 pp.
- 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.
- Cochran, W.G. (1977). *Sampling technique* (3rd Ed). John Wiley and Sons, New York. 96pp.
- Creswell, J. W. & Poth, C. N. (2016). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches*. Sage Publications: New Delhi. 414pp
- Csikszentmihalyi M., Larson R. (2014). *Validity and reliability of the experience-sampling method. In: flow and the foundations of positive psychology*. Springer, Dordrecht: 298pp
- Danda, E. B. and. Bamanyisa, J. M. (2011). Governance in co-operatives and competitive business environment in Africa. International Co-operative Research Conference in Africa: Prospects and Challenges. MUCCoBS, Moshi Tanzania 26th to 28th Sept. 2011. 16 pp.
- Deng, W., & Hendrikse, G. (2013, November). Product diversification of co-operatives and corporations' evidence from the Netherlands. In *Economics and Management of Networks Conference, Proceedings, Agadir* (pp. 21-23).
- Edmeades, S., Smale, M., Kikulwe, E. M., Nkuba, J. & Byabachwezi, M. S. R. (2007). *An Economic Assessment of Banana Genetic Improvement and Innovation in the Lake Victoria Region of Uganda and Tanzania, IFPRI Research Report*: Washington. 204pp.
- Elbers, W., van Rijsbergen, B., Bagamba, F., & Hoebink, P. (2015). *Coffee certification in East Africa, Impact on farms, families and co-operatives*. Wageningen Academic Publishers: Netherlands . 265pp.
- Evans, E. A., Ballen, F. H. & Siddiq, M. (2017). Mango production, global trade, consumption trends and post-harvest processing and nutrition. *Handbook of Mango Fruit*. 10(2): 1-16.
- FAO (2018). Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. Rome. 254.
- Fehr, C. (2010). Banana (*Musa spp.*) Growing for export: innovative approaches in production and marketing the need for partnerships . *Acta Hort*. 879, *ISHS 2010* : 53-56pp
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- Johnny, 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.
- Kazungu, I., Ndiege, B. O., Mchopa, A. & Moshi, J. (2014). Improving livelihoods through micro and small agribusiness enterprises: Analysis of contributions, prospects and challenges of nursery gardens in Arusha Tanzania. *European Journal of Business and Management*, 6 (9): 142-148.
- Kimario, A. M. (1992). *Marketing Co-operatives in Tanzania: Problems and Prospects*; Dar es Salaam University Pres. 160pp.
- Kimaro, J., Liseki, S., Mareale, W., & Mrisha, C. (2013). Enhancing rural food security through improved beekeeping in Northern Tanzania. *Livestock Research for Rural Development*, 25(12): 1-14
- 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.
- Lario, N. A. Ugedo, J. F. M. and Vera, A. M. (2014). Farmers' Satisfaction with Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Marketing Spanish Co-operatives: An Explanation from Agency Theory. *International Food and Agribusiness Management Review* 17(1): 127-146.
- 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.
- Likwata, M. Y. and Venkatakrishnan, V. (2014). Performance of agricultural marketing co-operative societies in cashew nut production and marketing in Masasi District, Mtwara Region, Tanzania IRACST- *International Journal of Research in Management & Technology* (IJRMT). 4(5): 52pp.
- Machimu, G. (2017). Levels of Livelihood Outcomes Among Smallholder Sugarcane Outgrowers in Morogoro Region, Tanzania. *International Journal of Development Research*, 7(9): 14912-14916 .
- Magali, J. J. (2014). *Variables for Modelling SACCOS in Tanzania*, Asian Journal of Finance & Accounting. 6(1) pp 22.
- Maghimbi, S. (2006). The Organisation Capacity of Co-operatives for Peasants and Small Scale Farmers Small Farmers: A View From an Outside, Paper Presented to REDET's Training Workshop for Leaders of Co-operatives, Zanzibar 1st -2nd February 2006. 19pp.
- 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.
- Miho, A. (2017). Comparing technical efficiency of maize smallholder farmers in Tabora and Ruvuma regions of Tanzania: a frontier production approach.

- Asian Journal of Agriculture and Rural Development*, 7(9): 180-197.
- Moshi Co-operative University (2017) Research Policy and Guidelines, 28 pp
- Moshi Co-operative University (2020) Research Agenda, 23 pp
- 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.
- Nugusse, W. Z. Van Huylenbroeck, G. and Buysse, J. (2013). Determinants of rural people to join co-operatives in Northern Ethiopia, *International Journal of Social Economics*, 40(12): 1094-1107.
- Obaga, B. R., & Mwaura, F. O. (2018). Impact of farmers' participation in banana value addition in household welfare in Kisii Central Sub-County. *International Academic Journal of Social Sciences and Education*, 2(1): 25-46.
- Ogunsanya, O. (2019). Development of Business Theories. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 10 :(12): 1-9
- Olendayai, G. J. (2017). *Improving Widows Income Through Establishment of Banana Farm at Mikungani Village in Arumeru District: Arusha Region, Tanzania*. Dissertation for Award of M.A Community Economic Development at The Open University of Tanzania. 97pp.
- Ruben, R. & Hoebink, P. (2014). *The impact of Utz certification on smallholder farmers in Uganda. Coffee certification in East Africa*. Los Angeles. 53pp.
- 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. *Arts and Social Sciences Journal of Arts and Social* 9(1) 01-05
- 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. 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 (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. (2020). Democratic Decision Making and Member Participation in Primary Agricultural Marketing Co-operatives in Tanzania: Evidence from Selected Primary Co-operatives of

-
- Bukoba and Moshi Districts. *AJCDT Vol.* 5(1) 37-51.
- 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.
- Thanasomboon, R., Kalapanulak, S., Netrphan, S., & Saithong, T. (2020). Exploring dynamic protein-protein interactions in cassava through the integrative interactome network. *Scientific reports*, 10 (1): 1-15.
- Tinzaara, W., Stoian, D., Ocimati, W., & Enoch Kikulwe and Gloria Otieno, E. (2018). Challenges and opportunities for smallholders in banana value chains Bioversity International, Uganda; and Guy Blomme, Bioversity International. 1(1): 85-110.
- URT (2002). Co-operative Development Policy 2002, Ministry of Agriculture, Food Security and Co-operatives, Government Press, Dar es Salaam.
- Waal, V. (2019). Exporting Bananas for Improved Livelihoods and Social Development: Experiences and Challenges from Latin America and Africa. *Acta horticulturae* , 30(3): 37-40.
- Wagai, S., Ouma, G., Odhiambo, G. D., & Kwach, J. (2019). An analysis of socioeconomic factors affecting avocado production in saline and flooded areas around Lake Victoria Basin of Western Kenya. 14 (35). 2048-2061.
- Wambugu, P. W., Ndjiondjop, M. N., & Henry, R. J. (2018). Role of genomics in promoting the utilization of plant genetic resources in green banks. *Briefings in functional genomics*. 17(3): 198-206.
- WBG. (2019). *Tanzania Mainland Poverty Assessment*. Washington D.C.60.