

CHAPTER IV

CHAPTER IV

PERFORMANCE EVALUATION OF RUBBER MARK THROUGH MEMBER SOCIETIES AND CULTIVATOR SELLER.

In this chapter the performance of Rubber Mark is evaluated through the member societies and cultivator sellers with the help of selected parameters viz., Input supply, Advance payment on security of products, co-ordination of members, etc. This chapter serves the second object of the study i.e., evaluation of the working of Rubber Marketing federation in the light of member societies and cultivator sellers.

PROFILE OF MEMBER CULTIVATOR SELLERS.

1. Education.
2. Occupation.
3. Size of land holdings.
4. Total annual income.
5. Utilisation of land holdings and income.

EVALUATION OF MEMBER SOCIETIES THROUGH CULTIVATOR SELLERS.

1. Profile of member societies.
2. Impact of membership.
3. Impact of input supply.
4. Impact of utilisation of Rubber Marketing Societies.
5. Other activities impact.

EVALUATION OF RUBBER MARK BY MEMBER SOCIETIES:

PERFORMANCE EVALUATION OF RUBBER MARKETING FEDERATION THROUGH MEMBER SOCIETIES AND CULTIVATOR SELLERS.

INTRODUCTION:

In this chapter an attempt is made to measure the effectiveness of Federation and member societies with a cross-examination of different sections of the respondents, i.e., large, medium and small farmers. The researcher has tried to measure the effectiveness of society and Federation with the help of data collected through an open-ended questionnaire administered to 200 selected respondents who are members of the society.

This chapter is divided into three parts: First part highlights the profile of the members and focuses on the education, occupational structure, size of land holding and annual income of the respondents and their relationship. Second and third part deals with the main theme of the research work i.e., effectiveness of Federation with regard to member societies and beneficiaries of different size groups. Effectiveness of Federation is identified with due consideration to various aspects i.e., procurement, advance payment, storage facility, input supply, etc. These important factors have been studied under this investigation.

PROFILE OF CULTIVATOR-SELLERS:

This part highlights the profile of members of the society. It mainly focuses on their education, size of land holdings, occupational structure, and total annual income and utilisation of holdings.

TABLE NO. 4.A.1 shows the data pertaining to the size of land holding and the educational qualifications of the society members. It is observed that the educational qualifications of the respondents vary from school education to post graduate level. Out of 200 respondents 30 (i.e.15%) respondents are below S.S.L.C., 64 (32%) respondents are educated upto S.S.L.C. Whereas 59 (i.e.26%) and 39 (i.e.20%) and 8 (i.e.7%) are educated upto intermediate, graduate and post-graduate level respectively.

TABLE 4.A.1

Distribution of respondents according to size of land holding and education.

SR. NO.	SIZE OF LAND HOLDINGS	EDUCATIONAL QUALIFICATION					TOTAL
		BELOW SSLC	UPTO SSLC	UPTO INTER-MEDIATE	UPTO GRADU-ATION	POST GRADU-ATION	
1	SMALL FARMERS	23	43	45	31	6	148
2	MEDIUM FARMERS	6	14	9	6	2	37
3	LARGE FARMERS	1	7	5	2	-	15
	T O T A L	30	64	59	39	8	200
	P E R C E N T A G E	15%	32%	26%	20%	7%	100%

Table 4.A.2 shows the data of main and subsidiary occupation of the respondents. The table reveals that majority of the respondents i.e. 128 were engaged in agricultural operation alone whereas 36 respondents were engaged in business activities and 36 respondents were employees as well as engaged in agricultural operations.

TABLE 4.A.2

Distribution of respondents according to size groups and occupation

SR. NO.	SIZE GROUP	OCCUPATION			TOTAL
		AGRICULTURE	BUSINESS	SERVICE	
1	SMALL FARMERS	99	25	24	148
2	MEDIUM FARMERS	17	9	11	37
3	LARGE FARMERS	12	2	1	15
	T O T A L	128	36	36	200

It shows the important characteristic that agriculture is the main source of livelihood for a majority of Indian rural population.

Out of 160 respondents, 42 respondents are engaged in business as a subsidiary occupation. The table also reveals that their main occupation is agriculture. Business occupation covers small service shops, grocery shops, contract business etc. Employees include company employees, school teachers, government employees, etc.

Table 4.A.3 indicates that the size of the land holding of the selected respondents. The pattern of land holding in the sample study has found that there were 148 (i.e.74%) small farmers and 37 (i.e.19%) are medium farmers and 15 (i.e.7%) are large farmers.

TABLE 4.A.3

Distribution of respondents according to size of land holding.

SR. NO.	SIZE GROUP	SIZES OF LAND HOLDING (ACRES)	TOTAL RESPONDENTS	PER-CENTAGE
1	SMALL FARMERS	UPTO 5	148	74
2	MEDIUM FARMERS	UPTO 10.5	37	19
3	LARGE FARMERS	10.5 & ABV	15	7
	T O T A L		200	100

The table reveals that the size of land holding is a factor worth consideration in the occupational pattern, particularly for identifying the effectiveness of the society.

Table 4.A.4 shows the total annual income of different size group of land holders. It reveals that 121 respondents' income is upto Rs.30,000. 42 respondents' income is within the range of Rs.30,000 to Rs.45,000 and thereafter upto Rs.75,000 and above. It indicates that 4 respondents' income is above Rs.75,000.

TABLE 4.A.4

Distribution of respondents according to size groups and total annual income.

SR. NO.	TOTAL ANNUAL INCOME (IN RUPEES)	SIZE GROUPS			TOTAL
		SMALL	MEDIUM	LARGE	
1	UPTO 15000	20	-	-	20
2	15001 - 30000	101	-	-	101
3	30001 - 45000	27	15	-	42
4	45001 - 60000	-	17	3	20
5	60001 - 75000	-	5	9	14
6	75001 & ABOVE	-	-	3	3
	T O T A L	148	37	15	200

It is observed from the table that the total income is closely related to the size group of land holding. It means that if the size of the land holding increases, then the total annual income also increases.

Table 4.A.5 shows the income groups and utilisation of land holdings for rubber cultivation. It reveals that 80 respondents utilise more than 50% of their total land holdings for cultivation of rubber.

TABLE 4.A.5

Distribution of respondents according to income groups and utilisation of holdings for rubber cultivation

SR. NO.	TOTAL ANNUAL INCOME (IN RUPEES)	UTILISATION OF LAND FOR RUBBER CULTIVATION			TOTAL
		UPTO 50%	50% - 75%	ABOVE 75%	
1	UPTO 15000	17	2	1	20
2	15001 - 30000	40	46	15	101
3	30001 - 45000	2	22	18	42
4	45001 - 60000	3	5	12	20
5	60001 - 75000	1	4	9	14
6	75001 & ABOVE	-	1	2	3
	T O T A L	63	80	57	200

It is observed from the table that the total annual income is closely related to utilisation of land holdings for rubber cultivation. It means that if the land utilisation for rubber cultivation increases, then the total annual income also increases.

PROFILE OF MEMBER SOCIETIES:

This section highlights the profile of members societies. In Ernakulam District the Federation has got three member societies and one agency purchase branch. Following are the important objects of the member societies.

1. To arrange for sale of rubber belonging to members.
2. To procure and distribute among the members rubber planting materials, manure and implements etc. required by them according to the orders received from them.
3. To rent or own godowns or sales depots to facilitate the storage and sale of rubber.
4. To own or hire or ply lorries on hire for the transport of its goods.
5. To advance money on the pledge of produce of member sent for sale.
6. To disseminate knowledge of the latest improvements in the cultivation of rubber and processing of latex.
7. To act as the agent of the Government and Rubber Board for implementing extension programme.

The member societies are managed by Board of Directors. This Board includes representatives of Rubber Board, and the persons nominated by the registrar of Co-operative Societies.

EVALUATION OF MEMBER SOCIETIES:

This section mainly deals with the judging the effectiveness of the Federation with the help of cultivator sellers and members societies. It can be justified through various factors, viz., impact of membership, impact of input supply, utilisation of selling facility and other activities.

1. Impact of membership.

Table 4.B.1 indicates the size group of land holding and the number of membership years of the respondents.

TABLE 4.B.1

Distribution of respondents according to size group and period of membership.

SR.	NO.	SIZE GROUPS	PERIOD OF MEMBERSHIP				TOTAL
			5 YRS	10 YRS	15 YRS	20 YRS	
1		SMALL FARMERS	42	83	18	6	149
2		MEDIUM FARMERS	12	15	5	4	36
3		LARGE FARMERS	4	6	3	2	15
		TOTAL	58	104	26	12	200
			29%	52%	13%	6%	

It is observed from the table that out of 200 respondent members 58(i.e.29%) respondents have put in membership for 5 years. Further 104 respondents (i.e.52%) have put in membership for 10 years, 26 respondents (i.e.13%) and 12 (i.e. 6%) have put in membership for 15 years and 20 years respectively. The table reveals that more than 81% of the respondents have put in membership upto 10 years, remaining 15 to 20 years. However, the respondents were more experienced in dealing with Rubber Marketing Societies.

Table 4.B.2 illustrates the respondents' view towards their being members of the society. It is also revealed from the table

that there are three views expressed by the respondents i.e. economic upliftment, loan facility and employment opportunity.

TABLE 4.B.2

Distribution of respondents according to size groups and their view towards membership.

SR. NO.	SIZE GROUP	RESPONDENTS VIEW TOWARDS MEMBERSHIP			TOTAL
		ECONOMIC UPLIFTMENT	LOAN FACILITY	EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY	
1	SMALL FARMERS	129	-	20	149
2	MEDIUM FARMERS	20	-	16	36
3	LARGE FARMERS	15	-	-	15
	T O T A L	164	-	36	200

Respondents expressed their satisfaction towards economic upliftment. They reported that they are receiving many services through various activities of the society.

Another satisfactory view expressed by the members was about the employment opportunity. The society has provided employment opportunities to the people in this district.

However about 66% respondents were expressed their dissatisfaction for the non-availability of loans and advances from the society.

2. IMPACT OF INPUT SUPPLY:

Table 4.B.3 illustrates the respondents' who are purchasing inputs from Rubber Marketing Society. Out of 200 respondents 150 are purchasing the required inputs from Rubber Marketing Societies. Remaining respondents are purchasing from private dealers. They are given a number of reasons.

1. Distance from Rubber Marketing Society is more. So not convenient to purchase from Rubber marketing Society.
2. No much difference in rates between the inputs supplied by private dealers and Rubber Marketing Society.
3. There is no difference in quality between the inputs supplied by Rubber Marketing Society and private dealers.

TABLE 4.B.3

Distribution of respondents on the basis of purchasing inputs from Rubber Marketing Society and not.

SR. NO.	SIZE GROUP	PURCHASING FROM RUBBER MARKETING SOCIETY	NOT PURCHASING FROM RUBBER MARKETING SOC.	TOTAL
1	SMALL FARMERS	107	38	145
2	MEDIUM FARMERS	29	10	39
3	LARGE FARMERS	14	2	16
	T O T A L	150	50	200
	%	75%	25%	100

Table 4.B.4 indicates the size group of respondents and various reasons for not purchasing inputs from Rubber Marketing Societies. Out of 50 respondents 47 (i.e.94%) respondents are not purchasing because of high rates. Remaining due to poor quality of inputs supplied by Rubber Marketing Societies. The table reveals that majority i.e. 94% are not purchasing because of high price of inputs.

TABLE 4.B.4

Distribution of respondents who are not purchasing inputs from Rubber Marketing Society according to size groups and various reasons.

SR. NO.	SIZE GROUP	REASONS			TOTAL
		HIGH RATES	UNSATIS-FACTORY WEIGHTS & MEASURES	POOR QUALITY	
1	SMALL FARMERS	36	-	2	38
2	MEDIUM FARMERS	9	-	1	10
3	LARGE FARMERS	2	-	-	2
	T O T A L	47	-	3	50
	PERCENTAGE	94%	-	6%	100%

3. IMPACT OF UTILISATION OF RUBBER MARKETING SOCIETY FOR SELLING:

Table 4.B.5 shows the distribution of respondents according to size group and utilisation of Rubber Marketing Society for selling.

This table reveals that 122 (i.e.61%) of respondents are utilising Rubber Marketing Society for selling their products. Remaining 78 (i.e.39%) respondents are selling their products through private dealers.

TABLE 4.B.5

Distribution of respondents according to size groups and utilisation of Rubber Marketing Society for selling.

SR. NO.	SIZE GROUP	SELLING THROUGH RUBBER MARKETING SOCIETY	NOT SELLING THROUGH RUBBER MARKETING SOC.	TOTAL
1	SMALL FARMERS	90	58	148
2	MEDIUM FARMERS	22	15	37
3	LARGE FARMERS	10	5	15
	T O T A L	122	78	200
	PERCENTAGE	61%	39%	100

It is observed from the table that out of total 200 respondents belonging to different size groups majority are utilising Rubber Marketing Society for selling their products.

Table 4.B.6 shows the distribution of respondents according to size groups and their view towards rates, weights and measures of Rubber Marketing Society. Out of total 122 respondents who are utilising Rubber Marketing Society for selling their products 82 of small farmers (i.e. 91%) and 17 (i.e.77%).of medium farmers and 80% of large farmers are satisfied with the weights and measures and rates of Rubber

Marketing Society. But 8 (i.e. 9%) of small farmers and 5 (i.e. 23%) of medium farmers and 20% of large farmers are not satisfied with weights and measures and rates of Rubber Marketing Society.

TABLE 4.B.6

Distribution of respondents who are utilising Rubber Marketing Society according to size groups and their view towards selling through Rubber Marketing Society.

SR. NO.	SIZE OF HOLDINGS	VIEW TOWARDS SELLING				TOTAL
		RATES		WEIGHTS & MEASURES		
		SATISFIED	NOT SATISFIED	SATISFIED	NOT SATISFIED	
1	SMALL FARMERS	43	6	39	2	90
2	MEDIUM FARMERS	9	4	8	1	22
3	LARGE FARMERS	4	2	4	-	10
	T O T A L	56	12	51	3	122

The table reveals that out of 122 cultivators who are utilising Rubber Marketing Society for selling their products 107 (i.e. 88%) were satisfied with rates and weights and measures of the Rubber Marketing Society.

Table 4.B.7 indicates the reasons for not utilising Rubber Marketing Society for marketing their products. Out of 78 respondents who are not utilising Rubber Marketing Society for

marketing their products 56 (i.e.72%) are not utilising because they are far away from the depots of Rubber Marketing Society. More than 19 (i.e.28%) respondents are not utilising the facility of Rubber Marketing Society for selling because they are not satisfied with grading system, working days and other matters of Rubber Marketing Society.

TABLE 4.B.7

Distribution of respondents who are not utilising Rubber Marketing Society according to size group and various reasons.

SR. NO.	SIZE GROUP	VARIOUS REASONS						TOTAL
		NOT CON- VENIENT	%	NO DIFF IN RATE	%	NOT SATIS FIED WITH R.M.S.	%	
1	SMALL FARMERS	40	69	16	28	2	3	58
2	MEDIUM FARMERS	12	80	2	13	1	7	15
3	LARGE FARMERS	4	80	1	20	-	0	5
	T O T A L	56		19		3		78
	PERCENTAGE	72%		24%		4%		100%

It is revealed from the table that majority of respondents i.e.72% were not selling through Rubber Marketing Society because they have no convenient depot of Rubber Marketing Society or agency purchase branch of Rubber Marketing Federation.

Table 4.B.8 shows the view of the respondents towards the grading of the Rubber Marketing Society. Out of 122 respondents who are utilising Rubber Marketing Society for selling their products 108 respondents (i.e.89%) were found satisfied with grading of Rubber Marketing Society but remaining 14 respondents (i.e.11%) are not satisfied with grading of Rubber Marketing Society.

TABLE 4.B.8

Distribution of respondents according to size groups and their views towards grading.

SR. NO.	SIZE GROUP	VIEW TOWARDS GRADING		TOTAL
		SATISFIED	NOT SATISFIED	
1	SMALL FARMERS	81	9	90
2	MEDIUM FARMERS	19	3	22
3	LARGE FARMERS	8	2	10
	T O T A L	108	14	122
	PERCENTAGE	89%	11%	100%

It is observed from the table that out of total respondents who are selling through Rubber Marketing Society majority are satisfied with grading of Rubber Marketing Societies.

Table 4.B.9 shows the view of respondents towards the present price of rubber. Out of 200 respondents 189 (i.e.95%)

respondents were not satisfied with the present market price of rubber. 11 (i.e.5%) respondents were satisfied.

TABLE 4.B.9

Distribution of respondents according to size groups and their view regarding present price.

SR. NO.	SIZE GROUP	VIEW REGARDING PRICE		TOTAL
		SATISFIED	NOT SATISFIED	
1	SMALL FARMERS	8	140	148
2	MEDIUM FARMERS	2	35	37
3	LARGE FARMERS	1	14	15
	T O T A L	11	189	200
	PERCENTAGE	5%	95%	100%

It is revealed from the table that majority of the respondents are dissatisfied with the present market price of rubber when compared to cost of production.

Table 4.B.10 reveals the respondents' size group of land holdings and their view towards advance and storage facility.

TABLE 4.B.10

Distribution of respondents according size group and their view towards advance and storage facility.

SR. NO.	SIZE GROUP	VIEW TOWARDS ADVANCE AND STORAGE				TOTAL
		NEED ADVANCE	%	NOT NEED ADVANCE	%	
1	SMALL FARMERS	106	72	42	28	148
2	MEDIUM FARMERS	21	57	16	43	37
3	LARGE FARMERS	6	40	9	60	15
	T O T A L	133		67		200
	PERCENTAGE	66%		34%		100%

It is revealed from the table that out of 200 respondents majority 133 (i.e.66%) respondents require advance and storage facility to obtain benefit of price increase in off-season. Storage and advance against storage will enable the cultivators to obtain better price for their products. Whereas remaining 34% did not require advance and storage facility.

It is observed from the table that size group and need of advance is closely related. Higher the size group less will be the need for advance.

TABLE 4.B.11

Distribution of respondents according size group and their view towards price payment system.

SR. NO.	SIZE GROUP	VIEW TOWARDS PRICE PAYMENT SYSTEM		TOTAL
		SATISFACTORY	NOT SATISFACTORY	
1	SMALL FARMERS	118	30	148
2	MEDIUM FARMERS	35	2	37
3	LARGE FARMERS	14	1	15
	T O T A L	167	33	200
	PERCENTAGE	86%	14%	100%

Table 4.B.11 indicates the distribution of size groups of land holding and their view towards price payment system. It is revealed from the table that out of 200 respondents 86% are satisfied in the price payment system of the Rubber Marketing Society. Remaining 14% are not satisfied. It shows that majority are satisfied in the price payment system of Rubber Marketing Society.

TABLE 4.B.12

Distribution of respondents according to size groups and dependence on various sources of market information.

SR. NO.		VARIOUS SOURCES OF MARKET INFORMATION			TOTAL
		NEWSPAPER	TELEVISION	RADIO	
1	SMALL FARMERS	113	8	27	148
2	MEDIUM FARMERS	24	4	9	37
3	LARGE FARMERS	4	10	1	15
	T O T A L	141	22	37	200
	PERCENTAGE	71%	11%	18%	100%

Table 4.B.12 shows the distribution of respondents according to size groups and dependence on various sources of market information. Out of 200 respondents 71% depends upon newspaper. Remaining 11% and 18% depends upon television and radio respectively.

It is observed from the table that the main source of market information is newspaper and majority of respondents depend upon newspaper.

TABLE 4.B.13

Distribution of respondents according size group and their view towards the present sources of market information.

SR. NO.	SIZE GROUP	VIEW TOWARDS MARKET INFORMATION		TOTAL
		SATISFACTORY	NOT SATISFACTORY	
1	SMALL FARMERS	134	14	148
2	MEDIUM FARMERS	29	8	37
3	LARGE FARMERS	13	2	15
	T O T A L	176	24	200
	PERCENTAGE	88%	12%	100%

Table 4.B.13 shows the views of respondents towards the sources of market information. It is observed from the table that majority of the respondents i.e. 88% are satisfied with the present information system. Remaining 12% are not satisfied.

TABLE 4.B.14

Distribution of respondents according size group and their view towards working days, dealings of staff and other matters.

SR. NO.	SIZE GROUP	VIEW TOWARDS WORKING DAYS AND OTHER MATTERS		TOTAL
		SATISFIED	NOT SATISFIED	
1	SMALL FARMERS	85	5	90
2	MEDIUM FARMERS	19	3	22
3	LARGE FARMERS	9	1	10
	T O T A L	113	9	122
	PERCENTAGE	93%	7%	100%

Table 4.B.14 indicates the distribution of respondents according to size groups and their view towards working days, dealing of staff and other matters of Rubber Marketing Society. Out of the total 122 respondents who are utilising Rubber Marketing Society for selling their their products 93% are satisfied with working days, dealings of staff and other matters. Remaining 7% are not fully satisfied on all matters.

It is observed from the table that majority of the respondents who are dealing with Rubber Marketing Society are satisfied with Rubber Marketing Society.

EVALUATION OF RUBBER MARK:

In this section an attempt is made to evaluate the working of Rubber Mark in the light of member societies.

1. It is found that majority of member societies are not able to compete with private dealers in procurement of rubber because of the high operational costs and lack of prompt payments from Federation.
2. It is noticed that the societies have got only few collection depots for collecting the products of cultivators and supplying inputs to the cultivators. They are supplying inputs not at lower prices. Because they are not getting inputs from Federation at low price.
3. It is found that almost all societies own vehicles for transporting its goods.
4. It is found that almost all member societies are facing the problem of lack of finance. The societies are not receiving any financial assistance from Federation or Government to provide advance to cultivator sellers against the security of their products.

It is found that there is no extensive programme to disseminate knowledge of the latest improvement in cultivation of rubber and processing of latex.

5. It is noticed that there is no qualified and experienced graders in member societies for proper grading.