

## **Factors Affecting Membership in Breeders Association and Contributions of the Associations to the Farmers Training**

S. Akin<sup>1\*</sup>, A. Kara<sup>1</sup>, and M. Tutkun<sup>2</sup>

### **ABSTRACT**

It is possible to achieve rural development by using the technological innovations obtained by the worldwide scientific research findings and organization of the producers. Giving agricultural extension services within a certain system is the first factor affecting rural development. While there have been significant developments regarding a pluralistic public system in recent years, studies are being carried out to activate the agricultural extension role of producer organizations in Turkey. On the other hand, it is also true that there are discrepancies in Turkey, as in many developing countries, between expectations from agricultural organizations and real situation in terms of producers' needs and government policy. In this study, factors affecting the membership in Diyarbakır Province Cattle Breeders Association (DCBA) and Diyarbakır Sheep and Goat Breeders Association (DSGBA) and the contributions by these associations to the required agricultural extension training were determined. It was observed that 94.07% of DSGBA members and 82.64% of DCBA members had not taken any training on animal breeding. It was found that 75.86% of the DSGBA members and 53.84% of DCBA members had joined the training given by the Diyarbakır Agriculture Provincial Directorate. In this case, the lack of education in rural areas related to agricultural extension is unveiled, again. It was found that 87.68% of DCBA members and 89.32% of DSGBA members could not participate in any agricultural training since there was no training organized by the two associations.

**Keywords:** Agricultural extension training, Agricultural organizations, Development.

### **INTRODUCTION**

While livestock in Turkey make an important contribution to the agricultural sector and the national economy, they are associated with a number of problems. Compared with other developed countries in the world and the EU, the amount of animal production in Turkey is low and external dependence is a major problem in genetic material such as live animal and semen, which entail significant costs. Turkey is world's 12<sup>th</sup> largest importer of bull semen and imported 4,5 million doses

worth \$45 million of frozen bull semen in 2015 (İnal and Çam, 2015)

Although Turkey is forefront in terms of the number of domestic animals in the world, it is not at the same level in the amount of animal production since the small family enterprises in Turkey and the problems arising from the requirement of sufficient capital investment lead to inefficiency (Karlı and Çelik, 2010). In the market economy, producers are confronted with a highly organized commercial sector when they supply goods or demand inputs from the market. Agro-industrial enterprises, intermediaries and commissioners are able to move the oligopoly market feature and act

<sup>1</sup> Department of Agricultural Economics, Faculty of Agriculture, Dicle University, 21280, Sur/Diyarbakır, Turkey.

\* Corresponding author; e-mail: sakin@dicle.edu.tr

<sup>2</sup> Department of Animal Science, Faculty of Agriculture, Dicle University, Sur/Diyarbakır, Turkey.



together. The producers can not protect their professional and economic interests because they can not have a large number of scattered, sufficient capital accumulation. Ensuring the development and solving problems in agriculture is possible by organizing farmers in effective organization.

Effective producer organizations are the most important tool to improve efficiency by increasing the quality of agricultural production, thereby improving the living standards of those engaged in agriculture to improve their living standards (İnan *et al.*, 2005).

Agricultural organizations is classified as economic, social, and professional organizations in Turkey (Rehber, 2009). Economic and rural organizations play an important role in raising awareness of the population living in rural areas. Farmer organizations are encouraged in almost every country. Agricultural extension should be used effectively for training of the human factor which is on the focus of development and analyzing of the farmer problems (Saltan, 2006). Although effective implementation of agricultural training and extension activities within agricultural organizations is an expected result, it is known that it can not always have the desired intensity and efficiency. Effective agricultural extension should be used for the training of the focal point of the development of human factors and the manufacturer to analyze problems (Saltan, 2006). Although effectively presenting agricultural training and extension activities is perceived as a natural result in agricultural organization, the results are not always as expected.

Diyarbakır Cattle Breeders Association (DCBA) and Diyarbakır Sheep and Goat Breeders Association (DSGBA) have emerged in last decade in the producers' organizations in accordance with the agricultural policy in Turkey. These organizations have some responsibilities given by the legislation to ensure solidarity among the members, training, registration of the pedigree, progeny testing activities, the

health of the animal, and to provide artificial insemination services, to organize marketing. These associations have duties such as taking measures to ensure marketing of the agricultural products of breeders and the value of the sales price given by the law (Anonymous, 2014a)

In Diyarbakır Province, 85% of enterprises consist of cattle, while 15% consist of small ruminant enterprises. Livestock enterprises in Diyarbakır Province are usually in the form of subsistence. There are a total of 26,850 cattle enterprises in Diyarbakır and 14,194 consist of small-scale cattle enterprises having 1-5 head of cattle. Large-scale enterprises having more than 500 head of cattle is 4 only (Anonymus, 2014b).

DCBA was established in 2004 and the number of members is 2045 in 2016. The DSGBA was established in 2006 and has 2,184 members. In this study, we aimed to find out the level of satisfaction of the members about the training and the expectations of the members in this subject through determination of the reasons why the producers are members.

Research objectives:

- Factors affecting membership in Association,
- What is the expectation of the farmers from Breeders Associations.

Hypothesis of research:

- Breeders associations member's problems show similarity,
- The association is unable to meet the members' agricultural extension needs.

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

The material of this study was animal enterprises which included both members and non-members of DCBA and DSGBA in Diyarbakır Province. The analysis data used in the study were compiled by questionnaire from the enterprises between the years 2014-2015. Additionally, official records of Diyarbakır Agriculture Provincial Directorate has also been used as secondary data.

Face to face interviews were conducted in survey due to lack of farm records in Diyarbakır Province and Turkey as well. Time series data was used as in many of the agricultural and socio-economic studies.

The Simple Random Sampling method was used in order to determine the sample size for finite populations (Çiçek and Erkan 1996).

$$n = \frac{N \times s^2 \times t^2}{(N - 1) \times D^2 + s^2 \times t^2}$$

Where,  $n$ = Sample size;  $s$ = Standard deviation;  $t$ = Standard  $z$  score at the confidence level considered;  $N$ = Size of sampling frame, population,  $D$ = Margin of error as the percentage of population mean.

Sampling parameters were calculated taking into account the number of cattle and small ruminant registered to the Diyarbakır Province Sheep-Goat Breeders Association and Breeding Cattle Breeders Association (Table 1).

For this purpose, enterprises are listed from small to large size according to the number of animals supported. In calculation, 95% confidence interval and average of 10% was taken as error. The parameters used in calculation of the sample size were determined separately for 2125 small ruminant and 2,045 large ruminant breeders as given in Table 1. Accordingly, the number of samples were calculated separately for enterprises who were members of both unions as follows;

Small ruminant enterprises

$$n = \frac{2125 \times (144,78)^2 \times (1,96)^2}{(2125 - 1) \times (18,83)^2 + (144,78)^2 \times (1,96)^2}$$

Cattle enterprises

$$n = \frac{2045 \times (10,62)^2 \times (1,96)^2}{(2045 - 1) \times (1,59)^2 + (10,62)^2 \times (1,96)^2}$$

While analyzing the data collected, 5% of

sample size calculated based on the above formula was taken to survey and enterprises number to be surveyed was calculated as 216 and 167 for sheep and cattle breeders respectively.

In the study, survey was conducted and evaluated with 765 enterprises in which 167 were enterprises of DCBA, 216 enterprises of DSGBA, and 379 enterprises were not member of any association,

All the data were checked and necessary corrections made before data entry. In data entry, to ensure uniformity, previously prepared excel sheets were used. The data was analyzed after incorrect data input was checked and corrected. In the analysis of quantitative data, the SPSS computer program was used, the frequencies ( $f$ ) and percentages (%) were calculated and *Chi Square* ( $X^2$ ) analysis technique was used. In statistical analysis, descriptive statistical methods were used for determination of the current situation of enterprises. In rating and determination of the the benefits and/or dissatisfaction due to the membership, 1-5 scoring scale was used in Table 3 as 1= Never, 2= Rarely, 3= Sometimes, 4= Often, 5= Always, and in Table 4 as 1= Noneffective, 2= Somewhat effective, 3 as = , 4= effective, 5= Very effective.

In order to obtain rating points in each subject considered, the scores obtained according to the 1-5 scale were multiplied by the exact number of the respondents who gave that scores. Later, percentages of these rating points were calculated and ranked from the highest to the lowest.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### Demographic Characteristics

Within the scope of the research, 167

**Table 1.** The sampling parameters.

	Mean ( $\bar{x}$ )	Standard deviation (s)	Error (D)	t value
DSGBA	188,28	144,78	18,83	1,96
DCBA	15,85	10,62	1,59	1,96



members of DCBA, 219 of DSGBA, and 379 non-members of any breeder association were taken as samples (Table 1). Age is an important factor in determining the attitudes and behaviors of producers in carrying out agricultural activities (Köksal, 2009).

In the study, the average age of DCBA, DSGBA and Non Union Members (NUM) was found as 43.74, 48.13, and 46.61%, respectively. Similarly, in a survey conducted in the United States, it was found that those who were members of the co-operatives were middle-age producers (Bhuyan, 2007). The fact that the average age of producers were close increased the expectation that they would show similar behavior and attitudes.

The proportion of those have no education of the DCBA, DSGBA and Non-Union members was found to be 45, 57.51, and 57.53%, respectively. It was determined that education level differences among the groups were significant statistically ( $P= 0.049$ ). In all education levels, the level of DCBA members was found higher than that of the other groups, and it was observed that the education levels of DSGBA members was found lower than the other association members.

All the enterprises included in the study resided in rural areas, the average distance to the city center was calculated as 44.05, 60.93, and 43.47 km for DCBA, DSGBA and Non-Union members, respectively (Table 2). Household in the agricultural enterprise can undertake various tasks ranging from the management of the enterprise to the source of the labor force. In the economic analysis of the enterprises, the population that constitutes the source of the labor force is significant in terms of quantity, age, and education.

The average family size of rural areas in Diyarbakir is 7.2 person (ABPRS, 2011). In this study, 37.8% of DCBA members, 21% of DSGBA, and 28.2% of NUM are in 1-5 family size group.

The family-size group of DSGBA members was found as ten person. In other

words, there is a parallel between family size and production in sheep goat breeding enterprises, which generally show extensive production characteristics.

The difference between the answers of the group were highly significant ( $P= 0.000$ ) (Table 2). In other studies related to the subject, there was no relation between the membership of the organizations and family-size. (Terin and Ateş, 2010).

#### Problems Related to Animal Production

It was found that both associations members had common problems relating to animal husbandry (Table 3). DCBA and DSGBA members ranked the some problems in the first three places: absence of governmental subsidy, high veterinary costs, and organizational deficiencies, respectively.

Absence of governmental subsidy was ranked in the first place in a study carried out in Amasya Cattle Breeders. The lack of technical knowledge was perceived by the DCBA members as the fifth and DSGBA members as the fourth rank.

Due to the utilization of sheep goat breeders from pasture, it is believed not to be faced with more problems relating to supply of quality feed. DCBA members declared the inability to find a stud such as sire and ram at sixth, while DSGBA members put it in the seventh place.

#### Factors Affecting Membership in the Association

In the study, 50.5% of the producers were members of breeders' associations (Table 1). Breeder's organizations have more than one purpose and function that are determined and guaranteed by law. These aims and functions constitute the expectations of the members of the organization and those who want to become members. The producers are the members of breeder organizations with different expectations. In general, the protection of economic interests is the most important expectation and realization of the social purposes can be the other expectation (Hansen *et al.*, 2002). The priorities of the

Table 2. The demographic structure of the producers.

	Membership status			Distance to city center (km)			Age									
	N	%	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean								
DCBA	167	21.8	DCBA	44.05	167	DCBA	166	43.74								
DSGBA	219	28.7	DSGBA	60.93	219	DSGBA	219	48.13								
Non-members	379	49.5	Non-members	43.47	379	Non-members	378	46.61								
Total	765	100	Total	47.45	765	Total	763	46.42								
	Education status			Person			Family size									
	DCBA	DSGBA	Non-members	Total	Person	DCBA	DSGBA	Non-members	Total							
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N							
Uneducated	76	45.78	126	57.54	218	57.60	420	21.00	107	28.23	216					
Primary School	69	41.56	82	37.44	129	34.10	280	6-9	81	48.51	75	34.25	166	43.80	322	
High School	15	9.00	7	3.19	21	5.50	43	10 and more	23	13.77	98	44.75	106	27.96	227	
University	7	4.21	4	1.83	11	2.80	22	Total	167	100	219	100	379	100	765	
Total	166	100	219	100	378	100	765									

$\chi^2 = 12.632, P = 0.049$   $\chi^2 = 45.851, P = 0.000$

Table 3. Problems related to Animal Production.

	Inability to afford quality feed		Inability to find stud		Milk marketing (Low price)		Lack of technical knowledge		Animal diseases and deaths		Absence of government subsidy		Organizational deficiencies	
	DCBA	DSGBA	DCBA	DSGBA	DCBA	DSGBA	DCBA	DSGBA	DCBA	DSGBA	DCBA	DSGBA	DCBA	DSGBA
Never (0)	N 42	74	44	66	52	59	34	51	17	6	4	4	5	11
%	25.30	35.07	29.53	51.56	40.00	32.41	21.51	28.02	10.42	2.87	2.46	1.96	3.57	6.39
Rarely (1)	N 11	29	14	14	7	19	16	17	27	24	1	3	3	0
%	6.62	13.74	9.39	32.03	5.38	10.43	10.12	9.34	16.56	11.48	0.61	1.47	2.14	0
Sometime (2)	N 2	6	4	1	3	4	4	4	5	6	1	0	2	1
%	1.20	2.84	2.68	0.78	2.30	2.19	2.53	2.19	3.06	2.87	0.61	0	1.42	0.58
Often (3)	N 9	11	15	11	9	16	17	37	11	29	2	6	3	9
%	5.42	5.21	10.06	8.59	6.92	8.79	10.75	20.32	6.74	13.87	1.23	2.94	2.14	5.23
Always (4)	N 102	91	72	36	59	84	87	73	103	144	154	191	127	151
%	61.44	43.12	48.38	28.12	45.38	46.15	55.06	40.10	63.11	68.89	95.06	93.62	90.7	87.79
Total score	271.04	207.53	238.45	171.84	212.26	225.78	267.67	235.08	295.34	334.79	385.76	384.77	374.20	368.01
Priority	4	6	6	7	7	5	5	4	3	3	1	1	2	2



expectations can also be changed in different breeders groups. While members of DCBA put the expectation of benefit from the support in the first place, DSGBA members put it in the fifth place. The difference between the two expectations is thought to be due to the amount of subsidy given by government, small ruminant breeders can not benefit from the subsidy due to inadequate record keeping of the frequency of sales of the small ruminants.

While DCBA members, put the expectations of pedigree record keeping in the second place, DSGBA members ranked it as in third place. According to the law, subsidies are only paid to the member of association. Animal enterprises want to be a members of association in order to benefit from subsidies given by government (Table 3). While DCBA members put benefit from veterinary services in the third place, DSGBA members put it in the second place. Because epidemic disease and animal death is a major problem in the region, benefiting from the training services was ranked as seventh by the DCBA members while the DSGBA members placed the training expectation in the last place (Table 3). Similarly, economic issues ranked first (52%) among the reasons for the membership according to the DSYB member breeders (farmers) (Akkurt and Köknaroglu, 2016). This difference may be a result of high uneducated rate, i.e. 57.53%. Breeders put the training expectations in the last place by the rate of 8.5% in a study conducted in Van Province (Terin and Ateş, 2010)

DCBA members put the expectation of marketing animal products at a higher price in the fifth place, while DSGBA puts this expectation in the first place.

This situation arises due to marketing problem of the small ruminants enterprises which are active in remote areas far from the city center and engaged in extensive production. DCBA members put “providing easy input” in the sixth expectations, DSGBA members put it in the fourth place (Table 3).

Input supply is not among the duties of Breeders Associations. This is usually the responsibility of cooperatives. Breeders Associations can be perceived as cooperative by the associations members. In a research conducted in Tokat Province related to the place of breeders associations in organization, they found that 82.14% of the members perceived the associations as cooperatives (Kızılaslan and Doğan, 2013). Expectation of “supply of breeding animals” was put in the seventh place by DCBA members, and in the sixth place by DSGBA members similarly (Table 4).

The expectations of both association members were different, but presence of the economic-based expectations in the first three ranks was found to be consistent with other studies. Aydoğan and Yulafci (2013) have stated that the purpose of becoming member of almost all of the breeders’ associations was economics.

More than half of the producers (59.3%) were found to be members of an agricultural organization to benefit from the subsidies (Aydoğan and Yulafci, 2013; Akkurt and Köknaroglu, 2016).

It is considered that there is a relationship between membership in the associations and expectations. As it is known, people who have a positive approach to membership are directly involved in membership when they want to join the association. As the ways of membership to association were examined in study, it was found that the rate of members who were registered voluntarily was 2.43%, by the guidance of agricultural organization was 9.75%, by the association staff who visited the village was 40.85% and by the recommendation of the neighbors was 46.95% as well. As to the membership ways of DSGBA, the rate of membership was found 2.76% voluntarily, 54.83% as a result of informing association staff during the visits to the village, 35.02% membership with the advice of the neighbors and friends, and 7.37% with the guidance of the agricultural organizations (Table 5).

Table 4. Factors affecting membership to Association.

	To benefit from the subsidy		To provide easy input		Providing ease of breeding animals		Pedigree record keeping		Veterinary service		To market the products at higher prices		To benefit from training services														
	DCBA	DSGBA	DCBA	DSGBA	DCBA	DSGBA	DCBA	DSGBA	DCBA	DSGBA	DCBA	DSGBA	DCBA	DSGBA													
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%													
Noneffective (0)	15	10.06	24	11.42	34	27.64	34	58	33	27.73	57	39.31	16	33.11	33	37	33	62	33.33	1	33.33	5	83.33				
Somewhat effective (1)	11	7.38	17	8.09	13	10.56	6	3.52	12	10.08	5	3.44	8	1.98	5	2.68	5	4.58	5	2	2	1.25					
Hesitant (2)	2	1.34	2	0.95	4	3.25	6	3.52	5	4.20	3	2.06	2	0.66	0	1.61	3	1	1	1	0.62						
Highly effective (3)	10	6.71	8	3.80	9	7.31	21	12.35	11	9.24	15	10.34	5	8.60	13	10.21	11	10.09	8	5.00							
Very effective (4)	111	74.49	159	75.71	63	51.21	79	46.47	58	48.73	65	44.82	76	55.62	87	63.04	87	54.12	59	43.71	2	16.66					
Total score	328.15		324.23		247.08		233.49		241.12		213.52		309.28		251.58		255.85		255.58		343.71		266.64		66.64		
Order of importance	1		5		6		4		7		6		2		3		3		2		5		1		4		7



In a study conducted to investigate the DCBA service facilities, 55.4% of the membership were a result of the village visits of the association staff (Özyılmaz and Özdoğru, 2011).

### Contribution of the Association to the Farmers Training

Considering the low education level of the farmers in rural areas, we should accept the necessity of the training of the farmers on subjects more relevant to type of production. Training service will help farmers to carry out more conscious and intensive agricultural production.

As a result, increased production can be achieved. Agricultural extension and training is extremely important for sustainable rural development and education. Agricultural extension training is given by the government in Turkey. However, due to the uncertainty of agricultural policy, lack of adequate resources allocated to the extension training, lack of qualified agricultural trainers, and organizational inefficiencies, the government failed to achieve the expected success in training.

According to the results, 17.36% of DCBA members and 5.93% of DSGBA members participated in training activities related to animal husbandry. In a study conducted in Ankara Province Cattle Breeders Association, it was found that 90.4% of the members participated in any

training related to animal husbandry (Özyılmaz and Özdoğru, 2011). While 24.14% of DCBA members participated in training provided by Association, 75.86% of DCBA members participated in training provided by the agricultural organization. This rate for the DSGBA members was 46.16 and 53.84%, respectively (Table 6).

In this case, the training provided by the state extension service was not effective enough because of previously mentioned reasons, however, trainings of the Breeders Associations are not adequate in this regard as well. According to assessment results of the training effect, 86.20 % of DCBA members stated the training effect as beneficial, 3.44% of as not beneficial, and 10.34% as less beneficial. It was found that 92.30% of DSGBA members evaluated the training as beneficial and 7.70% as less beneficial.

In a study conducted in Amasya Cattle Breeders Association, 47% of the breeders taking the training stated that it was useful and 21,7% as unuseful (Gül, 2015). More than 87% of DCBA members who did not participate in training stated that there was no training held, 8.69% of members thought it was unnecessary, while 3.62% had no time to participate in training. This rate for the DSGBA members was 89.32, 8.25, and 2.43%, respectively. The difference between the two associations members has been found statistically significant ( $p: 0.023$ ) (Table 6). In a study conducted in Kazova Region Fresh Vegetables and Fruits Producers Associations, 57.14% of members

**Table 5.** Membership methods in association.

Method	DCBA		DSGBA		Total
	N	%	N	%	
By advise of association staff	67	40.85	119	54.83	186
Voluntarily	4	2.43	6	2.76	10
By advise of neighbors or friends	77	46.95	76	35.02	153
By advise of agricultural organization	16	9.75	16	7.37	32
Total	164	100	217	100	381

**Table 6.** Participation in training, attitudes and opinions.

Participation to Training related to animal husbandry					Training Institution				
	DCBA		DSGBA			DCBA		DSGBA	
	N	%	N	%		N	%	N	%
Yes	29	17.36	13	5.93	Association	7	24.14	6	46.16
No	138	82.64	206	94.07	Agricultural organizations	22	75.86	7	53.84
Total	167	100	219	100	Private firms				
$X^2=28.378$ $P=0.000$					Total	29	100	13	100
					$X^2=27.870$ $P=0.000$				
The satisfaction level of training					The reasons for not taking training				
	DCBA		DSGBA			DCBA		DSGBA	
	N	%	N	%		N	%	N	%
Beneficial	25	86.20	12	92.30	Unnecessary	12	8.69	17	8.25
Not beneficial	1	3.44	-	-	Unorganized	121	87.68	184	89.32
Less beneficial	3	10.34	1	7.70	I had no time	5	3.62	5	2.43
Total	29	100	13	100	Total	138	100	206	100
					$X^2=14.657$ $P=0.023$				

stated that there was no training given by the association, while 42.86% of members declared that there was training (Kızılaslan and Dogan, 2013). In a similar study carried out to examine organizational responsibility and satisfaction level of the cattle breeders, Can and Yalçın (2015) emphasized on the necessity of giving the first priority in training programs for the breeders to low socioeconomic status in eastern and south eastern Anatolia.

### CONCLUSIONS

Agricultural extension training and agricultural organization are seen as instruments to solve the problems of agriculture sector in Turkey, while structural problems in these two issues are still continuing. New approaches in agricultural extension training system featured various agricultural organizations, however, to ensure success in this issue is still uncertain. Sustainability of the livestock sector depends on breeders decision to be realized the production. In this study, problems with the livestock sector vary according to the type of production. Although the problems of the livestock industry vary according to

types of production, in this study, the first three problems of the DCBA and DSGBA members were determined to be inadequate agricultural support, high cost of veterinary services, particularly in dairy enterprises, and organizational deficiencies. For that reason, corrective measures to be taken in combating these problems will have positive impacts on both cattle and small ruminant breeding.

Perception of the lack of technical knowledge as a problem by Diyarbakır Province Cattle Breeders Association and Diyarbakır Sheep and Goat Breeders Association members shows an awareness of this issue. When examining the factors that affect membership in associations, it seems that the special expectations of the members of both associations are changing the level of importance, but the main purpose of benefiting from state support and the economic objectives are always in the front-line. In Turkey, there are important problems arising from the lack of knowledge of the functions and powers of organizations due to the inadequacy of agricultural organization training, as shown in many studies. It is thought that the farmers do not demand training because they do not know



that agricultural training is among the duties of the association.

It was seen that 94.07% of DSGBA members and 82.64% of DCBA members had not taken any training relating to animal breeding. The rate of participation in training given by Provincial Directorate of Agriculture was found as 75.86% of DSGBA members and 53.84% of DCBA. This situation has shown that both associations have no play an active role in agricultural extension training and that the related regulations should be urgently and seriously revised.

We can infer from the results that both unions are inactive in agricultural extension services. So, corrective regulations should be made urgently and seriously. Study results also revealed that both unions members were eager to attend training programs, but they can not participate in the training activities since the unions do not provide such services.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This research was supported by Faculty of Agriculture, Dicle University: Determination of the rural needs.

## REFERENCES

1. ABPRS. 2011. Address-based Population Registration System. [http://www.tuik.gov.tr/PreTablo.do?alt\\_i d=1059](http://www.tuik.gov.tr/PreTablo.do?alt_i d=1059)
2. Akkurt, M. and Köknaroğlu, H. 2016. Isparta İli Damızlık Sığır Yetiştiricileri Birliğine Üye Olan ve Olmayan İşletmelerin Performanslarının Karşılaştırılması ve Üreticilerin Damızlık Sığır Yetiştiricileri Birliği İle İlişkilerinin İncelenmesi. *SDÜ Ziraat Fakültesi Dergisi*, **1(2)**: 79-90.
3. Aydoğan, M. and Yulafcı, A. 2013. *Determination of the Structural Problems of Agricultural Producer Organizations in Samsun: The Final Report*. General Directorate of Agricultural Studies and Policies Black Sea Agricultural Research Institute Publications, Samsun, Turkey, 49 PP.
4. Anonymous. 2014a. Turkey Statistical Institute. (Access Date, May 10 2016), <http://tuikapp.tuik.gov.tr/hayvancilikapp>
5. Anonymous. 2014b. Diyarbakır Food, Agriculture and Livestock Provincial Directorate Data (Access Date, May 10 2016), <http://Diyarbakir.tarim.gov.tr/Menu/25/Tarimsal-Yapi>
6. Bhuyan, S. 2007. The People Factor in Cooperatives: An Analysis of Members' Attitudes and Behavior. *Can. J. Agric. Econ.*, **55(3)**: 275-298
7. Can, M. F. and Yalçın, C. 2015. Investigation of Organizational Responsibility and Satisfaction Level of the Cattle Producers in Turkey. *Kafkas Univ. Vet. Fak. Derg.*, **21(5)**: 711-717.
8. Çiçek, A. and Erkan, O. 1996. *Agricultural Economy Research Sample and Sampling Method*, pp 209 pp .Gaziosmanpaşa University Faculty of agriculture Publishing, Tokat, Turkey.
9. Hansen, M. H., Morrow, Jr. J. L. and Batista, J. C. 2002. The Impact of Trust on Cooperative Membership Retention, Performance and Satisfaction: An Exploratory Study. *Int. Food Agribus. Manage. Rev.*, **5**: 41-59.
10. Gül, U. 2015. Examination of Attitudes and Behaviors in Extension and Training Activities of Amasya Cattle Breeders Association Member Breeders. *J. Econ. Res.*, **1**: 1-8.
11. İnal, Ş. and Çam, M. 2016. Türkiye'ye 2015 Yılında Sperması İthal Edilen Boğalardaki Kalıtsal Kusurlar. *Eurasian J. Vet. Sci.*, **32(4)**: 278-284.
12. İnan, İ. H., Direk, M., Başaran, B., Birinci, S. and Erkmen, E. 2005. The Organization in Agriculture. *Turkey Agricultural Engineering Congress*, Ankara, PP. 1133-1157.
13. Karlı, B. and Çelik, Y. 2010. Effectiveness to Organization Members and Commercial Relationship of Members to Producer Organizations Were Investigated in GAP (Southeastern Anatolia Project) Region. Working Paper, Agricultural Research Institute Publications. Ankara.

14. Kızılaslan, H. and Doğan, H. G. 2013. Importance and Status of Producer Unions in the Producer Organizations of Turkey (A Case Study with Fresh Vegetable and Fruit Producers Organization Of Kazova Region In Tokat Province). *Acad. J.*, **38(5)**: 1.
15. Köksal, Ö. 2009. Technical Efficiency of Alternative Farming Systems: The Case of Greek Organic and Conventional Olive-Growing Farms. PhD. Thesis (Unpublished), Department of Agricultural Economics, Institute Of Science And Technology, Ankara University, Ankara, Turkey.
16. Özyılmaz, O. and Özdoğru, H. 2011. Evaluation of Services in Association of Raisers That Have Veals Used for Breeding in Ankara. *Indust. Arts Edu. Faculty J. Gazi Univ.*, **27**: 41-51.
17. Rehber, E. 2009. *The Problem of Agricultural Organization*. (Access Date, May 16, 2016), <http://www.erekonomi.com/orgut.pdf>.
18. Saltan, A. 2006. Socio-Economic Structure and Assessment of Agricultural Extension Activities on Development of Kökez Village In Aladag District of Adana Province. Master Thesis (Unpublished), Department of Agricultural Economics, Institute of Natural And Applied Sciences, University of Çukurova, Adana/Turkey
19. Terin, M. and Çelik, A. H. 2010. A Study on the Level of Cooperation among the Farmers and Their Expectations From the Associations: The Case of Van Province. *J. Ege Univ. Faculty Agri.*, **47(3)**: 265-274.

## عوامل موثر بر عضویت در اتحادیه به‌نژادگران و نقش اتحادیه در آموزش کشاورزان

س. آکین، ا. کارا، و م. توتکون

### چکیده

توسعه روستایی با استفاده از نوآوری های فناوری به دست آمده از پژوهش های علمی سراسر جهان و سازماندهی تولید کنندگان (محصولات کشاورزی) مقدور می شود. ارائه خدمات ترویجی در یک سامانه معین اولین عامل موثر بر توسعه روستایی است. درحالیکه در سال های اخیر تحولات مهمی در باره یک سامانه پلورالیستی رخ داده است، مطالعاتی در باره فعال کردن سازمان های تولید کننده در زمینه ترویج کشاورزی در ترکیه در جریان است. از سوی دیگر، این نیز صادق است که در ترکیه، همانند بسیاری از کشورهای در حال توسعه، تفاوت هایی بین انتظارات از سازمان های کشاورزی و وضعیت واقعی بر حسب نیازهای تولید کنندگان و سیاست های دولت وجود دارد. در پژوهش حاضر، عوامل موثر بر عضویت در اتحادیه به‌نژادگران گاو در استان دیاربکر (DCBA) و اتحادیه به‌نژادگران گوسفند و بز دیاربکر (DSGBA) و نقش و مشارکت این اتحادیه ها در نیازهای ترویج کشاورزی بررسی و تعیین شد. چنین مشاهده شد که ۹۴/۰۷٪ اعضای DSGBA و ۸۲/۶۴٪ اعضای DCBA هیچ برنامه آموزشی مربوط به به‌نژادی دام ندیده بودند. نیز معلوم شد که ۷۵/۸۶٪ اعضای DSGBA و ۵۳/۸۴٪ اعضای DCBA در برنامه آموزشی ارائه شده توسط اداره کل کشاورزی استان دیاربکر شرکت کرده بودند. در این مورد، مجدداً مسئله نبود آموزش مربوط به ترویج کشاورزی در مناطق



روستایی آشکار شد. یافته دیگر این بود که ۸۷/۶۸٪ اعضای DCBA و ۸۹/۳۲٪ اعضای DSGBA به خاطر عدم برگزاری دوره آموزشی توسط این دو اتحادیه نمی توانستند در هیچ برنامه آموزش کشاورزی شرکت نمایند.