
AGRICULTURAL COOPERATIVES AND MARKET ACCESS FOR SMALLHOLDERS

Dr. Sukhpal Singh

Professor

Centre for Management in Agriculture

Indian Institute of Management Ahmedabad, Ahmedabad, Gujarat, India

Abstract

Smallholder farmers often produce marketable surpluses but face structural barriers that limit their ability to sell reliably, negotiate fair prices, meet quality standards, and participate in higher-value agricultural chains. Fragmented production, small transaction volumes, weak storage facilities, costly transport, limited access to market information, uneven bargaining power, and restricted credit frequently keep farmers dependent on local traders and distress sales. Agricultural cooperatives can address these constraints by enabling members to aggregate produce, coordinate input purchases, share services, develop collective marketing arrangements, and engage more effectively with buyers, processors, financial institutions, and public agencies.

This study examines the role of agricultural cooperatives in improving market access for smallholders from an inclusive rural-development perspective. It considers how cooperative structures can reduce transaction costs, improve product quality, facilitate access to inputs and credit, support storage and logistics, provide market information, and strengthen farmers' bargaining capacity. Attention is given to the institutional conditions that determine whether collective action becomes a practical business advantage or remains a weak administrative arrangement. These conditions include member participation, transparent governance, professional management, financial discipline, gender inclusion, market-oriented services, and credible relationships with downstream buyers.

The paper adopts a descriptive, analytical, and comparative approach based on published research, policy reports, and documented experiences of farmer organizations, producer cooperatives, and collective marketing initiatives. It evaluates cooperative-market access strategies according to their ability to improve sales reliability, reduce marketing costs, raise value realization, broaden participation, manage commercial risk, and sustain member trust. The analysis indicates that cooperatives are most effective when they combine democratic member control with commercially sound services, such as aggregation, grading, storage, finance, digital information, and long-term buyer linkages. Smallholders are more likely to benefit when cooperatives operate as accountable enterprises rather than only as channels for short-term project support.

Keywords: *Agricultural cooperatives; Smallholders; Market access; Collective marketing; Farmer organizations; Value chains; Bargaining power; Rural development; Producer groups; Inclusive agribusiness*

1. INTRODUCTION

Agriculture remains a primary source of income, food security, and employment for millions of rural households. Yet smallholder farmers frequently participate in markets under unfavorable conditions. Their farms may produce relatively small and irregular volumes, while buyers, processors, transporters, and wholesalers often prefer larger lots with predictable delivery, consistent quality, and simplified transaction arrangements. As a result, many smallholders sell at the farm gate, immediately after harvest, or through informal channels that provide quick cash but offer limited price discovery

and little scope for negotiation. The issue is not simply whether a market exists; it is whether farmers can enter that market on terms that are reliable, transparent, and economically worthwhile.

Market access is shaped by a combination of physical, financial, informational, and institutional factors. Poor rural roads and costly transport can make distant markets inaccessible. Lack of storage may force households to sell when prices are low. Limited working capital can prevent farmers from paying for grading, packaging, or delayed sale. Incomplete information about market prices, quality requirements, and buyer

demand can increase dependence on intermediaries. In addition, individual smallholders may find it difficult to obtain formal credit, insurance, quality certification, or contracts because their transactions are too small and their production is perceived as risky.

Agricultural cooperatives offer one institutional response to these challenges. By organizing farmers around shared economic interests, cooperatives can pool output, purchase inputs in bulk, coordinate post-harvest handling, provide basic business services, and negotiate as a group. Collective marketing can reduce per-unit transaction costs, create larger and more reliable supply volumes, and improve the ability of farmers to compare buyers. Cooperatives may also provide a platform for training, financial record keeping, extension coordination, and investment in common assets such as collection centers, weighing equipment, warehouses, cold storage, or small processing facilities.

However, cooperative membership alone does not guarantee improved market outcomes. Some organizations are constrained by weak governance, irregular member participation, inadequate capital, limited management skills, political interference, poor accounting, or insufficient commercial orientation. A cooperative that collects produce but cannot grade it, store it safely, arrange transport, or secure buyers may do little to improve value realization. Similarly, a cooperative that is formally democratic but lacks transparency can exclude women, tenant farmers, younger producers, and households with small marketable surpluses. The quality of the institution, not simply its legal registration, influences the benefits members can obtain.

Therefore, this paper focuses on agricultural cooperatives and market access for smallholders, examining the barriers faced by individual producers, the mechanisms through which collective action can improve marketing conditions, and the governance and service capacities required for durable results. The discussion emphasizes the connection between cooperative performance, buyer relationships, member participation, and inclusive rural transformation.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

The literature on smallholder market participation emphasizes that farming households face high transaction costs when they sell individually. Transaction costs include the time and money required to search for buyers, obtain price information, travel to markets, assemble small quantities, negotiate sales, verify weights, and manage payment risk. For perishable crops, these costs become more serious because delayed sale can result in quality deterioration. Researchers have therefore examined collective action as a means of reducing the disadvantages associated with small scale, geographic isolation, and weak bargaining power.

Studies of producer organizations show that cooperatives can facilitate access to input suppliers, financial institutions, extension providers, and output markets. When a cooperative aggregates produce, it can offer buyers a larger lot and reduce the number of individual transactions required to source a consignment. This can make smallholders more attractive suppliers to processors, exporters, retailers, institutional buyers, and organized wholesale markets. Cooperatives can also coordinate production calendars, quality protocols, sorting, packaging, and traceability, thereby helping members meet the specifications of more demanding markets.

At the same time, the literature warns against treating cooperatives as universally effective solutions. The collective action needed for marketing depends on trust, clear rules, member commitment, and credible benefits. Members may side-sell to other traders when the cooperative offers late payments, weak prices, inconvenient collection systems, or uncertain services. Leaders may prioritize personal networks rather than transparent member interests. Where commercial risks are high, cooperatives need sound working-capital arrangements, professional bookkeeping, and timely market intelligence. Evidence therefore suggests that successful cooperatives combine member ownership with disciplined business practices and accountability mechanisms.

2.1 SMALLHOLDER MARKET CONSTRAINTS AND TRANSACTION COSTS

Smallholders often sell into fragmented and imperfect markets. The distance between

farms and major trading centers can be considerable, particularly in areas with weak roads, irregular transport, and limited communication. A farmer who takes a small quantity of produce to a distant market may face high costs for loading, travel, market fees, and unsold produce. These costs reduce the net price received even when the observed market price appears attractive. In such settings, farm-gate traders can provide an important service by collecting produce, but they may also obtain significant bargaining power when farmers lack alternative channels.

Seasonality further affects market access. Many households harvest at broadly the same time and require immediate cash for loan repayment, household expenses, or the next agricultural season. Without storage, drying facilities, cold chains, or affordable credit, producers may be unable to delay sale until conditions improve. Losses during harvesting, handling, and transport can further reduce the quantity that reaches buyers. When products are sold without grading or standard packaging, farmers may receive average or discounted prices despite producing higher-quality output.

Information asymmetry is another central constraint. Individual farmers may not know prevailing prices in nearby markets, the quality characteristics valued by processors, the terms of buyer contracts, or the likely pattern of demand. Limited digital access and low confidence in formal negotiation can strengthen dependence on informal intermediaries. Cooperatives can reduce information gaps by collecting market data, communicating buyer requirements, maintaining sales records, and allowing members to compare terms across channels. Yet such information services must be regular, understandable, and trusted to influence actual selling decisions.

2.2 COOPERATIVES, COLLECTIVE MARKETING, AND VALUE-CHAIN LINKAGES

A cooperative is generally understood as a member-owned and democratically controlled enterprise formed to meet common economic, social, and cultural needs. In agricultural settings, cooperative functions may include input procurement, credit facilitation, advisory support, product aggregation, storage,

processing, transport, marketing, and risk management. Not all cooperatives undertake all of these functions; their role depends on the commodity, local market structure, technical capacity, and resource base of their members. The most relevant issue is whether the organization provides services that individual farmers cannot efficiently obtain alone.

Collective marketing is particularly important when buyers require volumes that exceed the output of a single household. A cooperative can organize collection points, establish delivery schedules, use standard weighing procedures, and assemble lots that meet buyer expectations. It may also invest in quality assurance, including cleaning, drying, sorting, grading, residue control, and traceability. These activities can enable smallholders to participate in formal supply chains that would otherwise be inaccessible. In higher-value products such as dairy, fruits, vegetables, coffee, spices, pulses, and seed production, collective arrangements can be important for maintaining quality and reducing spoilage.

The relationship between cooperatives and buyers is not limited to one-time sales. Repeated commercial interaction can support longer-term arrangements involving production planning, technical advice, procurement commitments, and payment systems. A cooperative that consistently delivers agreed quality and volume may be in a better position to negotiate prices, receive advance information, and access services from processors or retailers. However, dependence on one buyer can also create risk. Cooperatives should therefore maintain market intelligence, evaluate multiple buyers where possible, and negotiate contracts that clearly specify quality standards, quantities, pricing methods, delivery obligations, and payment schedules.

The literature also emphasizes the importance of inclusion. Women often contribute substantially to production, post-harvest work, livestock care, and local trade but may have limited formal ownership of land or membership rights in producer organizations. Tenant farmers, young farmers, and households with low surplus production may also be excluded when membership conditions, fees, or delivery thresholds are restrictive. Inclusive cooperative design requires clear membership criteria, transparent

benefit distribution, representation in governance, accessible meeting arrangements, and services that recognize different farm and household circumstances.

3. OBJECT OF STUDY

The primary object of this study is to examine how agricultural cooperatives can improve market access for smallholder farmers through collective action, member-oriented services, and stronger value-chain relationships. The study treats market access as more than the physical ability to sell produce. It includes the capacity to obtain market information, aggregate sufficient volumes, meet quality requirements, negotiate transparent terms, access transport and storage, receive timely payment, and retain an equitable share of the value generated along the chain.

The study specifically considers the relationship between cooperative capability and smallholder marketing outcomes. This includes farm-level production patterns, product quality, marketable surplus, member participation, cooperative governance, access to credit, post-harvest facilities, transport arrangements, buyer relationships, and the terms of trade available to members. It also considers the difference between cooperatives that operate primarily as formal associations and those that function as accountable business organizations with clear commercial services.

A key aspect of the research is the identification of cooperative practices that can improve farmer bargaining power without creating unsustainable obligations. The analysis compares basic aggregation arrangements with more advanced models that include grading, storage, processing, branding, digital marketing, and long-term contracts. It evaluates how these models influence transaction costs, price realization, payment reliability, value addition, member trust, and the ability of smaller or marginalized farmers to participate.

In addition, the study examines market access at multiple scales. Household-level decisions influence production, quality, and willingness to market through the cooperative. Village-level collection and governance systems determine whether aggregation is reliable. District- and regional-level infrastructure affects transport, storage, processing, and links with larger buyers. National policies relating

to registration, finance, standards, competition, and public procurement can either support or constrain cooperative development. These levels must be connected for collective marketing to become durable and inclusive.

3.1 SMALLHOLDER PRODUCTION, MARKETING, AND PARTICIPATION CONDITIONS

This subsection focuses on the production and household conditions that influence a farmer's ability and willingness to participate in cooperative marketing.

- Assessment of farm size, commodity mix, seasonal production volumes, and marketable surplus.
- Evaluation of product quality, post-harvest losses, storage capacity, grading practices, and packaging conditions.
- Identification of existing sales channels, including local traders, village markets, wholesalers, processors, retailers, and institutional buyers.
- Analysis of transport costs, distance to markets, collection schedules, market fees, and payment practices.
- Examination of market information, mobile connectivity, awareness of price trends, and understanding of buyer requirements.
- Assessment of gender, age, tenancy, landholding, and income differences that shape participation in cooperative services.

3.2 COOPERATIVE CAPACITY, GOVERNANCE, AND SERVICE DELIVERY

This section examines the internal capabilities that determine whether a cooperative can provide credible and useful marketing services to its members.

- Analysis of membership rules, voting rights, representation, leadership selection, and meeting participation.
- Study of financial records, member capital, working-capital needs, payment systems, and audit practices.
- Evaluation of aggregation facilities, weighing systems, storage, cold-chain access, transportation, and quality-control arrangements.
- Assessment of management skills, staff capacity, business planning, buyer communication, and contract administration.

- Identification of member incentives, loyalty mechanisms, complaint procedures, and methods for preventing side-selling.
- Examination of partnerships with banks, extension agencies, input suppliers, processors, traders, retailers, and digital platforms.

3.3 MARKET-LINKAGE AND IMPLEMENTATION SCOPE

This subsection considers the practical strategies through which cooperatives can improve access to profitable, reliable, and inclusive markets.

- Aggregation of member produce through transparent collection centers, standardized weighing, and documented receipts.
- Use of grading, sorting, drying, packaging, and traceability systems to meet buyer quality requirements.
- Development of storage, cold-chain, transport, and first-stage processing facilities where economically viable.
- Collective procurement of seeds, fertilizer, feed, packaging, and services to improve cost efficiency and production quality.
- Use of price information, digital platforms, market calendars, and buyer databases to improve sales decisions.
- Negotiation of fair contracts, diversified buyer relationships, payment guarantees, and risk-sharing arrangements.
- Training of members and leaders in cooperative governance, bookkeeping, quality management, market negotiation, and inclusive participation.

4. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The present study adopts a descriptive, analytical, and comparative research methodology to examine the relationship between agricultural cooperatives and market access for smallholders. The methodology is designed to connect farm-level marketing constraints, cooperative institutions, value-chain services, and buyer relationships. It focuses on the practical performance of collective marketing arrangements rather than assuming that all forms of cooperation produce the same results. Secondary information is drawn from peer-reviewed research, policy reports, development publications, cooperative studies, and documented experiences

concerning producer organizations, market participation, value chains, rural finance, and post-harvest management.

The study follows a structured analytical framework that compares different cooperative services according to their relevance for market access, local feasibility, financial sustainability, governance requirements, inclusiveness, and commercial risk. Particular attention is given to the relationship between collective action and the ability of smallholders to reduce transaction costs and meet buyer requirements. The framework recognizes that member trust, management quality, access to working capital, infrastructure, and payment reliability are as important as formal membership when determining whether a cooperative can sustain marketing services.

4.1 RESEARCH DESIGN

The research follows a descriptive and comparative design to analyze cooperative

structures, market-access conditions, and service-delivery options for smallholder farmers.

Component	Description
Research Type	Descriptive, Analytical, Comparative
Approach	Cooperative and agricultural-market access analysis
Data Source	Reports, journal articles, policy documents, cooperative case studies
Analysis Method	Comparative assessment of cooperative services and market-linkage strategies
Focus Area	Smallholder market participation, collective marketing, and inclusive value-chain access

4.2 STUDY DIMENSIONS AND COOPERATIVE-SYSTEM SELECTION

The study considers major dimensions of cooperative performance and smallholder market access for evaluation:

- Collective aggregation, standardized weighing, quality management, and transparent sales records.
- Access to inputs, finance, insurance, extension support, and technical services through cooperative arrangements.
- Storage, transport, cold-chain, processing, and packaging systems that reduce post-harvest losses and improve timing of sale.
- Market information, digital communication, buyer discovery, contract negotiation, and price-risk management.
- Governance, member representation, accountability, financial discipline, and equitable distribution of cooperative benefits.

Each cooperative-market access option is assessed on the basis of:

- Potential to reduce transaction costs and improve the net price received by smallholders.
- Ability to meet buyer volume, quality, safety, traceability, and delivery requirements.
- Suitability for local commodities, production cycles, infrastructure, and member capacities.
- Capital requirements, operating costs, payment risks, management complexity, and access to finance.
- Equity of participation for women, tenant farmers, young producers, remote households, and low-surplus farmers.
- Long-term viability, resilience to price shocks, and capacity to maintain member trust.

5. DATA ANALYSIS

The data analysis section presents a qualitative evaluation of agricultural cooperatives as instruments for improving market access among smallholders. The analysis is organized around five interconnected dimensions: production aggregation, transaction costs, quality and post-harvest management, buyer relationships, and cooperative governance. These dimensions help explain why individual farmers often remain in low-value market channels and why collective action can improve outcomes only when services are reliable, transparent, and commercially relevant.

The first finding is that aggregation can improve market access by transforming many small sales into a larger and more predictable consignment. Buyers who require minimum volumes may be unwilling to negotiate separately with numerous small farms, particularly when procurement, transport, quality inspection, and payment administration are costly. A cooperative collection system can reduce these burdens by assembling produce at agreed locations, using standard measures, and documenting member deliveries. This arrangement can help smallholders reach wholesalers, processors, retailers, institutional buyers, and export-oriented chains that would otherwise be difficult to access individually.

The second finding concerns the importance of quality management. Higher-value markets frequently require uniformity, cleanliness, moisture control, traceability, safe handling, and regular delivery. Smallholders may produce good-quality output but receive little reward when it is mixed with lower-quality material or sold without grading. Cooperatives can organize sorting, testing, weighing, packaging, and basic record keeping, allowing

members to receive payments that better reflect quality. However, quality systems must be transparent. When farmers cannot understand deductions, grades, or rejection decisions, trust may decline and members may return to informal buyers.

A third finding is that storage and payment arrangements influence bargaining power. Farmers are more likely to sell quickly at low prices when they have urgent cash needs, loans to repay, or no safe place to store produce. Cooperatives can improve timing of sale by facilitating warehouse services, receipt systems, short-term finance, and scheduled payment mechanisms. Even modest improvements in drying, storage, and access to working capital can reduce distress sales. At the same time, storage is not automatically profitable; it requires careful management of quality, inventory, market risk, and financing costs.

The analysis also shows that market information and buyer diversification are central to cooperative effectiveness. A cooperative that knows only one local buyer may reproduce the same dependence faced by individual farmers. Regular information on prices, demand, quality standards, transport options, and buyer reputations gives the organization a stronger basis for negotiation. Digital platforms can support this function, but they are most useful when combined with local staff, verified information, timely communication, and the ability to arrange actual physical delivery. Information without aggregation, logistics, or payment security may not change farmer outcomes.

Finally, the evidence indicates that governance is a decisive determinant of whether marketing gains are shared with members. Cooperatives must manage collective funds, member deliveries, service charges, buyer payments, and contracts in ways that are understandable and accountable. Transparent records, periodic audits, clear leadership roles, grievance mechanisms, and inclusive decision making can reduce conflict. Where governance is weak, side-selling, elite capture, delayed payments, and mistrust can undermine even well-designed market-linkage projects. Thus, institutional quality is not separate from market performance; it is part of the

mechanism through which cooperatives create value.

6. DISCUSSION

The findings indicate that agricultural cooperatives should be understood as practical market institutions rather than simply membership associations. Their value lies in the ability to organize economic services that individual farmers cannot obtain efficiently alone. These services may include aggregation, input supply, credit facilitation, quality control, storage, transport, price information, and contract management. A cooperative that performs these functions well can reduce the disadvantages of small scale and help farmers participate in more reliable markets. A cooperative that focuses only on registration, meetings, or project distribution may have limited commercial impact.

An important observation is that cooperative services must be matched to the commodity and local market context. Grain cooperatives may benefit from drying, storage, standardized bags, warehouse finance, and collective sales after harvest. Dairy cooperatives may require daily collection, testing, cooling, and rapid payment. Fruit and vegetable cooperatives may need grading, crates, cold-chain logistics, and close coordination with retailers or processors. High-value export crops may require traceability, certification, contract compliance, and technical support. There is therefore no single cooperative model that fits all smallholder markets.

The discussion also highlights the need to balance commercial discipline with member inclusion. Cooperatives operate in competitive markets and must maintain quality, control costs, and honor commitments to buyers. At the same time, they should not exclude smaller, poorer, or less connected farmers merely because these members require additional support. Graduated service models, smaller collection units, training, flexible payment arrangements, and targeted participation strategies can help include farmers who might otherwise remain outside formal value chains. Women's participation deserves particular attention because women may contribute substantially to production and marketing while lacking equal membership rights or leadership roles.

Infrastructure and finance remain critical. Collective marketing may fail when a cooperative cannot pay members quickly, transport produce reliably, or prevent quality deterioration. Investments in collection centers, storage, cold rooms, processing, weighing equipment, digital records, and working capital can improve performance, but they should be based on realistic business plans and expected operating costs. Public agencies, development partners, banks, and private buyers can support these investments, but external support should strengthen member-owned institutions rather than create dependency or replace local accountability.

The role of policy is also significant. Supportive cooperative laws, transparent registration procedures, access to affordable finance, investment in rural roads and market infrastructure, extension services, competition safeguards, quality standards, and public procurement opportunities can create an enabling environment. Policy should recognize that cooperatives differ in their maturity and commercial capacity. Early-stage organizations may need training and governance support, whereas more established cooperatives may benefit from investment finance, certification support, and stronger buyer partnerships. A phased approach is more appropriate than applying identical requirements to all producer groups.

7. CONCLUSION

This study concludes that agricultural cooperatives can play an important role in improving market access for smallholder farmers when they provide practical, accountable, and commercially relevant services. Smallholders face barriers related to small volumes, high transaction costs, weak price information, limited storage, costly transport, inconsistent quality, restricted credit, and unequal bargaining power. Collective action can reduce these constraints by enabling farmers to aggregate output, coordinate quality management, share marketing services, and negotiate with buyers from a stronger position. The analysis demonstrates that aggregation alone is not sufficient. Sustainable market gains depend on the cooperative's ability to manage quality, logistics, payment systems, market information, and buyer relationships. Storage, grading, packaging, digital

communication, finance, and contract management can strengthen market participation when they are selected according to local commodities and business conditions. Cooperatives should develop a service portfolio that responds to the actual constraints members face, rather than adopting infrastructure or activities that cannot be financed, maintained, or used effectively.

The study further concludes that governance and member trust are central to cooperative performance. Transparent records, fair weighing, timely payment, inclusive participation, clear service charges, accountable leadership, and regular communication reduce the risk of conflict and side-selling. Cooperatives must treat members as owners and clients, while also operating with sufficient commercial discipline to fulfill obligations to buyers and financial partners. The balance between democratic control and professional management is essential.

Another important conclusion is that market access must be inclusive. Women, young farmers, tenant farmers, remote households, and producers with small surpluses can be excluded when cooperative rules and services are not designed around their needs. Inclusive membership criteria, local collection systems, capacity building, representation in decision making, and transparent benefit-sharing can broaden participation and strengthen the legitimacy of collective action. Inclusion is therefore not only a social objective; it improves the cooperative's supply base, resilience, and long-term viability.

Finally, the study suggests that future cooperative-development strategies should link farmer organization with value-chain investment, rural infrastructure, working capital, digital information, quality assurance, and supportive public policy. Partnerships with banks, extension agencies, processors, retailers, and local governments can help cooperatives scale their services, but such partnerships should preserve member ownership and accountability. With the right institutional and commercial foundations, agricultural cooperatives can help smallholders move from uncertain, low-value transactions toward more secure, informed, and remunerative market participation.

8. REFERENCES

1. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. (2012). *Agricultural Cooperatives: Key to Feeding the World*. Rome: FAO. <https://openknowledge.fao.org/>
2. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. (2013). *Smallholder Integration in Changing Food Markets*. Rome: FAO. <https://www.fao.org/4/i3292e/i3292e.pdf>
3. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. (2014). *Developing Sustainable Food Value Chains: Guiding Principles*. Rome: FAO. <https://www.fao.org/3/i3953e/i3953e.pdf>
4. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. (2017). *The Future of Food and Agriculture: Trends and Challenges*. Rome: FAO. <https://www.fao.org/3/i6583e/i6583e.pdf>
5. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. (2021). *The State of Food and Agriculture 2021: Making Agrifood Systems More Resilient to Shocks and Stresses*. Rome: FAO. <https://www.fao.org/3/cb4476en/cb4476en.pdf>
6. International Fund for Agricultural Development. (2016). *Rural Development Report 2016: Fostering Inclusive Rural Transformation*. Rome: IFAD. <https://www.ifad.org/>
7. International Fund for Agricultural Development. (2021). *Rural Development Report 2021: Transforming Food Systems for Rural Prosperity*. Rome: IFAD. <https://www.ifad.org/>
8. International Fund for Agricultural Development. (2023). *Access to Finance for Farmers' Organizations: Evidence from a Multi-country Survey*. Rome: IFAD. <https://www.ifad.org/en/w/publications/access-to-finance-for-farmers-organizations-evidence-from-a-multi-country-survey>
9. World Bank. (2008). *World Development Report 2008: Agriculture for Development*. Washington, DC: World Bank. <https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/handle/10986/5990>
10. World Bank. (2019). *Future of Food: Harnessing Digital Technologies to Improve Food System Outcomes*. Washington, DC: World Bank. <https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/handle/10986/31565>
11. International Cooperative Alliance. (1995). *Statement on the Cooperative Identity*. Brussels: ICA. <https://ica.coop/en/cooperatives/cooperative-identity>
12. International Labour Organization. (2015). *Cooperatives and the Sustainable Development Goals: A Contribution to the Post-2015 Development Debate*. Geneva: ILO. <https://www.ilo.org/>
13. Markelova, H., Meinzen-Dick, R., Hellin, J., & Dohrn, S. (2009). Collective action for smallholder market access. *Food Policy*, 34(1), 1-7. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodpol.2008.10.001>
14. Bernard, T., & Spielman, D. J. (2009). Reaching the rural poor through rural producer organizations? A study of agricultural marketing cooperatives in Ethiopia. *Food Policy*, 34(1), 60-69. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodpol.2008.08.001>
15. Fischer, E., & Qaim, M. (2012). Linking smallholders to markets: Determinants and impacts of farmer collective action in Kenya. *World Development*, 40(6), 1255-1268. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2011.11.018>
16. Hellin, J., Lundy, M., & Meijer, M. (2009). Farmer organization, collective action and market access in Meso-America. *Food Policy*, 34(1), 16-22. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodpol.2008.10.003>
17. Barrett, C. B. (2008). Smallholder market participation: Concepts and evidence from eastern and southern Africa. *Food Policy*, 33(4), 299-317. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodpol.2007.10.005>
18. Poulton, C., Dorward, A., & Kydd, J. (2010). The future of small farms: New directions for services, institutions and intermediation. *World Development*, 38(10), 1413-1428. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2009.06.009>
19. Verhofstadt, E., & Maertens, M. (2014). Can agricultural cooperatives reduce poverty? Heterogeneous impact of cooperative membership on farmers' welfare in Rwanda. *World Development*, 61, 209-226. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2014.03.003>
20. Abebaw, D., & Haile, M. G. (2013). The impact of cooperatives on agricultural technology adoption: Empirical evidence from Ethiopia. *Food Policy*, 38, 82-91. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodpol.2012.10.003>

21. Mojo, D., Fischer, C., & Degefa, T. (2017). The determinants and economic impacts of membership in coffee farmer cooperatives: Recent evidence from rural Ethiopia. *Food Policy*, 67, 84-94. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodpol.2016.11.010>
22. Francesconi, G. N., & Heerink, N. (2011). Ethiopian agricultural cooperatives in an era of global commodity exchange: Does organizational form matter? *Journal of African Economies*, 20(1), 153-177. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jae/ejq036>
23. Shiferaw, B., Hellin, J., & Muricho, G. (2011). Improving market access and agricultural productivity growth in Africa: What role for producer organizations and collective action institutions? *Food Security*, 3, 475-489. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12571-011-0153-3>
24. Reardon, T., Barrett, C. B., Berdegue, J. A., & Swinnen, J. F. M. (2009). Agrifood industry transformation and small farmers in developing countries. *World Development*, 37(11), 1717-1727. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2008.08.023>
25. Vorley, B., Fearn, A., & Ray, D. (2007). *Regoverning Markets: A Place for Small-Scale Producers in Modern Agrifood Chains?* London: IIED. <https://www.iied.org/>
26. Shepherd, A. W. (2007). *Approaches to Linking Producers to Markets: A Review of Experiences to Date*. FAO Agricultural Management, Marketing and Finance Occasional Paper 13. Rome: FAO. <https://www.fao.org/3/a1123e/a1123e00.htm>
27. Wanyama, F., Develtere, P., & Pollet, I. (2009). Reinventing the wheel? African cooperatives in a liberalized economic environment. *Annals of Public and Cooperative Economics*, 80(3), 361-392. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8292.2009.00390.x>
28. Ton, G. (2008). Challenges for Smallholder Market Access: A Review of Literature on Institutional Arrangements in Collective Marketing. *Stewart Postharvest Review*, 4(5), 1-6. <https://www.stewartpostharvest.com/>
29. Bijman, J., Muradian, R., & Cechin, A. (2011). Agricultural cooperatives and value chain coordination. In: Helmsing, A. H. J., & Vellema, S. (Eds.), *Value Chains, Social Inclusion and Economic Development*. London: Routledge.
30. United Nations Conference on Trade and Development. (2015). *The Role of Cooperatives in Sustainable Development*. Geneva: UNCTAD. <https://unctad.org/>