



WWJMRD 2017; 3(10): 108-114
www.wwjmr.com
International Journal
Peer Reviewed Journal
Refereed Journal
Indexed Journal
UGC Approved Journal
Impact Factor MJIF: 4.25
e-ISSN: 2454-6615

Benjamin Mudiwa
Department of Law and
Humanities, University of
Africa (UoA), Box 35440,
Thorn Park, Lusaka, Zambia

The Influence of Groups and Group Leadership on Smallholder Beef Enterprise Performance: A Case of Chipinge District in Zimbabwe

Benjamin Mudiwa

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to investigate the influence of groups and group leadership on smallholder beef enterprise performance in Chipinge district of Zimbabwe. Data on groups, group leadership structure and the influence of leaders on group performance was collected from 79 participants across five purposefully selected cattle marketing groups through focus group discussions. Data were captured in QRS Nvivo Version 10 software and analyzed using the thematic analysis approach. Results showed that group establishment by smallholder farmers is not a natural process; formation is facilitated by an internal response to an external stimulus such as private companies, non-governmental organizations and the government. The study also revealed that group leadership, innovativeness and information seeking and sharing behavior influenced both the groups' success and its sustainability. The paper concluded that group leadership, information seeking and sharing behavior and innovativeness are critical in enhancing farmer group success and sustainability.

Keywords: Leadership, farmer groups, entrepreneurship, smallholder beef farms

Introduction

The concept of farmer groups is not new (Ramdwar, Stoute and Ganpat, 2014); in Africa, including in Zimbabwe, it dates back to the 18th Century. Smallholder farmers engage in groups for various valid reasons. Nguyet (2002) argued that when smallholder farmers work together in groups, new skills are developed and the farmers are able to collectively solve their problems. She added that by working together, group members obtain benefits of scale and make better use of existing skills and opportunities.

Farmer groups can be formal or informal institutions. Formal institutions are farmers' organizations while informal institutions include producer or marketing groups. Marketing groups are farmers groups formed to leverage produce for sale. They are a means for farmers to gain market intelligence. Barham and Chitemi (2009) described farmer groups as social structures and successful collective action initiatives which are influenced by group asset configurations, compositions and characteristics. They have been proven to increase agricultural productivity through knowledge sharing (Liverspool and Winter-Nelson, 2010). Martin, Rogers, Cook, and Joseph (2004) asserted that when farmers form groups, they can enhance their social capital and positively impact on individual and household food security. Ramdwar et al. (2014) added that although farmer groups are informal, they can be sustained given the right group dynamics. Swaminathan and Balan (2013) posited that with the globalization of agriculture if farmers are to realize good returns on investments, they need to transform themselves from producing for the domestic market to producing for a wider market. They added that for farmers to get the intended results, they need to engage in participatory collective action.

Groups can be simple or complex. According to Swaminathan and Balan (2013), a complex group is dynamic only when it is characterized by strong interactions between various actors of the group; a strong dependency on time; and an internal complex causal structure subjected to feedbacks. Swaminathan and Balan (2013) added that farmers' groups should have common objectives, tasks, group identities, neighborhood and mutual trust.

Correspondence:
Benjamin Mudiwa
Department of Law and
Humanities, University of
Africa (UoA), Box 35440,
Thorn Park, Lusaka, Zambia

Despite the importance and existence of farmer groups in Africa, little is known about how they influence beef cattle enterprises and how group leadership influences the sustainability of groups. The purpose of this study was to investigate the influence of groups and group leadership on smallholder beef enterprise performance in lower Chipinge district of Zimbabwe.

Materials and methods

Sampling

To answer the research objectives, data were collected through group interviews. Five focus group discussions were conducted separately, in farmers' localities. The groups were purposely selected and focused on beef cattle marketing groups in lower Chipinge. These were pre-existing groups. Initially, the researcher had planned to interview the groups until a saturation point was reached, a stage where no additional information is obtained by interviewing the next group but ended up interviewing all the cattle marketing groups in the research area for triangulation purposes. A saturation point was reached after interviewing three groups, but two additional groups were also interviewed. Focus group discussion participants were mobilized by one person belonging to that group and this resulted in all the group members attending the discussion. Focus group sizes ranged from 11 to 21 members, the average group size was 16. In total, there were 79 participants from five focus groups. Although the group sizes appear large, they were easy to control and allowed for a maximum variable sample, that is, both male and female, youths, adults and the elderly group members were in attendance across all the natural groups.

Data collection tool

A semi-structured questionnaire was used. The data collection tool had topic guides or open-ended questions, defining the areas to be explored as well as probes. Examples of topic guides were; group formation, purposes of the group, group sizes, leadership structure, roles and responsibilities of leaders. Albeit the data collected was of qualitative nature, quantitative data on group sizes were also collected.

To assess if the questions were acceptable, the data collection tool was pre-tested at two stages; first with colleagues and, second, with smallholder farmers at Musikavanhu irrigation scheme in Chipinge district. At both stages, the data collection tool was refined.

Data collection process

Focus group discussions were conducted in the farmers' settings, in Wards 16, 20, 22 and 26. Musapingura and Pepukai-Kondo cattle marketing groups were both from Ward 16 but from different villages. There were three moderators, one who introduced the discussions and two who took notes (scribes). The first two groups interviewed were unwilling to be audio or video recorded; as a result, the moderators took notes in these and the rest of the focus group discussions. Discussions were conducted over five days from Monday to Friday, individual groups were interviewed on separate days. Interviews (lasted 2- 3 hours) were conducted in the mid-mornings and afternoons when farmers had finished household and field chores. The moderator promoted debate by using the topic guide and encouraged all participants to speak and prevented

domination by vocal individuals. At the end of every focus group discussion, the moderator summarized the discussion points with the participants. It is at this stage that other salient or additional but useful information was captured. Misrepresented or misinterpreted facts were also corrected.

Data analysis

Data captured on hard copies were captured in a QSR Nvivo Version 10 (specialized software for qualitative data analysis) data base. A thematic analysis approach was used. This approach considers all data to identify the common recurring issues and identifies the main themes revealed by the focus group respondents. Although the data collected was mostly qualitative, quantitative data on group sizes and composition was presented using means and percentages, respectively.

Results and Discussion

Cattle Marketing Group Sizes and Composition

Cattle marketing group sizes in lower Chipinge ranged from 11 to 21 members (Table 1). The group size was not fixed. Group members revealed that they wanted more beef farmers to join the group so that they can easily and quickly mobilize more cattle for sale and enjoy economies of scale. Formal buyers or abattoirs who bought cattle at double the price offered by informal buyers require at least 15 cattle for them to offer farmers free transport. This arrangement reduced transaction costs for both actors. The abattoirs benefited from reduced cattle search costs. Based on this incentive, to enhance economies of scale, members preferred larger group sizes to smaller ones. This result is contrary to the findings by Agrawal (2001) who cited small-sized groups as one of the factors for successful collective action. However, Agrawal (2001) did not define the cut off on group sizes to be classified as small. Olson (1965) also posited that as the group size increases, the contribution offered by group members towards collective goals decline. Results from a study conducted by Barham and Chitemi (2009) showed that group size did not have any effect on group marketing performance; instead, findings by Mudiwa (2017) showed that smallholder farmers' creative tendency and calculated risk unlock marketing opportunities.

Table 1: Group Size and Composition

Name of Farmer group	Group Size	Proportion of Females
Matikwa	14	29%
Pepukai-Kondo	20	25%
Kumboedza	13	100%
Dzidzai	21	95%
Musapingura-Evergreen	11	27%
Total/ Mean	79	57%

Source: Survey Data, 2017

Two cattle marketing groups (Komboedza and Dzidzai) were dominated by women while the rest (Matikwa, Pepukai-Kondo, and Musapingura) were male dominated. On average, 57 percent of members of the five cattle marketing groups were women. An analysis of women involvement in cattle production and marketing showed that the majority of the women farmers (80 percent) were widowed or divorced. Twenty percent of women involved

in cattle production and marketing attributed this to the farming as a family business concept which requires all household members to participate in farming to ensure continuity in the event of the death of one household member. This finding that cattle production is in the male domain was supported by Kergna, Diarra, Kouriba, Kodoi, Teme and McPeak (2010) and Musasa (2017). Male farmer respondents highlighted that cattle production is a source of food (meat and milk), draught power, manure, an acceptable form of payment for dowry, store of wealth and generates household dispensable income. Strategic as they are, men added that they would not want to distribute their cattle to their spouses or daughters, who, in the event of their death, would send them to their maternal homes or the daughter's matrimonial home.

Group Formation

Smallholder beef farmers in lower Chipinge revealed that farmer group formation is not a new concept with cotton

marketing groups, in which some of the interviewees were members, formed in the 1980s. Examples of these cotton groups were Matikwa, Edzai, Chakabvapasi, Budiro, and Kushinga. This finding is supported by Poole and Frece (2010) who reported that the origin of agricultural cooperatives in Africa, dates back to 1900 and was largely attributed to the colonial administrations. For example, in Kenya, the first cooperative was founded in 1908. In Uganda, the growers' association was established in 1913 but was quickly abandoned and paved the way for the Buganda Growers' Association which was founded in 1923 (Young, Sherman and Rose 1981). In the Belgian Congo and in South Africa, cooperatives simultaneously emerged in the 1920s.

Albeit group formation has a long history in Africa and in Zimbabwe, respondents from the beef cattle producer and marketing groups in lower Chipinge indicated that group formation or evolution was not uniform (Table 2).

Table 2: Farmer group formation in lower Chipinge, Zimbabwe

Name of Farmer group	Year Group formed	Reasons for group formation	Current Group Activities
Matikwa	1980s	Was required by cotton buyers (Cargill, FSI Agricom, Grafax & Zesa holdings)	-Fodder production -Cattle marketing -Targeting pen fattening
Kumboedza	2014	- Increase household income through ISALs -Group formation was facilitated by the NGOs under the ENSURE program	-ISAL funding poultry project -Cattle production and marketing
Dzidzai	2014	- Increase household income through ISALs -Group formation was facilitated by the NGOs under the ENSURE program	-Cattle direct marketing -Buying and selling cattle -Pen fattening
Musapingura-Evergreen	2015	-To reduce transaction costs by bulking cattle -Group formation was facilitated by Feed the Future Zimbabwe Livestock Development program	-Cattle supplementary feeding -Cattle direct marketing -Pen fattening -Fodder production -Build cattle loading bay -Build good cattle pens
Pepukai-Kondo	2015	-To reduce transaction costs by bulking cattle -Group formation was facilitated by FTFZ-LD	Supplementary feeding -Fodder production -Direct cattle marketing -Pen fattening -Build cattle loading bay -Build good cattle pens -Buy heifers -Some group members now paravets -Artificial insemination

Source: Survey Data, 2017

Farmers from the Matikwa group testified that the group was originally formed in the 1980s to grow and sell cotton as directed by Cargill, a cotton buying company. Other cotton buying companies that came into the area in later years were FSI Agricom and Zesa holdings. Cotton farmers who were not part of any group were not issued a growers number or card and were thus not allowed to sell directly to the established cotton buyers. Most of the none-group members sold through members at a fee. This implies that farmers were forced to form groups. Farmers added that Matikwa group broke up in early 2000 with the exit of the cotton companies from that area. With the Feed the Future Zimbabwe Livestock Development (FTFZ-LD) program's

intervention in 2016, some of the members from Matikwa who had beef cattle regrouped to focus on cattle production and marketing. The breakaway of Matikwa cotton group is not a unique experience, the only difference being the reasons for the collapse. Agricultural cooperatives of the eighteenth century in the UK also broke away because of structural problems- they lacked capital and management expertise and ran up debts and were opposed by other economic and class interests (Poole and Frece (2010). Members of Kumboedza and Dzidzai farmer groups reported that the two groups were established by World Vision International under the ENSURE program in 2014 and initially focused on internal savings and lending

schemes. With the coming on board of the Feed the Future Zimbabwe Livestock Development program in the same district, the same groups added a cattle production and marketing functions and have since sold beef cattle to formal buyers.

Musapingura and Pepukai Kondo groups were formed by the Feed the Future Zimbabwe Livestock Development program beneficiaries in 2015. Farmers revealed that they took heed of the program's training on the benefits of working in groups and self-selected to form cattle producer and marketing groups.

Hundred percent of the tabulated farmer groups were created by an internal response of farmers to an external stimulus. The private sector and Non-governmental organizations (NGOs) played a role in the formation of farmers groups in Chipinge. The finding is in conformity with that of Perret and Mercoiret (2003) who reported that farmers' group formation was influenced by local external interventions with some created in the context of development programs. They added that some farmers' group formation resulted from local initiatives.

The aforementioned groups were formed around beef cattle or cotton. These are high-value enterprises. This finding suggests that the groups are formed around high-value agricultural enterprises. Thus the profit motive cannot be ruled out in group formation. Put together with the above finding that farmer groups were created by any internal response of farmers to an external stimulus suggests that group formation, success, and sustainability by farmers is feasible when the farmers see the money.

Purpose of the Cattle Marketing Groups

The chairperson of Pepukai-Kondo group said "Formulating objectives gives identity and purpose to farmer group". Other farmers alluded that it is for this reason that they agreed and developed a written constitution. An analysis of the written constitutions of Pepukai-Kondo, Matikwa, Dzidzai, Kumboedza and Musapingura groups showed the following common group objectives;

- To improve the welfare of its members by taking cattle as a farming business
- To increase beef and dairy cattle performance
- To produce adequate milk for family consumption and selling
- To promote youth participation in livestock (and crop) farming
- To promote nutritional status of the children under 5 years and women of reproductive age (15- 49 years), and
- To Accessing loans from banks and microfinance institutions to capitalize beef and dairy production, and encourage one another to repay the loans fully in time

The groups' objectives show that smallholder farmers have a development mindset. All the farmers interviewed who had sold cattle testified that they had gained access to formal and better-paying beef markets not only by working as a group but also by riding on group members' entrepreneurial behavior. One member thanked the chairperson of his group (Pepukai-Kondo) whom he described as being innovative and good at information seeking and sharing as well as being a good price negotiator. He, however, attributed the success of the group

to team work in aggregating many cattle for sale and strong negotiation skills by group members, especially the group leaders. The results confirmed preliminary findings by Mudiwa (2017) who found collective entrepreneurship of beef farmers in lower Chipinge as an enabler to access formal and profitable markets.

Leadership Structure, Roles, and Responsibilities of a Leader

Cattle marketing groups in Chipinge consisted of a seven-member leadership or management committee. The cattle marketing group members are responsible for electing a committee comprising of a chairperson, vice chairperson, secretary, vice secretary, treasurer and two committee members. The management office runs for a year after which another committee is elected by the voting system. Outgoing members also stand an equal chance of being elected into the same or different position.

The chairperson is responsible for chairing meetings but can delegate to the vice chairperson or anyone on the leadership committee. The chairperson is also a signatory to all documents including the group bank account. He or she encourages participation by all members in all aspects viz., discussion, work, and decision making. The chairperson ensures adherence to the group constitution by all members and that the management committee members do their duties. He or she maintains harmony in the group and represents the group to outsiders. Other duties of group leaders are calling for group meetings; coordinating the procurement and disbursement of inputs; coordinating the consolidation of products for group marketing; negotiating with buyers, input suppliers, and other service providers. Farmers revealed that when the chair of the meeting (the facilitator) promotes every members' voice to be heard, quiet characters contributed important points necessary for group success.

The secretary is responsible for keeping up-to-date records of all group activities, including minutes of all meetings. He or she serves as an administrator of the group. He or she assists the chairperson. Farmers agreed that this position must be occupied by literate group members and minutes creates a reference point and makes follow-ups easier. This ensures group progress.

The treasurer keeps all the group cash or bank records and is a signatory to the group bank account. Farmers revealed that the treasurer is also responsible for financial reports brings transparency and transparency brings trust which is a factor for group success.

The committee members are required to attend group meetings and are assigned any duties by the Committee. Committee members are readily available to assist with other assignments and duties as delegated by the chairperson. This ensures group progress.

Group success and sustainability

Farmers across the five cattle marketing groups perceived the following factors to influence the success and sustainability of farmers groups;

- Trustworthy leaders
- Information seeking and sharing behavior
- Good leadership
- Innovativeness by group members
- Unity
- Diversity of activities within a group

- Productive and regular group meetings, and
- The proximity of group members to each other.

While trustworthy leaders, leaders' management capabilities, innovativeness by group members, unity, information seeking and sharing behavior, productive and regular group meetings and proximity of members were agreed upon as factors influencing the success of a group, leaders' risk assessment capacity and diverse activities were cited as factors influencing the sustainability of a group. From the aforementioned farmers' responses, group leadership was found to influence both the groups' success and its sustainability. Eighty-four percent of group members reported that the success and sustainability of a farmer group depend on good or strong group leaders. One farmer said, "leadership can make or break a group". Ramdwar et al. (2014) had similar findings that when leadership is not strong and the personality is not attractive, it makes the group ineffective and eventually dissolves. They added that the type and style of leadership are fundamental to the success of the group and that the membership will lose confidence in a group if leadership is poor. Other researchers found that lack of accountability and transparency and mistrusting the group leadership sets the group at risk of failure (Danida, 2004; Norbu, 2008). The results on innovation or creative tendency and risk as factors affecting the success of a group confirmed preliminary findings by Mudiwa (2017) who reported that creative tendency and calculated risk helped beef farmer groups in lower Chipinge to access formal markets.

Information seeking and sharing behavior

One of the factors cited by smallholder beef farmers to influence group success was its information seeking and sharing behavior. This finding was supported by Reddy and Reddy (2005) who reported that information plays a significant role in both professional and personal lives and is useful for decision making (Reddy & Reddy 2005). Acheampong, Frimpong, Adu-Appiah, Asante B.O and Asante, M.D (2017) added that farming is a profession that requires a constant flow of information.

Across all groups, information gathering and sharing were through farmer-to-farmer interactions (social networks), mobile phones, government extension officers, NGO extension officers, schools via school children, field days, and listening to the radio. In addition to the abovementioned information seeking and dissemination channels, other researchers have found that farmers use televisions, newspapers, telephones, attending seminars and personal experience as information sources (Byamugisha, Ikoja-Odongo, Nasinyama and Lwasa, 2008; Abeyrathne and Jayawardena, 2014).

However, smallholder beef farmers in Chipinge cited social networks (fellow farmers within the group), mobile phones and contact with government and NGO extension officers as the most common means of communication. The finding cross-pollination of information among group members was supported by Byamugisha et al. (2008) who found out that exchange visits between farmer groups to increase access to agricultural information. Albeit other researchers reported the extensive use of telephones by farmers in rural areas elsewhere, this study revealed the use of mobile phones for communication among farmers in Chipinge, Zimbabwe. Respondents revealed that they use mobile

phones to send text messaging or make phone calls. Members from Pepukai-Kondo cited that in addition to text messages and phone calls, they also use a Whats app application on their mobile phones to send messages. Farmers further reviewed that they share information on husbandry practices, fodder production and preservation, farm animal health such as livestock disease prevention and control, alert each other of livestock disease outbreaks, and market-related information such as beef cattle prize trends or changes and mobilizing cattle for selling. Across all the five farmers groups, focus group discussion participants alluded that all members were involved in information seeking and sharing but group leaders (Chairperson and vice, secretary and vice, and treasurer) were most effective in this regard.

Although farmers cited government extension officers as a source of information, they highlighted that the majority of officers lacked business related information such as current market prices, gross margin budget and partial budgets.

Group leadership

Smallholder beef farmers cited group leadership or management committee as a strong factor influencing both the groups' success and its sustainability. A good leader was perceived as one with the following qualities; innovative, ability to assess risk, honest and impartial, earns trust and respect from others, has vision, inspires group members and outsiders, team player, resolves conflicts and keep the group united, decision-making ability, good communicator, knowledgeable, and participatory in group activities. Qualities of good leadership such as trustworthy, inspires other members, honest and resolves conflicts were supported by Mgbada and Agumagu (2007) and other researchers.

Conflict resolution and unity

This finding was supported by CRS and MEAS (2015) which found out that a good leader knows that only a united group can be strong and successful. They added that a leader helps resolves disputes among members and guides their energy into positive channels. Unity of a group has been cited by beef farmers as one of the factors that lead to group success. Hence group leaders who keep the group united through conflict resolution and convert quarreling time and energy into productivity time ensure group success and sustainability. A study by Mgbada and Agumagu (2007) in Nigeria on the role of local leaders in agricultural production revealed that rural communities are always involved in one conflict or the other and it is said that no community in conflict progresses, therefore the local leaders are doing a wonderful job in resolving conflicts in order to allow for progress in the rural communities.

Knowledgeable and good communicator

Farmers reported that group success and sustainability depends on effective communication and how much the leader knows. They added that when leaders are knowledgeable, they look up to them for advice and consultation. This finding is consistent with an earlier finding that groups succeed when its members seek and share information. When leaders have information seeking and sharing ability, communication will not be one way, from the leaders to the group members, leaders will also

listen to other members. Farmers added that when leaders have good listening skills, not just to a few members but to everyone, it brings confidence, trust and respect to both the speaker and the listener (the leader and the follower) and creates an environment for unity and team work. Both beef farmer group leaders and members further revealed that government and NGOs extension workers prefer to disseminate technical information to farmer groups rather than individuals because of its resource efficiency, it reduces farmer mobilization costs and search costs. The finding on information seeking behavior by group leaders was supported by Mgbada and Agumagu (2007) who reported that community leaders are responsible for bringing information from extension agents to the farmers. The above evidence suggests that group activity leads to better access to information. This is achieved in the following ways;

- Farmers in groups attract government and NGO extension officers. This is one closest source of agricultural information in rural areas
- Group members seek and share information with the rest of the group members. Thus, put together, the amount of information accessed by each group member is much more than the information accessed by individual farmers.

Innovation

Farmers pointed out that they want leaders who are innovative. Leaders who come up with new ideas that can move the group forward. They added that when leaders come up with other ways of doing business including other innovative ways of conducting meetings, no one will leave the group. Thus innovation in this case leads to group success and members make more money and to group sustainability as members remain in the group for immediate and medium to long-term benefits.

Participatory leadership

Farmers revealed participatory leadership as a requisite for group sustainability. They defined participatory leadership as all members have an equal opportunity to become leaders. They added that apart from benefits derived by working as a group, they would not leave the group hoping that one day, they will lead the group, make critical decisions for the group and take it to greater heights. They classified the period they are not in leadership as they waiting phase (to become leaders) and a period they will be learning from the current leaders' strengths and weaknesses. Parzonko (2012) described this kind of leadership as "shared leadership" where members take turns to become leaders. This implies that leadership skills are acquired while extending one's experience base and the field of self-awareness (Woyach, 1995). Farmers added that shared leadership makes the group more effective and promotes further participation. This finding was supported by Parzonko (2012) who reported that a good leader gives the group the chance for effective activity oriented on the achievement of the group's objectives and its further development.

Group leadership among beef farmers in the study area is based on the principles of partnership, the theory of collective action and the Schumpeterian entrepreneur. The principles of partnership and the theory of collective action require participation and contribution by all members.

Rotating leadership and duties gives farmers a chance to develop their leadership skills. Schumpeter described his entrepreneur as either sociological or psychological leader (Basilgan, 2011; Bula, 2012). Schumpeter views an entrepreneur as an innovator and not an imitator (Schumpeter 1966). Farmers in the study area emphasized that if leaders come up with other ways of doing business including innovative ways of conducting meetings, no one will leave the group. Schumpeter argued that money is not what decisively motivates an entrepreneur but innovation.

Conclusion

Group establishment by smallholder farmers is not a natural process; it is created by an internal response to an external stimulus. External stimuli can be in the form of private companies, NGOs or government departments. These organizations played a facilitatory role in the establishment of farmers groups. Group success depends on group leaders and members' behaviors such as innovativeness; unity; information seeking and sharing behavior combined with productive and regular group meetings. While the success of a group depends on the entrepreneurial behavior of group members and leaders, its sustainability rests upon the number of economic functions that the group performs and leaders' risk assessment ability. Thus Group leadership, information seeking and sharing behavior and innovativeness were found to influence both the success and the sustainability of farmer groups.

Recommendation for further research

A study on women's ownership, access, and control over economic resources such as cattle.

References

1. Abeyrathne, H.R.M.P, and Jayawardena, L.N.A.C (2014) Impact of Group Interactions on Farmers' Entrepreneurial Behavior. *Ekonomika a management*, XVII, 4, 46-57Ppp.
2. Acheampong, L.D, Frinpong, B.N, Adu-Appiah, A, Asante, B.O, and Asante, M.K. (2017) Assessing the information seeking behavior and utilization of rice farmers in the Ejisu-Juaben municipality of Ashanti Region of Ghana. *Agriculture and Food Policy*, 6 (38), 1- 9 pp.
3. Agrawal, A., 2001. Common property institutions and sustainable governance of resources. *World Development* 29 (10), 1649–1672.
4. Babu, S.C, Glendenning, C.J, Asenso-Okyere, K and Govindarajan, S.K. (2011). Farmers' information needs and search behaviors: Case study in Tamil Nadu, India: International needs Food Policy Research Institute, 2011.
5. Barham, J and Chitemi, C (2009) Collective action initiatives to improve marketing performance: lessons from farmer groups in Tanzania. *Food Policy* 34 (1): 53-59.
6. Basilgan, M. (2011). The creative destruction of economic development: The Schumpeterian entrepreneur. *TODAIE's Review of Public Administration*, 5 (9), 35-76.
7. Bula, H.O. (2012). Evolution and theories of entrepreneurship: A critical review on the Kenyan perspective. *International Journal of Business and Commerce*, 1(7), 81-96.

8. Byamugisha, H.M, Ikoja-Odongo, R, Nasinyama, G.W and Lwasa, S. (2008). Information Seeking and Use among Urban Farmers in Kampala District, Uganda. IAALD AFITA WCC 2008, World Conference on Agricultural Information and IT. 5710582.
9. Chouinard, O and Forgues, E. (2002). Collective Entrepreneurship and Regional Development: Case Study of a New Brunswick Cooperative. *Journal of Rural Cooperation*, 30 (2), 2002, 79-94.
10. CRS and MEAS (2015). Organizing and managing farmers; groups: A SMART Skills manual. Catholic Relief Services, Baltimore, MD, and Modernizing Extension and Advisory Services project, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, IL.
11. Danida. (2004). Farmer empowerment: Experiences, lessons learned and ways forward. (Technical paper Vol. 1). Copenhagen, Denmark: Ministry of Foreign Affairs.
12. Daudu, S, Chado, SS, Igbashal A.A (2009). Agricultural information sources utilized by farmers in Benue state, Nigeria. *Pup Agric Technol*. 2009. 5(1): 39-48.
13. JOHANNISSON, B. beyond Process, and Structure: Social Exchange Networks. *International Studies of Management and Organizations*. 1987, Vol. 17, No. 1, pp. 3-23. ISSN 0020-8825.
14. Kelly, M (2015) Farmers groups within extension networks in Northern Uganda: inclusive or exclusive? *African Studies of Australasia and the Pacific (AFSAAP)*, 37TH Annual Conference- Dunedin- New Zealand, 25-26 November 2014, Conference Proceedings (published January 2015), Africa: Diversity and Development. 17pp.
15. Kergna, A., Diarra, L., Kouriba, A., Kodoi, B., Teme, B. and McPeak, J. (2010) Role of farmer organizations in the strategy for improving the quality of life for livestock producers in Mali. *Research Brief 10-02-MLPI*. Global Livestock CRSP (Cooperative Research Program), January
16. Martin, K, Rogers, B, Cook, J and Joseph, H (2004). Social capital is associated with decreased risk of hunger. *Soc. Sci. Med*. 58:26452654.
17. Mgbada, J.U and Agumagu, A.C (2007). Role of Local Leaders in Sustainable Agricultural Production in Imo State Implication for Youth in Agriculture. *Journal of Economics Theory* 1 (104).
18. Mudiwa, Benjamin. (2017). An Analysis of Collective Entrepreneurship of Smallholder Farmers In Zimbabwe In Realizing Market Opportunities: A Case of Chipinge District. *Int. J. Adv. Multidiscip. Res*. 4(6): 36-44.
19. Musasa, A. (2017) Nda cattle production culture: Women cattle ownership, access, rights, and benefits. MSc Thesis (72 pages)
20. Nguyet, N. T. K (2002) Establishment and Maintenance of Farmers' Groups (FGs). *Agricultural Extension Network Updates*, Vol. 5 No. 1, 7pp.
21. Norbu K (2008). A situational assessment of cooperatives & farmers' groups and associations in Bhutan. SNV, Thimphu, October 2008.
22. Olson, M. (1965). The logic of collective action: Public goods and the theory of groups. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
23. Parzonko, A (2012). Role of Leadership in Development of Group Enterprise
24. Poole, N and Frece, A (2010) A Review of Existing Organizational Forms of Smallholder Farmers' Associations and their Contractual Relationships with other Participants in the East and Southern African ACP Region. AAACP Paper Series- No. 11. 106pp.
25. Riesenber, L.E and Gor, C.O. (1999). Farmers' preferences for methods of receiving information on new or innovative farming practices, Graduate Student University of Idaho 1999.
26. Schumpeter, Joseph A. (1966), *Imperialism and Social Classes* (Translated by Heinz Norden), 9th Ed, Meridian Books, Cleveland and New York.
27. Starasts, A.M (2004). Battling the knowledge factor: a study of farmers' information seeking learning and knowledge process with an online environment in Queensland. 2004 Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis.
28. Swaminathan, B and Balan, K.C.S (2013) An Inquiry into the Role of Group Dynamics in Enhancing Farm Remuneration. *American International Journal of Research in Humanities, Arts, and Social Sciences*, 4 (1), 41-44.
29. Liverpool, S.L.O and Winter-Nelson, A (2010) Poverty status and the impact of social networks on smallholder technology in rural Ethiopia. IFPRI Discussion Washington DC. IFPRI.P.970
30. Ramdwar, M.N.A, Stoute, V.A, and Ganpat, W.G (2014). A focus group approach to the exploration of the dynamics of farmers' groups in Trinidad, West Indies. *Journal of Agricultural Extension and Rural Development*. Vol 6 (9), pp 288-297
31. WIJEKON, W M N D., JAYAWARDENA, LNAC. Utilization of Sources of Information for decision making of Farmers – A Case Study. Peradeniya University Annual Research Sessions-2010. Sri Lanka: University of Peradeniya, 2010. ISBN 978-9555891448.
32. Woyach, R.B (1995). *Jak zostac przywodca*, CDN Publishing House, Warsaw, p12
33. Young, C., Sherman, N. P. and Rose, T. H. (1981). *Cooperatives and Development: Agricultural Politics in Ghana and Uganda*. Wisconsin, University of Wisconsin Press.