



AgEcon SEARCH
RESEARCH IN AGRICULTURAL & APPLIED ECONOMICS

The World's Largest Open Access Agricultural & Applied Economics Digital Library

This document is discoverable and free to researchers across the globe due to the work of AgEcon Search.

Help ensure our sustainability.

Give to AgEcon Search

AgEcon Search
<http://ageconsearch.umn.edu>
aesearch@umn.edu

*Papers downloaded from **AgEcon Search** may be used for non-commercial purposes and personal study only. No other use, including posting to another Internet site, is permitted without permission from the copyright owner (not AgEcon Search), or as allowed under the provisions of Fair Use, U.S. Copyright Act, Title 17 U.S.C.*

Lessons in Failure: The Rice Growers Association Cooperative

Jennifer J. Keeling
Department of Agricultural and Resource Economics
University of California, Davis 95616
keeling@primal.ucdavis.edu

Colin A. Carter
Department of Agricultural and Resource Economics
University of California, Davis 95616
colin@primal.ucdavis.edu

*Selected Paper prepared for presentation at the American Agricultural Economics Association
Annual Meeting, Denver, Colorado, July 1-4, 2004*

Copyright 2004 by Jennifer J. Keeling and Colin A. Carter. All rights reserved. Readers may make verbatim copies of this document for non-commercial purposes by any means, provided that this copyright notice appears on all such copies.

Summary

This empirical study investigates a large California cooperative's closure and identifies lessons learned that might be useful to other cooperatives. It was found that the cooperative's directors failed to effectively supervise management. In turn, management fell short of expectations to fully evaluate complex business decisions.

Introduction

Recently several large California cooperatives including Tri-Valley Growers (TVG) and the Rice Grower's Association (RGA) have closed, while others are experiencing financial difficulties. These developments suggest that California cooperatives may be finding it increasingly difficult to compete in today's agribusiness climate. Given the size and national importance of California's agriculture industry, a decline in the role of the state's cooperatives may be indicative of a larger, countrywide trend.

A survey of former affiliates of RGA has been conducted. The results of this survey and interviews with former members and management form the basis of this paper. RGA closed in August 2000 after nearly 80 years of operation (Wilson). The cooperative's dramatic swing in fortunes, from a dominant cooperative that handled upwards of 70% of the total California rice crop in the early 1980s, to one that handled approximately 5% at the time of its closure in 2000, makes this a particularly interesting research subject.

The goals of this research are to determine the origins of RGA's problems and identify lessons learned that might be useful to other cooperatives. We aim to determine what affiliates of the failed cooperative perceive to be causing California cooperatives difficulty and, more specifically, what led to the RGA's closure. Survey findings have been consistent with patterns observed in other studies of struggling or failed cooperatives (Bhuyan et al., Sexton and Iskow).

We find that RGA's board of directors failed to actively exercise their duty to supervise the management. In turn, the management fell short of expectations to fully evaluate complex business

decisions and was remiss in planning for future contingencies. The report begins with an overview of the analytical framework used in the survey and proceeds with a detailed analysis of survey results. The results section includes discussion of respondent characteristics, attitudes and perceptions, and relative strengths and weaknesses of RGA. In the final section conclusions are presented and recommendations are made.

Analytical Framework

Data for this study was collected primarily through a confidential mail survey. The survey instrument was designed to capture attitudes and perceptions of former management and members of RGA with regard to the state and future of California agricultural cooperatives, and the factors leading to the closure of RGA. Information on the personal background of participants was also collected and included such statistics as age, income, education, and employment status.

Individuals who were involved in rice cultivation at the time of the survey were also asked to describe the characteristics of their farming operations and family farming and cooperative history.

Survey Sample

As the title suggests, the survey was targeted at the former management, membership, and employees of RGA. Membership lists were solicited from the former management, however due to legal considerations; complete membership lists were not available for the last 10 years of RGA's operations. In order to obtain a complete sample of former RGA affiliates, a systematic random sample of rice growers from the 8 main rice growing regions of Central California were sent surveys. Former members of RGA that could be identified were excluded from the random sample.

Sample Size

A systematic random survey sample was employed to identify possible mail survey targets in addition to a non-random sample of former RGA affiliates. Lists of Central Valley rice producers were obtained from the USDA, CA and sorting by entity size and other characteristics was used to

provide the best coverage of the survey throughout the state. Table 1 below shows the breakdown of sample size, including known RGA affiliates, by county.

Table 1: Sample Size by County		
County	Sample	Percent of Sample
Glenn	64	15.5
Placer	12	2.9
Yuba	104	25.2
San Joaquin	24	5.8
Stanislaus	24	5.8
Yolo	47	11.4
Sutter	66	16.0
Colusa	71	17.2
Total	412	100

Data Collection

Data collection included an initial and follow up mailing of surveys. A follow up mailing was sent to those individuals who did not respond to the first mailing. To maintain confidentiality, individuals were assigned an identification number. The total number of usable responses was 412 representing a response rate of 24 %. The majority of responses, 74%, came from the four largest rice producing counties: Yuba, Glenn, Sutter, and Colusa. The balance of response came from the smaller rice counties of Yolo, Placer, San Joaquin, and Stanislaus.

Interviews with Former RGA Managers, and Board of Director Members

In order to gain a better understanding of the structure and history of RGA and the rice industry as a whole, interviews with former managers and members were conducted. The interview process began in August 2001 with a meeting of former managers and continued until May 2003. During that period of time nearly 30 former RGA affiliates were interviewed, in many cases multiple interviews were conducted.

Results and Discussion

The sample population was spread over a relatively large area of the Central Valley of California. Results show that the vast majority of respondents were between the ages of 55-70. Nearly all

(82%) of those surveyed worked full time and earned most of their income (82%) directly from agricultural activities. Approximately 26% of respondents had a total income in the range of \$50,001-\$100,000. Notably, the second largest income bracket of the sample reported total income of over \$500,001. Total income was not adjusted for subsidy and program benefits.

The average level of education is relatively high compared to other cooperative membership surveys such as Bhuyan et al. Fully one-half of survey respondents were college graduates and nearly a quarter had high school diplomas. Almost all survey respondents (96%) indicated that there was a family history of farming and 82% had family histories of involvement in cooperatives. Given the family ties to farming, it is not surprising to find that 40% of farmer/respondents had between 21-30 years of farming experience.

It is surprising, however to find that despite family histories of cooperative involvement, only 25% of those surveyed were currently members of an agricultural cooperative. In addition, very few of the respondents indicated that they had ever held a position of leadership at RGA. The majority of involvement occurred as a board of directors member (7%), while the least common leadership position was as an advisory council member (4%). This finding is, however, in line with *a priori* expectations given that members who held board positions generally remained on the board for several terms, thus there were fewer opportunities for other members to engage in a board leadership role. Low board turnover also reveals that cooperative governance and oversight duties at RGA tended to be held in the hands of a small group of individuals.

Cooperative Attitudes and Issues

The former affiliates of RGA were asked to describe their experiences with cooperatives and RGA and also their outlook for the future of agricultural cooperatives. Answers to these questions are summarized in Table 3 located in Appendix I. Notably, fully one-half of former affiliates said they have had extremely disappointing experiences with cooperatives. Somewhat fewer (33%) had

extremely disappointing experiences with RGA. Although a percentage of affiliates had positive experiences with cooperatives and RGA, the majority of experiences tended to be negative.

Despite generally negative experiences with cooperatives, the vast majority (72%) of affiliates expressed agreement or strong agreement that agricultural cooperatives are a necessary part of the agricultural sector. Even more (77%) believed that agricultural cooperatives have a future in California. In spite of a positive outlook on the future of cooperatives, a large majority of affiliates (70%) felt that cooperative businesses were not managed as well as other types of agribusiness. In addition, a slight majority (54%) felt that cooperatives were generally less successful than other forms of business and only 41% felt that cooperative were equally successful.

Relative Strengths and Weaknesses of RGA

Several questions were designed to try and identify what affiliates of a failed cooperative perceived to contribute to the closure of RGA. Affiliates were asked to describe both their reasons for joining the cooperative and the relative strengths of RGA. In Tables 4, 5, and 6 in Appendix I, the collected responses are summarized.

Former affiliates were asked to identify their main reasons for joining RGA and rank them as being very important to very unimportant. From Table 4, five reasons stand out as being the most important to cooperative members. In order of importance these reasons are: increase agricultural income, benefits from price pooling, reduced marketing risk, appealing differentiated products strategy, and increased voice in agricultural issues. Few respondents cited prestige or investment opportunities as reasons for joining RGA.

Table 5 summarizes perceptions of what factors contributed to the failure of RGA. Interestingly, several of the main reasons cited for joining RGA are directly related to what affiliates perceived to be the causes of RGA's failure. This indicates a fundamental gap between what members expected through cooperative membership and what was borne out in reality. For instance, some growers responded that RGA had an appealing differentiated product strategy, yet

affiliates cited poor decision making by management, including the decision to pursue a differentiated products strategy, as a chief contributor to RGA's failure.

Former affiliates identified the high cost of maintaining both the cooperative's assets and contract with the California Rice Transport (CRT) shipping vessel, as important factors in RGA's failure. Expenses from maintaining numerous assets and the problematic CRT no doubt diminished the higher-than-industry average returns that initially attracted members to RGA. Consequently, members may have left RGA after realizing higher profits could be earned by marketing through competitors.

Lack of attention by the board of directors was reported as another important contributor to RGA's decline. In interviews, this survey finding was supported by former managers who frequently stated that the board of directors was passive and ill equipped to scrutinize the business decisions it was charged with overseeing. The survey results also indicate that affiliates perceived the board to be lacking adequate cooperative governance and control abilities.

Numerous factors can be identified as having contributed to RGA's decline. However, it is also the case that many positives aided in the cooperative's survival through years of financial struggle (Table 6). Former affiliates identified relative strengths from a series of possibilities. Many of the respondents (>90%) agreed that RGA's brand name, the volume of rice handled, and RGA's access to markets were all important relative strengths.

In contrast, the majority of members did not identify the skill of RGA's management team nor their attention to member needs to be a relative strength. Few of the responding affiliates participated in leadership positions at RGA, thus the perception that member needs were not met does not appear to have inspired increased grower involvement in the cooperative. This survey finding gives some support to the hypothesis that both membership and the board suffered from the "free-rider" notion that they did not have to contribute much effort to running RGA in order to benefit from the cooperative's strengths. Many members may have believed that others were

paying attention to the administrative details of running RGA and thus there was no need to exert much time and energy in oversight.

Conclusions

RGA's closure was neither the product of one individual's actions nor the result a single event's influence. Rather was the confluence of many incidents and shortcomings that contributed to the development of an organizational environment that was not sustainable in the long run.

In particular, the survey finds that former affiliates felt RGA's board of directors lacked the cooperative governance skills necessary to effectively direct and control management. This failure represents a possible violation of the "duty of care" which implies that directors serve with due diligence (Baarda) and ensure their own competency to evaluate and pass judgment on the business decisions and actions of management. Through neglect, RGA's directors may have further expanded the gap between member expectations and reality created by an inattentive management.

Furthermore, the survey findings indicate that RGA's management was perceived to be deficient in the skills necessary to guide the cooperative through tough times that included periods of low world rice prices (Decker, Evans), industry scandals, and high costs of maintaining the coop's assets and shipping vessel contract. These effects no doubt diminished the higher-than-industry-average returns that initially attracted members to RGA. Consequently, members may have left RGA after realizing higher profits could be earned by marketing through competitors.

Awareness of the cooperative's struggles and limitations does not appear to have inspired members to become active directors. At a 2001 meeting for former RGA managers, many agreed that members viewed the cooperative as the sole buyer of their rice instead of as an organization that they owned and had responsibilities to. This suggests that free-rider problems were pervasive at the cooperative. Further support for this notion was expressed in interviews with management who revealed frustration in trying to solicit feedback and active participation from members.

Ultimately, the survey findings imply that RGA's closure was the result of a lack of board member education and oversight coupled with an inattentive management and passive membership. Many challenged organizations may identify with the Rice Growers Association experience. However, if these organizations are able to identify and address the above problems and issues in their own cooperatives, they may avoid the same fate as RGA.

Appendix 1

Table 2: Respondent Characteristics				
	Attributes	Number of Valid Responses	All Counties	
			Number	Percentage
Age		412		
	Less than 25		15	3.6
	25-34		0	0.0
	35-44		104	25.1
	45-55		104	25.1
	55-70		166	40.2
	70+		35	8.6
Employment Status		390		
	Full Time		320	82.1
	Part Time		28	7.1
	Retired		42	10.7
Total Income		401		
	Less than \$50,000		57	14.3
	\$50,001-\$100,000		115	28.6
	\$100,001-\$200,000		29	7.1
	\$200,001-\$300,000		43	10.7
	\$300,001-\$400,000		43	10.7
	\$400,001-\$500,000		29	7.1
	\$500,001 or more		86	21.4
% Income from Ag		401		81.8
Education		392		
	Grade School, Less		42	10.7
	Some High School		0	0.0
	High School graduate		84	21.4
	Some College		70	17.9
	College Graduate		196	50.0
	Advanced Degree		0	0.0
Lease/Own Farmland		400		
	Yes		329	82.1
	No		71	17.9
cont'd				

Table 2: Respondent Characteristics, Continued

Attributes	Number of Valid Responses	All Counties	
		Number	Percent
Family History of Farming	380		
Yes		366	96.3
No		14	3.7
History of Cooperative Involvement	380		
Yes		312	82.1
No		68	17.9
Years Farming	380		
Less than 5 yrs		15	4.0
5-10 yrs		30	8.0
11-20 yrs		91	24.0
21-30 yrs		152	40.0
31-40 yrs		15	4.0
41+ yrs		76	20.0
Current Cooperative Membership	385		
Yes		96	25
No		289	75
Position of Leadership	385		
No Position		326	85
Advisory Council		15	4
Board of Directors		29	7
Management Committee		15	4
Member		0	0
Fieldsman		0	0

Table 3: Cooperative Attitudes and Issues				
Responses		Number of Valid Responses	All Counties	
			Number	Percentage
Overall Satisfaction with Cooperatives		412		
	Extremely Disappointed		206	50.0
	Somewhat Disappointed		32	7.7
	Neutral		95	23.1
	Somewhat Positive		63	15.4
	Extremely Positive		16	3.9
Overall RGA Experience		412		
	Extremely Disappointed		137	33.3
	Somewhat Disappointed		103	25.0
	Neutral		103	25.0
	Somewhat Positive		52	12.5
	Extremely Positive		17	4.2
Are cooperatives a necessary part of the agricultural sector?		412		
	Strongly Disagree		16	4.0
	Disagree		66	16.0
	Neutral		33	8.0
	Agree		231	56.0
	Strongly Agree		66	16.0
Is there a future for agricultural cooperatives in CA?		412		
	Strongly Disagree		32	7.7
	Disagree		0	0.0
	Neutral		63	15.4
	Agree		254	61.5
	Strongly Agree		63	15.4
What is happening to the volume of commodities handled by CA cooperatives?		412		
	Increasing		33	8.0
	No Change		82	20.0
	Decreasing		297	72.0
				cont'd

Table 3: Cooperative Attitudes and Issues, Continued

Responses	Number of Valid Responses	All Counties	
		Number	Percentage
Are agricultural cooperatives managed as well as other agribusinesses?	408		
Yes		119	29.2
No		289	70.8
Are cooperatives _____ successful than other business types?	400		
More		17	4.8
Equally		167	41.7
Less		217	54.2

Table 4: Main Reasons for Joining RGA

All responses listed as percentage of valid responses

Reason	Very		Neutral	Important	Very Important
	Unimportant	Unimportant			
Reduce marketing risk.....	0.0	0.0	25.0	25.0	50.0
Family Ties.....	15.8	0.0	21.1	42.1	21.1
Prestige.....	15.8	21.1	42.1	15.8	5.3
Increase agricultural income.....	0.0	0.0	5.3	57.9	36.8
Access to a greater number of markets.....	0.0	0.0	21.1	36.8	42.1
Benefits from price pooling.....	0.0	0.0	10.5	57.9	31.6
Increase voice in agricultural policies.....	0.0	0.0	27.8	50.0	22.2
Eliminate the middleman.....	0.0	15.8	26.3	26.3	31.6
Improve community ties/Social reasons.....	0.0	31.6	47.4	15.8	5.3
Investment opportunity.....	15.8	21.1	31.6	15.8	15.8
Appealing differentiated products strategy.....	0.0	5.3	21.1	52.6	21.1
Leadership opportunities.....	5.3	5.3	57.9	21.1	10.5

Table 5: Perceived Factors Contributing to the Failure of RGA

All responses listed as percentage of valid responses

Reason	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Changing competitive environment.....	4.6	4.6	9.1	59.1	22.7
Increased cost of rice production.....	13.6	40.9	13.6	31.8	0.0
Increased environmental constraints.....	8.7	26.1	34.8	17.4	13.0
High cost of maintaining assets, i.e. warehouse, mills.....	0.0	13.0	4.4	39.1	43.5
Poor decision making by management.....	4.4	0.0	0.0	17.4	78.3
Negative influence of competitors.	8.7	13.0	30.4	26.1	21.7
High cost of contract with California Rice Transport.....	4.4	0.0	8.7	17.4	69.6
Lawsuits and legal action.....	0.0	0.0	17.4	17.4	65.2
Change in level of government support of rice growers.....	8.7	8.7	43.5	21.7	17.4
Lack of grower involvement.....	4.4	4.4	43.5	13.0	34.8
Lack of attention to cooperative issues by the Board of Directors...	4.4	4.4	13.0	4.4	73.9

Table 6: Perceived Relative Strengths of RGA		
All responses listed as percentage of valid responses		
Relative Strength of RGA	YES	NO
Brand name.....	90.9	9.1
Volume of rice handled.....	95.5	4.6
Service to customers.....	71.4	28.6
Quality of products produced.....	86.4	13.6
Variety of product line.....	77.3	22.7
Political Ties.....	54.6	45.5
Skill of management team.....	36.4	63.6
Ability to develop markets.....	63.6	36.4
Technological advantages	52.4	47.6
Grower returns.....	76.2	23.8
Access to markets.....	90.5	9.5
Transportation network.....	50.0	50.0
Size and location of facilities.....	77.3	22.7
Attention to member needs.....	40.0	60.0

References

Baarda, James, "The Circle of Responsibilities for Co-op Boards," USDA, Rural Business and Cooperative Services, Cooperative Information Report 61, February 2003.

Bhuyan, Sanjib, et.al., "Performance Analysis of Fruit and Vegetable Marketing Cooperatives in the Northeast U.S., New Jersey Agricultural Experiment Station, Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, September 2001.

Christy, Ralph D., "Farmer Cooperatives in a Declining Agricultural Economy" Louisiana Agricultural Experiment Station, Louisiana State University Agricultural Center, July 1987.

Decker, Diane editor, "Rice: Situation and Outlook Yearbook 1996 to 1999" United States Department of Agriculture, 1996-1999

Evans, Martha R. editor "Rice: Situation and Outlook Yearbook 2000" United States Department of Agriculture, 2000

RGA Annual Reports 1921-1990

Sexton, Richard and Julie Iskow, "Factors Critical to the Success or Failure of Emerging Agricultural Cooperatives" Giannini Foundation Information Series No. 88-3, June 1988.

Wilson, Jack H. editor, "Rice in California" Butte County Rice Growers Association, 1979.

Appendix II

Confidential Survey of Rice Growers Association Affiliates

If you have not formerly been affiliated with the Rice Growers Association as a grower or employee please discard this survey.

SURVEY NUMBER: _____

Section A: Cooperative Attitudes. This set of questions refers to your attitude about cooperatives. Please answer all applicable questions.

A1. Please rate your overall satisfaction with cooperatives you have been involved with in the past ten years including (if applicable) the Rice Growers Association.

Extremely Disappointed	Somewhat Disappointed	Neutral	Somewhat Positive	Extremely Positive
1	2	3	4	5

A2. Please rate your overall experience with the Rice Growers Association.

Extremely Negative	Somewhat Negative	Neutral	Somewhat Positive	Extremely Positive
1	2	3	4	5

A3. Do you believe that agricultural cooperatives are a necessary part of the agricultural sector?

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5

A4. Do you believe there is a future for agricultural cooperatives in California?

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5

A5. Briefly, please explain your answer to Question A4 above.

A6. Generally, do you believe that the volume of commodities handled by agricultural cooperatives in California is increasing, staying the same, or decreasing?

Increasing _____ No Change
in Volume _____ Decreasing _____

A7. In your opinion, are agricultural cooperatives managed as well as other agricultural businesses?

YES _____ NO _____

A8. In your experience, have you generally found cooperatives to be _____ than other business types?
Please check only one.

More Successful _____ Equally Successful _____ Less Successful _____

Section B: Cooperative Involvement. This set of questions pertains to your past and present involvement in agricultural cooperatives.

B1. Are you presently a member or employee of an agricultural cooperative?

Yes _____ No _____

B2. When did your affiliation with the Rice Growers Association begin and end? Please list the *Month* and *Year* if possible.

Begin: _____ End: _____
MM/YYYY MM/YYYY

B3. If you are a past member of the Rice Growers Association Cooperative please list your main reasons for joining. Please rank your reasons from very unimportant to very important.

Reason	Very Unimportant	Unimportant	Neutral	Important	Very Important
Reduce marketing risk.....	1	2	3	4	5
Family Ties.....	1	2	3	4	5
Prestige.....	1	2	3	4	5
Increase agricultural income.....	1	2	3	4	5
Access to a greater number of markets.....	1	2	3	4	5
Benefits from price pooling.....	1	2	3	4	5
Increase voice in agricultural policies.....	1	2	3	4	5
Eliminate the middleman.....	1	2	3	4	5
Improve community ties/Social reasons.....	1	2	3	4	5
Investment opportunity.....	1	2	3	4	5
Appealing marketing strategies....	1	2	3	4	5
Leadership opportunities.....	1	2	3	4	5
Other (please specify).....	1	2	3	4	5

B4. Briefly, please describe why your relationship with RGA ended.

B5. Did you have a position of leadership at RGA? Please check all positions that apply.

I was not in a leadership position at RGA _____
Advisory Council _____
Board of Directors Member _____
Management _____
Committee Member _____
Fieldman _____
Other _____
(Please explain)

Section C. Rice Growers Association Issues: This section pertains to issues relevant to closure of RGA.

C1. Historically, what were RGA's greatest strengths relative to competitors? Please check YES if the factor was a relative strength and NO if the factor was not a relative strength.

Relative Strength of RGA	YES	NO
Brand name.....		
Volume of rice handled.....		
Service to customers.....		
Quality of products produced.....		
Variety of product line.....		
Political Ties.....		
Skill of management team.....		
Ability to develop markets.....		
Technological advantages.		
Grower returns.....		
Access to markets.....		
Transportation network.....		
Size and location of facilities.....		
Attention to member needs.....		
Other (please specify).....		

C2. Historically, who was RGA's most feared domestic competitor? Please check one.

Farmer's Rice Cooperative _____
Comet Rice _____
California Pacific Rice Growers _____
Pacific International Rice Millers, Inc. _____
Other _____
(Please specify)

C3. Do you believe that the management of RGA kept the membership well informed about the financial state of the cooperative?

YES _____ NO _____ NO OPINION _____

C4. In 1987, under the management of Mike Cook, RGA began a strategy of differentiation of their rice products. This strategy included packaging smaller amounts of rice and creating flavored rice packages sometimes using long grain rice. Did you agree with management's decision to pursue a strategy of differentiation in 1987?

YES _____ NO _____ NO OPINION _____

C5. What factors contributed to the decline and eventual failure of RGA? Please rank your responses from strongly disagree to strongly agree.

Reason	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Changing competitive environment.....	1	2	3	4	5
Increased cost of rice production.....	1	2	3	4	5
Increased environmental constraints.....	1	2	3	4	5
High cost of maintaining assets, i.e. warehouses, mills.....	1	2	3	4	5
Poor decision making by management.....	1	2	3	4	5
Negative influence of competitors.	1	2	3	4	5
High cost of contract with California Rice Transport.....	1	2	3	4	5
Lawsuits and legal actions.....	1	2	3	4	5
Change in level of government support of rice growers.....	1	2	3	4	5
Lack of grower involvement.....	1	2	3	4	5
Lack of attention to cooperative issues by the Board of Directors...	1	2	3	4	5
Other (please specify).....	1	2	3	4	5
Other (please specify).....	1	2	3	4	5

C6. Prior to 1992, when CoBank attempted to force the liquidation of RGA, did you notice signs that RGA was having financial difficulties or that the cooperative may be heading for trouble?

C7. Who is responsible for the decline and failure of the former Rice Growers Association? Please check all that apply.

No One	_____
Growers	_____
Board of Directors	_____
Management	_____
State Government	_____
National Government	_____
International Competitors	_____
Domestic Competitors	_____
Banks and Financial Institutions	_____
Lawyers	_____
Other _____	_____
(Please describe)	

C8. Using the experience gained as an affiliate of RGA, what advice would you give to a MEMBER of a struggling cooperative? What advice would you give to a MANAGER of a struggling cooperative?

Member: _____

Manager: _____

Section D: Personal Background Information. This set of questions is about your personal characteristics and will be used for statistical purposes only.

D1. What is your age?

Less than 25	_____	45-54	_____
25-34	_____	55-70	_____
35-44	_____	70 +	_____

D2. What is your employment status?

Full Time	_____
Part Time	_____
Retired/ Not Currently Employed	_____

D3. What was your total annual income for 2001? Please include subsidies and program payments if they applied.

Less than \$50,000	_____
\$50,001-\$100,000	_____
\$100,001-\$200,000	_____
\$200,001-\$300,000	_____
\$300,001-\$400,000	_____
\$400,001-\$500,000	_____
\$500,001 or more	_____

D4. What percentage of your total annual income for 2001 was attributable to direct involvement in an agricultural industry?

_____ %

D5. What describes your highest education level?

Grade School or Less	_____
Some High School	_____
High School Graduate	_____
Some College	_____
College Graduate	_____
Advanced or Professional Degree	_____

D6. Do you lease or own farmland? If YES, please proceed to **Section E** on the next page.

YES _____ NO _____

Section E: Farm Characteristics. This set of questions relates to your farm operation and experience.

Family History

E1. Does your family have a history (at least five years) of farming in the Central Valley Region?

YES _____ NO _____

E2. Does your family have a history (at least 5 years) of involvement with agricultural cooperatives?

YES _____ NO _____

Personal History

E3. How long have you, personally, been farming?

Less than 5 years	_____	21-30 years	_____
5 – 10 years	_____	31- 40 years	_____
11 – 20 years	_____	41 years or more	_____

E4. What is the approximate number of acres you currently farm?

_____Acres

E5. If you grew rice last year, how many hundredweight (cwt) of rice did you market?

_____CWT

E5. Have you ever performed the following rice production and processing tasks in return for money?
Please check all that apply.

Trucking	_____
Milling	_____
Warehousing	_____
Drying	_____
Leveling	_____
Other	_____

End of Questionnaire

Thank you for your participation!