

State Cooperative Councils: What are the Local Member Cooperatives Looking For?

Joan R. Fulton and Michael Keenan

State cooperative councils serve a valuable role for local cooperatives by providing services including education, legislative monitoring and lobbying, and promotion of the cooperative form of business. This paper outlines the specific challenges that state councils are experiencing in today's changing agribusiness environment. The results of a survey of members of the Colorado Cooperative Council are reported. Logit analysis is performed to identify the factors contributing to the cooperatives' satisfaction with the state council and the cooperatives' use of the council's services. The paper concludes with suggestions for action by state councils.

The production and distribution of agricultural products has become increasingly consolidated in the past few decades, and the progression has been more rapid in recent years. This trend is evident for agricultural cooperatives across the United States. During the decade from 1985 through 1994 the number of farmer cooperatives decreased from 5,625 to 4,174 or 26 percent (Richardson et al. 1995). This consolidation, whether the result of merger, acquisition, or dissolution, was prompted by the need for economic efficiency and has often resulted in more efficient operations¹. However, the trends that are currently prevalent in agriculture are putting particular pressure on many local cooperatives that, because of their small size, are unable to compete with investor-oriented firms that are large enough to achieve size economies.

State cooperative trade associations or cooperative councils have served an important role in helping local cooperatives remain competitive in the business place. The importance of state cooperative councils is greater today than ever before, given the changing business demands local cooperatives are facing.

The objectives of this paper are

1. to identify the specific challenges state cooperative councils are facing as they strive to meet the needs of their member cooperatives in this changing agricultural business climate,
2. to report the results of a survey performed in Colorado and identify the factors that contribute to members' satisfaction with the council's services and the members' use of the council's services, and
3. to identify implications for programming and services for state cooperative councils in other states and other trade associations.

Joan R. Fulton is assistant professor at the Department of Agricultural Economics, Purdue University. Michael Keenan is a graduate research assistant at the Department of Agricultural and Resource Economics, Colorado State University. Support from the Colorado Agricultural Experiment Station and the Colorado Cooperative Council is gratefully acknowledged.

The following section of this paper discusses the roles cooperative councils at the state level traditionally play, along with the unique challenges these organizations are facing. The third section of the paper describes the data and the survey method used. The empirical analysis is described and the results are reported in the fourth section. The final section of the paper contains conclusions and suggestions for action by state councils and other trade associations.

State Councils

In 1992, cooperatives in thirty-eight U.S. states had a cooperative state trade association or council operating under names including institute, committee, federation, association, or council (Meyer 1993). For consistency, the term council will be used in this paper to refer to all such state associations. State cooperative councils offer some or all of the following services to the cooperatives and community in their respective states:

- education,
- public relations,
- promotion of the cooperative form of business,
- assistance with development of new cooperatives,
- assistance with industry relations,
- legislative oversight for member cooperatives,
- legislative lobbying on issues relating to cooperatives,
- a newsletter,
- a directory of cooperatives,
- an annual meeting, and
- business consulting.

The manner in which these services are provided is a direct function of the resources available to the council. As of 1992, twelve states employed a full-time executive and fourteen states paid a part-time executive to carry out council services. In the remaining twelve states, services were coordinated and offered through the efforts of a volunteer executive. Sixteen of the states that hired a full- or part-time executive had additional part- or full-time staff to assist with programming and services. Councils that relied on a volunteer executive did not have any paid employees. In these latter cases the executive usually relied on clerical assistance from the office where he/she worked (for example, the Extension Service). The revenue for state councils comes from two primary sources: dues from member cooperatives and cost recovery from educational programs and business consulting (Meyer 1993).

Education is the one service that all the state councils reported offering in the 1992 survey (Meyer 1993). The two most common groups targeted for the education component were youths and directors of local cooperatives in the state. However, other groups that were also recipients of the education service included young adults/farmers, educators, employees, cooperative members, and the general public. Meyer's survey revealed that, following education, these services were most commonly provided by state councils: organizing and sponsoring an annual meeting, preparing and distributing a newsletter, legislative monitoring and lobbying, and public relations.

State councils are facing a number of challenges to remain viable in today's changing business environment. An immediate challenge relates to the decreasing number of farmer cooperatives, as identified earlier in this paper. Since a signifi-

cant portion of the budget of many of the councils comes from member dues, it is becoming increasingly difficult to balance a budget as the number of member cooperatives declines. While it may be the case that the remaining cooperatives are larger and could, in theory, pay higher dues there is usually a sense among members that they cannot afford anything but the dues they have traditionally paid. Despite decreased numbers the demand for the services of the state councils has not decreased.

A second challenge facing state councils is one that relates to the nature of the services offered by the councils and that is, in fact, long standing. Most of the services offered by the state councils have characteristics of public goods. A public good is a good or service for which use by any one entity does not preclude any other entity from using it. Furthermore, it is difficult and often impossible to exclude people from consuming the good or service.

Among services offered by state cooperative councils, youth education, education of the general public, and legislative lobbying all represent public goods. The benefits of these services, as a result of youths and the general public being more aware of the cooperative way of doing business and legislative decisions that are favorable toward cooperatives, are enjoyed by the cooperatives that paid dues as well as those cooperatives that did not pay dues. The continual challenge when offering goods or services that have public goods characteristics is how to pay for them.

A third challenge facing state cooperative councils is that their membership is often diverse, including marketing cooperatives, farm supply cooperatives, farm credit cooperatives, and rural electric cooperatives. Many times, members are in very different lines of business and place different demands on a state council. For example, a director education program that addresses legal liability issues of a grain hedging program may be of very limited interest to directors of a rural electric cooperative. For state councils operating with limited resources, it is often difficult to determine the appropriate mix of services to offer.

A final challenge facing state cooperative councils relates to budget reductions that land grant universities, government departments, and regional cooperatives have recently experienced (Torgerson 1996). These institutions have been important sources of educational materials and people for programs offered to member cooperatives by the state councils.

The Colorado Cooperative Council

The Colorado Cooperative Council represents ten regional and over sixty local cooperatives, or about 90 percent of the cooperatives, in Colorado. With a full-time executive and a part-time secretary, the Colorado Cooperative Council is one of the larger councils in the country². However, there are several state councils that are considerably larger than Colorado's that employ several full-time paid staff in addition to the executive. Operating revenue for the Colorado Cooperative Council comes from member dues and fees for educational programs and business consulting services. The major ongoing services provided by the council are education, legislative monitoring and lobbying, a newsletter, an annual meeting and issues conference, general promotion of the cooperative form of business, and assistance with the forming new cooperatives. The Colorado Cooperative Council recently completed a multi-year project to rewrite and coordinate the adoption, in the Colorado General Assembly, of a new statute, the Colorado Cooperative Act, under which cooperatives are incorporated.

The main thrust of educational programming is targeted toward directors of local cooperatives, with winter seminars held around the state; and youths, with sponsorship of a youth delegation to the National Institute on Cooperative Education (NICE) and support of the ag-in-the-classroom program. In addition, the council supports young farmers through the Colorado Ag Leadership program and sponsors periodic seminars for cooperative employees on timely topics (Campbell 1993).

In light of the challenges facing state councils, as noted earlier, the Colorado Cooperative Council decided to seek insight to the needs and desires of its membership. The remainder of this paper reports the results of a mail survey of Colorado cooperatives.

Data

Data in this paper were obtained from a mail survey of the local cooperatives that are dues paying members of the Colorado Cooperative Council. Questionnaires were mailed to sixty-one local cooperatives in September 1995. Thirty-six of the questionnaires were returned resulting in a response rate of 59 percent.

It was suggested in the cover letter that, if time permitted, the manager consult the board of directors in completing the questionnaire. In all but two cases the questionnaire was completed by the general manager only. The vice chairman of the board completed one of the questionnaires while the financial manager completed the questionnaire in another case.

The questionnaire asked respondents for general information concerning the type and size of the cooperative. Respondents were asked to rank each of the services provided by the Colorado Cooperative Council on a five-point Likert scale, ranging from "Little Importance" to "Very Important." Finally, members were asked about their satisfaction with the services of the council and their involvement in activities sponsored by the council.

Eleven of the cooperatives that responded identified themselves as rural utility or farm credit cooperatives. The remaining twenty-five identified themselves as marketing and/or supply cooperatives. Cooperatives were categorized as rural utility/farm credit and marketing/supply because of their different levels of involvement, historically, with the activities of the council. Cooperatives in the former group participate less, with respect to sending directors to winter director training seminars and representatives to the annual meeting and issues conference, while those in the latter group are more involved.

It is not surprising to observe that the programming and services of the council tend to be targeted toward the marketing/supply cooperatives. A possible "chicken and egg" scenario exists with the rural utility/farm credit cooperatives not participating because (1) the programming is geared for the marketing/supply cooperatives and (2) the council designs programs for the group with the highest participation rate.

Of the rural utility/farm credit cooperatives, one reported having business volume in the less than \$5 million range, one in the \$10 to \$20 million range, three in the over \$20 million range, and six did not answer the question about business volume. In the marketing/supply category, seven cooperatives reported having business volume in the less than \$5 million range, eight cooperatives were in the \$5 to \$10 million range, three were in the \$10 to \$20 million range, and seven were in the over \$20 million range.

Results

Table 1 reports responses to the question of whether members are satisfied with the dues structure of the Colorado Cooperative Council. Seventy-five percent of respondents indicated that they are satisfied. The dues structure is based on a formula applied to net fixed assets and total equity combined, with a minimum of three hundred dollars and a maximum of three thousand dollars. The rural utility and farm credit cooperatives pay dues of three hundred dollars per association (Campbell 1993). Three of the eleven rural utility/farm credit cooperatives did not respond to the question. Among the marketing/supply cooperatives, three indicated that they were not satisfied, two did not respond to the question, and one checked both responses to the question, reflecting some degree of ambivalence about the dues structure. However, in general, these results suggest that the council's dues structure is satisfactory from the perspective of the local cooperatives³.

TABLE 1. Member Satisfaction with Dues Structure of the Colorado Cooperative Council

	Satisfied	Not Satisfied	No Response
Rural Utility/Farm Credit	8 ^a (73%) ^b	0 (0%)	3 (27%)
Marketing/Supply ^c	19 (79%)	3 (13%)	2 (8%)

^aThe numbers in the cells represent the number of cooperatives that selected the response to the question.

^bThe values in parentheses are the percentages of that type of cooperative that selected the response to the question.

^cOne cooperative in the marketing/supply category checked both "yes" and "no" to this question. The numbers reported in the table do not include that cooperative.

Responses to the question of degree of satisfaction with the services and value from the Colorado Cooperative Council are reported in table 2 and, in general, indicate a strong level of satisfaction. Eight of the eleven rural utility/farm credit cooperatives selected "Modestly Satisfied" or "Satisfied." Sixty-four percent of the marketing/supply cooperatives indicated that they are "Very Satisfied" or "Modestly Satisfied" with the services and value from the council while another 28 percent indicated that they are "Satisfied." None of the respondents selected the "Very Dissatisfied" response, while only one cooperative selected the "Dissatisfied" response. In this latter case, the marketing/supply cooperative checked both "Moderately Satisfied" and "Dissatisfied," suggesting some degree of ambivalence.

The questionnaire did not ask respondents about their level of satisfaction with specific services of the Colorado Cooperative Council. Related information, however, was obtained from the respondents. In particular, respondents were asked to rate the importance of each of the services. These ratings are the independent variables for the logit analysis reported in tables 5 and 6.

Respondents were also asked to indicate the five services offered by the council that are most important to their cooperative. The services that the rural utility/farm credit cooperatives found most important were: providing educational materials, with four cooperatives selecting the service; networking with the Colorado agricultural and commodity groups, with five cooperatives selecting the service; sponsoring legislation on behalf of Colorado cooperatives, with five cooperatives

TABLE 2. Member Satisfaction with Services and Value Received from the Colorado Cooperative Council

	Very Satisfied	Modestly Satisfied	Satisfied	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	No Response
Rural Utility/ Farm Credit	1 ^a (9%) ^b	3 (27%)	5 (45%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (19%)
Marketing/ Supply ^b	11 (46%)	5 (21%)	7 (29%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (4%)

^aThe numbers in the cells represent the number of cooperatives that selected the response to the question.

^bThe values in parentheses are the percentages of that type of cooperative that selected the response to the question.

^cOne cooperative in the marketing/supply category checked both "Modestly Satisfied" and "Dissatisfied" to this question. The numbers reported in the table do not include that cooperative.

selecting the service; and monitoring the Colorado General Assembly, with six cooperatives selecting the service. Services that the marketing/supply cooperatives found most important were: corporate services to update articles of incorporation and bylaws, with eleven cooperatives selecting the service; monitoring the Colorado General Assembly, with thirteen cooperatives selecting the service; and director training and development, with fifteen cooperatives selecting the service.

The degree of involvement by member cooperatives in the programs of the Colorado Cooperative Council are reported in tables 3 and 4. Participation by managers and directors in winter director training seminars, held throughout the state, is reported in table 3. Eighty-two percent of the rural utility/farm credit cooperatives do not participate in the seminars or did not respond to the question. In contrast, 68 percent of the marketing/supply cooperatives do participate in these seminars. There is a lower level of participation in the Annual Co-op Issues Conference and annual meeting of the council. None of the rural utility/farm credit cooperatives participate, while 64 percent of the marketing/supply cooperatives participate.

Logit analysis was performed to gain insight into the factors that contribute to member satisfaction with the services of the Colorado Cooperative Council and the cooperatives' use of the services. Table 5 reports the results of binary logit analysis of factors influencing satisfaction with services. The dependent variable

TABLE 3. Member Participation in Director Training Seminars Held Throughout the State

	Participate	Do Not Participate	No Response
Rural Utility/ Farm Credit	2 ^a (18%) ^b	8 (73%)	1 (9%)
Marketing/ Supply	17 (68%)	6 (24%)	2 (8%)

^aThe numbers in the cells represent the number of cooperatives that selected the response to the question.

^bThe values in parentheses are the percentages of that type of cooperative that selected the response to the question.

TABLE 4. Member Participation in Annual Cooperative Issues Conference and Colorado Cooperative Council Annual Meeting

	Participate	Do Not Participate	No Response
Rural Utility/ Farm Credit	0 ^a (0%) ^b	8 (73%)	3 (27%)
Marketing/ Supply	16 (64%)	8 (32%)	1 (4%)

^a The numbers in the cells represent the number of cooperatives that selected the response to the question.

^b The values in parenthesis are the percentage of that type of cooperative that selected the response to the question.

takes on a value of 1 if the respondent indicated "Very Satisfied" or "Modestly Satisfied" and 0 otherwise⁴. Several models were explored, and the results of two of the models with the best fit are reported in the table.

The lack of statistical significance on the coefficients is disappointing though probably not surprising given the small number of observations. Although the Chi Squared values of 5.39 and 6.44 indicate that the set of coefficients, as a group, is statistically significant, the coefficient for only one variable in each equation is statistically different from zero. In Model 1 the constant is statistically significant, while in Model 2 the coefficient on the NICE variable is statistically significant. This latter result suggests that the cooperatives that feel that supporting a youth

TABLE 5. Logit Analysis of Factors Influencing Satisfaction with Services and Value Received from the Colorado Cooperative Council^a

Variable	Model 1	Model 2
Constant	1.21** (0.57) ^b	-0.43 (0.67)
TYPE ^c	-2.03 (1.29)	-2.28 (1.50)
SIZE1 ^d	-1.54 (.93)	
SIZE2 ^e		1.12 (1.00)
NICE ^f		1.78* (0.97)
Chi Squared	5.39(2)* ^g	6.44(3)*

^a Dependent variable equals 1 if cooperative is "Very Satisfied" or "Modestly Satisfied" and 0 otherwise.

^b The values in parentheses below the coefficients are the standard errors.

^c This "TYPE" variable equals 1 if cooperative is rural utility or farm credit and 0 if cooperative is marketing or supply.

^d This "SIZE 1" variable equals 1 if cooperative does less than \$5 million in annual sales and 0 otherwise.

^e This "SIZE 2" variable equals 1 if cooperative does more than \$10 million in annual sales and 0 otherwise.

^f This variable equals 1 if "Partially funding and coordinating sponsorship of Colorado delegation to 'NICE.'" were deemed either "Very Important" or "Important" and 0 otherwise.

^g The values in parentheses are degrees of freedom.

* Statistically significant at the 90 percent level.

** Statistically significant at the 95 percent level.

delegation to NICE is "Very Important" or "Important" are more likely to be "Very Satisfied" or "Moderately Satisfied" with the services of the council. The negative sign on the coefficient on the TYPE variable indicates that the rural utility/farm credit cooperatives are less likely than the marketing/supply cooperatives to be "Very Satisfied" or "Moderately Satisfied" with the council's services. The coefficients on the size variables suggest that larger cooperatives are more satisfied with the services and value from the council.

Previous research suggests that participants are more likely to be supportive and pay their share to fund a public good when they are involved and feel a part of the organization (Braverman et al. 1991, Fulton et al. 1996, Karanth 1992, Sherman and Schwartz 1991). It is, therefore, important to examine the factors that contribute to the use of the council's services by local cooperatives.

Table 6 reports the results of logit analysis of factors influencing participation in the winter director training seminars. Eight models are presented in the last eight columns of the table. Different combinations of independent variables are represented in each model. For each model, the dependent variable equals 1 if cooperative managers and directors attend the seminar and 0 otherwise.

The Chi Squared values range from 6.48 to 11.71. These values indicate that, for each of the eight models, the set of coefficients, as a group, is statistically significant at the 95 percent level. In all models, the coefficient on the TYPE variable is statistically different from zero and negative. This indicates that the rural utility/farm credit cooperatives are less likely to participate in seminars than the marketing/supply cooperatives. In models 3 and 6, the coefficient on the SIZE variable is negative and statistically significant indicating that smaller cooperatives are less likely to participate in training seminars.

It is interesting to note that the coefficients on the TRAIN variable are not statistically significant—this is unusual, as one would expect that if director training were deemed important, a cooperative would send its directors to the winter seminars. However, these coefficients do have the expected positive sign reflecting that cooperatives who rank director training and development as "Very Important" or "Important" are more likely to participate in the seminars.

The four variables CMONTH, SUPPORT, NICE and SCOFIELD are included to see if the members who place more or less importance on some of the services with a broader benefit or public good are more or less likely to participate. The variable CMONTH equals 1 if "Coordinating Annual Colorado Co-op Month" was deemed "Very Important" or "Important" and 0 otherwise. The variable SUPPORT takes a value of 1 when respondents felt that providing financial support for the Colorado Foundation for Agriculture and other agricultural literary programs was "Very Important" or "Important" and 0 otherwise. The variable NICE is defined the same way as it was in table 5 and reflects the importance respondents placed on sending a youth delegation to NICE. The SCOFIELD variable equals 1 if respondents felt that offering an award for an outstanding field-based extension program, called the Scofield Award, was "Very Important" or "Important."

The coefficients on these variables all have the expected positive sign. However, only the coefficient on the NICE variable is statistically significant. One possible explanation is that the respondents are more aware of the sponsorship of the youth delegation to NICE since, following the trip, youths return to their home cooperatives and report on their experiences.

TABLE 6. Logit Analysis of Factors Influencing Attendance at Director Training Seminars^a

Variable	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5	Model 6	Model 7	Model 8
Constant	0.89** (0.45)	-0.37 (0.91)	0.15 (1.01)	0.36 (0.58)	0.31 (0.58)	0.45 (0.65)	0.12 (0.56)	0.41 (0.53)
TYPE ^c	-2.14** (0.92)	-1.92** (0.96)		-2.29** (0.97)	-2.19** (0.96)		-2.25** (1.03)	-2.42** (1.01)
SIZE ^d			-2.05** (0.99)			-2.37** (1.05)		
TRAIN ^e		1.57 (0.99)	1.16 (1.09)					
C MONTH ^f				1.07 (0.83)				
SUPPORT ^g					1.21 (0.83)	1.41 (0.95)		
NICE ^h							1.94** (0.92)	
SCOFIELD ⁱ								1.40 (0.91)
Chi Squared	6.48(1)**	9.16(2)**	7.19(2)**	8.25(2)**	8.74(2)**	8.42(2)**	11.71(2)**	9.19(2)**

^a Dependent variable equals 1 if cooperative management and directors attend director training seminars.

^b The values in parentheses below the coefficients are the standard errors.

^c This "type" variable equals 1 if cooperative is rural utility or farm credit and a 0 if cooperative is marketing or supply.

^d This "size" variable equals 1 if cooperative does less than \$5 million in annual sales and a 0 otherwise.

^e This variable equals 1 if "Director Training and Development" were deemed either "Very Important" or "Important" and a 0 otherwise.

^f This variable equals 1 if "Coordinating Annual Colorado Co-op Month Observance" was deemed either "Very Important" or "Important" and a 0 otherwise.

^g This variable equals 1 if "Financial Support for the Colorado Foundation for Agriculture and other Ag Literary Programs" was deemed either "Very Important" or "Important" and a 0 otherwise.

^h This variable equals 1 if "Partially funding and coordinating sponsorship of the Colorado delegation to 'NICE'" were deemed either "Very Important" or "Important" and a 0 otherwise.

ⁱ This variable equals 1 if "Funding the Scofield Award for outstanding service of a field based CSU extension program" was deemed either "Very Important" or "Important" and a 0 otherwise.

^j The values in parentheses are degrees of freedom.

**Statistically significant at the 95 percent level.

Conclusions and Recommendations

This paper reported the results of a recent survey of dues paying members of the Colorado Cooperative Council to determine their satisfaction with the services of the council and their degree of involvement with it. It is probably not surprising that there is currently a high level of satisfaction with the council's services. In fact, since the council depends on dues from members for survival, one would expect that it would take only a very short period of dissatisfaction with the council before it would cease to exist due to lack of support.

We recommend that, for state cooperative councils to be successful, it is necessary for them to: (1) offer programs and services of high quality that are of value to member cooperatives, (2) maintain the involvement of the member cooperatives, (3) maintain constant open communication with member cooperatives, and (4) provide continuous education to member cooperatives about the costs and payoffs of the services of the council.

The importance of quality programming follows logically. As noted above, the survival of any state council depends on direct support from member cooperatives. This support will continue only as long as members are receiving value for dues paid. The results of this analysis suggest that important programming areas for the member cooperatives are educational resources, sponsoring legislation on behalf of cooperatives, monitoring the state general assembly, and director training and development.

The importance of keeping member cooperatives involved was revealed in this analysis when considering the differences across cooperative types. Results from the survey suggest that rural utility/farm credit cooperatives have a lower level of satisfaction with the council's services and tend to be less involved.

The results of this analysis suggest state councils will be more effective at keeping member cooperatives satisfied when they keep the businesses aware of the programs and services offered by the council. The statistical significance of the NICE variable in the logit analysis of factors affecting participation suggests that those cooperatives that are aware of the services and value of the council are more likely to participate.

Finally, it is important for state councils to educate member cooperatives about the costs and payoffs of its services. This is especially important with respect to services that are public goods, like sponsoring legislation on behalf of cooperatives and monitoring the state general assembly. In the case of public goods, there is always the tendency for some to free ride and for others not to understand and appreciate the costs associated with providing these services.

Long-standing program efforts of state councils, including director training seminars held around the state, newsletters, and annual meetings, have and will continue to be excellent methods of securing involvement, awareness, and education. With advances in technology it will be necessary for state councils to make use of electronic communication (like the World Wide Web) to speed up the flow of information.

State cooperative councils face a challenge with balancing the programs and services they offer. This was revealed in the results reported here. The rural utility/farm credit cooperatives are less involved and have a lower level of satisfaction than the marketing/supply cooperatives. It was also noted that there may be a bias in favor of this latter group with respect to council programming and services. This

presents an important question: In an environment of limited resources, do you allocate funds to offer programs to less involved groups, or do you continue to target the group of businesses that are active and faithful participants? The reality is that, no matter what a state council does, there will always be a "fringe" group of cooperatives. Since state councils rely on member dues for survival, and cooperatives are diverse, the balancing act will continue to be necessary.

Notes

1. In a study of mergers, acquisitions, and consolidations of local cooperatives, Parliament and Taitt found that, in one-third of the cases, the profitability ratio of the reorganized business was stronger than that for all of the cooperatives prior to the reorganization. In another 25 percent of the cases, the profitability ratio of the reorganized business was stronger than the ratio of one of the original cooperatives.

2. The categorization of "larger" is taken from Meyer who categorizes councils from larger to smaller according to whether they have (1) full-time paid executive, (2) a part-time executive with pay, or (3) operate with an unpaid volunteer executive (Meyer 1993).

3. There were no questions in the questionnaire about whether respondents would have been willing to pay more for the services of the Colorado Cooperative Council. It is, therefore, impossible to derive any conclusions from the survey results regarding the willingness to pay more for the council's services. However, evidence from the Colorado Cooperative Council's board of directors' meetings suggests the willingness to pay more is very small. Whenever the topic of finding ways to increase the council's revenue was brought up the idea of increasing member fees was deemed unacceptable.

Multinomial logit analysis was considered since it would allow consideration of five possible outcomes for the dependent variable. However, given the distribution of values, with no responses for several of the cells, the results were not meaningful.

References

- Braverman, A., J. L. Guasch, M. Huppi, and L. Pohlmeier. 1991. Promoting rural cooperatives in developing countries: The case of Sub-Saharan Africa. World Bank Discussion Paper No. 121. Washington, D.C.: World Bank.
- Campbell, Dan, ed. 1993. 90 percent of state's co-ops supporting Colorado Council. *Farmer Cooperatives*. August.
- Fulton, Joan, Mukesh Bhargava, and Sally Dailly. 1996. Bottom-up versus top-down organization of cooperatives in development: The case of dairy cooperatives in India. *Cooperative values in a changing world*. Selected Papers from the 1993 Meetings of the Canadian Association for Studies in Cooperation. Centre for the Study of Cooperatives, University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon, Canada. p. 101-115.
- Karanth, G. K. 1992. Formal cooperatives and informal cooperation for credit in agriculture: The experience in rural south India. A paper presented at The Cooperative Experience in Agriculture: International Comparisons, Interconference Symposium of the International Association of Agricultural Economists, Maale-Hachamisha, Israel, April 12-17.
- Meyer, Tammy M. 1993. *State cooperative councils: Study of the services and programs offered to members*. Agricultural Cooperative Service Report. Washington, D.C.: Agricultural Cooperative Services, United States Department of Agriculture.
- Parliament, Claudia, and J. Taitt. 1989. Mergers, consolidations, acquisitions: Effect on performance in agricultural cooperatives. Department of Agricultural and Applied Economics Staff Paper P89-37, University of Minnesota.
- Richardson, Ralph M., Celestine C. Adams, Katherine D. DeVille, Jacqueline E. Penn, and Charles A. Kraenzle. 1995. *Farmer cooperative statistics, 1994*. RBS Service Report 49. Washington, D.C.: Rural Business/Cooperative Service, United States Department of Agriculture.

- Sherman, N., and M. Schwartz. 1991. The effect of public financial assistance on the management of Moshav economic affairs. *Human Organization* 50(2):163-172.
- Torgerson, Randall E. 1996. New public and private sector strategies in cooperative education. Paper presented at the National Institute on Cooperative Education, St. Louis, Missouri, August 5-8.