International Journal of Scientific Research in Engineering and Management (IJSREM)
Volume: 09 Issue: 08 | Aug - 2025 SJIF Rating: 8.586 ISSN: 2582-3930

"Cooperatives as a Labour-Economic Institution: A Grassroots Strategy for Absorbing Displaced Agricultural Stakeholders in India and Beyond"

Authors:

Dr. Mahesh Kadam, Associate Professor, Vaikunth Mehta National Institute of Cooperative Management (VAMNICOM), Pune. maheshkadamagribusiness1218@gamil.com
Dr. Amit Borkar, Assistant Professor, VAMNICOM, Pune borkaramit1984@gmail.com

Abstract

India is experiencing a structural squeeze in agriculture: average operational land-holdings are shrinking, resource endowments are under pressure, and rural households face growing livelihood vulnerability. Under these conditions, cooperatives emerge as an institutional mechanism to absorb displaced agricultural stakeholders by transforming small-scale family producers into collective, market-oriented enterprises that integrate production, processing, marketing, credit and training. Drawing on labour-economics theory (search-frictions and matching), empirical identification techniques (natural experiments), and institutional economics, this review synthesizes evidence from India (dairy and sugar cooperatives), China (land-shareholding cooperative innovations), and international literature on cooperative impacts on employment and income stability. The paper proposes a testable conceptual framework where cooperatives act as labour-market intermediaries that reduce search and coordination frictions, raise bargaining power, enable local industrialization (value-addition and processing), and stabilize real incomes — thereby moderating inflationary pressure at the household level. We compile and critique empirical findings (positive impact on household income and rural employment, but mixed governance outcomes), identify mechanisms (asset pooling, vertical integration, training and technology diffusion), and provide methodological guidance for future evaluations (difference-in-differences, matching, instrumental variables, and natural-experiment approaches). Policy implications emphasize enabling law, capacity building, finance, and governance reforms to scale cooperative-led local industrialization as a strategic labour-absorption pathway.

Key words: *Cooperatives, Labour, employment, industrialization, institutions, innovations*

Introduction — Schools of Thought in Labour Economics and Institutional Rationale

Labour economics provides multiple conceptual lenses for understanding why cooperatives can be more than a sectoral actor: they are structural institutions that reshape labour allocation, improve match quality between worker skills and local opportunities, and alter bargaining and distributional outcomes. Classical models of structural change (from agriculture to non-farm sectors) emphasize factor reallocation driven by productivity differentials; however, these models often assume frictionless migration of labour into urban industry and services. Real labour markets are characterised by frictions — search costs, information asymmetries, geographic immobility, and imperfect contracting — which generate persistent unemployment and underemployment even in growing economies. The theoretical contribution of Diamond, Mortensen and Pissarides on markets with search frictions demonstrates formally how frictions create simultaneous equilibrium of vacancies and unemployment, and how institutions that reduce these frictions can improve matching and reduce involuntary unemployment. Cooperatives, by pooling local demand and supply, institutionalize local matching and thus directly intervene in the core problem addressed by search-theory. (NobelPrize.org)

Empirical labour economics underwent a methodological revolution with the adoption of natural-experiment techniques championed by Card, Angrist and Imbens; their work shows how rigorous causal inference helps us evaluate the true labour-market effects of policy interventions. This methodological tradition is important for cooperative evaluation because apparent correlations between cooperative membership and welfare may reflect selection: better farmers join cooperatives. Natural-experiment designs and quasi-experimental techniques are therefore essential when testing whether cooperatives *cause* improved labour outcomes rather than simply correlate with them. (NobelPrize.org)

Contemporary labour analysis also highlights gendered labour transitions: Claudia Goldin's historical research demonstrates that labour supply, career continuity, and the structure of jobs (the "greedy" work problem) influence women's labour market outcomes. Cooperatives that enable flexible work schedules, local micro-enterprises, and

collective childcare/worker supports can create pathways for higher female labour participation — a crucial dimension for inclusive rural absorption policies. (NobelPrize.org)

Finally, institutional economics emphasizes how formal and informal rules shape long-run outcomes. Cooperatives are institutional devices: democratic governance, member equity, and shared risk change incentives and transaction costs compared to purely private or public models. If properly designed and regulated, cooperatives can reduce market failures (credit, input supply, marketing access) and enable productive local industrialization. This introduction therefore frames cooperatives as labour-market institutions whose success must be evaluated with methods and metrics from modern labour economics and institutional analysis. (FAOHome)

Literature Review — Cooperatives, Employment and Livelihoods (India & China, plus global evidence)

The international and country-level literature provides consistent evidence that cooperatives improve incomes, create jobs, and strengthen rural resilience — but outcomes vary by sector, governance and policy context.

Global and multilateral evidence. FAO, IFAD and other UN agencies have long argued that agricultural cooperatives increase bargaining power, improve access to inputs, technologies and markets, and generate employment through value-chain extension (processing, storage, transport). FAO synthesis reports and technical papers document cooperatives' contributions to rural employment, food security, and poverty reduction, and emphasise their role in risk-sharing and market integration. The global CICOPA and cooperative research literature show that cooperative work offers stability, participation, and decent work features in many contexts. (FAOHome, CICOPA -)

India — dairy (Amul) and sectoral lessons. The Amul (Anand) dairy cooperative network in Gujarat is the archetypal example: it demonstrates pooled procurement, collective processing and branding that deliver higher farmgate prices, a steady off-take for milk, and non-farm employment in processing and logistics. Multiple case studies link cooperative membership to increased farm incomes, market access, and reduced price volatility for members — all mechanisms that absorb labour by creating market-based livelihoods beyond pure cultivation. Conversely, large co-operative sectors like sugar in Maharashtra show governance and political economy complexities: while creating substantial rural employment and local industrial nodes, mismanagement, political capture, and financial fragility have weakened some cooperative sugar factories. These contrasting cases show the need for strong governance and professional management to realize cooperatives' labour absorption potential. (ijsi.in, nexxadigital.com, oldisrj.lbp.world, Taylor & Francis Online)

China — land shareholding cooperatives and localized industrialization. China's Land Shareholding Cooperative System (LSCS) is an institutional innovation that maintains household land rights while enabling pooled management and shareholding structures for scale, mechanization and ecological farming. Empirical studies of LSCS cases (e.g., Jiangsu villages) document increased income through dividends, improved efficiency, and local employment in ecological or value-added agriculture — demonstrating how cooperative land institutions can convert fragmented plots into economic entities that absorb labour via processing and service activities. The Chinese experience is instructive because it explicitly connects local institutional reform to capacity for localized industrialization. (MDPI, ResearchGate)

Quantitative evidence on income and employment. Recent empirical studies using matching, endogenous switching and panel methods (MDPI, ScienceDirect, and others) find that cooperative participation is associated with higher household net income, greater resilience to shocks, and increased employment (both agricultural and some non-farm jobs), though the magnitude and the channels differ by country and cooperative type. Studies show mechanisms: reduced transaction costs, factor reallocation (land consolidation), technology diffusion, and creation of local industrial clusters (processing units, input supply, output marketing). At the same time, evidence highlights constraints: cooperatives sometimes fail to extend into full non-farm employment without deliberate strategies for value-chain extension and training. (MDPI)

Synthesis. The literature justifies the proposition that cooperatives can absorb agricultural stakeholders through (a) direct on-farm intensification and increased farm incomes, (b) off-farm employment created by local processing and services, and (c) reduced friction in labour–job matching by institutionalizing pooled demand. Outcomes are positive where legal frameworks, finance, training, and transparent governance align; they are mixed where governance failures, political capture, or lack of market access persist. (PMC, Open Knowledge FAO)

Conceptual Framework & Analytical Model

This section sets out a testable framework that links input pressures (shrinking land, resource stress) to cooperative formation and then to labour absorption and income stabilization. The framework is both causal (hypothesis-driven) and operational (measurement and empirical strategy).

Core causal chain (textual diagram):
Land fragmentation & resource scarcity → Incentive to pool assets → Cooperative formation (types: production, marketing, processing, land-shareholding) → Institutional mediators (governance quality, access to finance/markets, training and technology) → Outputs: (a) increased on-farm productivity and incomes, (b) local non-farm employment via processing/enterprises, (c) improved labour matching and reduced friction, (d) gender-inclusive employment pathways → Aggregate outcomes: household real income stability, lower vulnerability to inflationary shocks, and localized economic resilience.

Key propositions (testable hypotheses):

1. H1: Membership in well-governed cooperatives increases household real income compared to non-members, ceteris paribus.
2. H2: Cooperatives that integrate upstream (inputs) and downstream (processing/marketing) activities create significantly more non-farm local employment than production-only cooperatives.
3. H3: Cooperative membership reduces individual search costs and unemployment spells by creating local job matching nodes (consistent with search-frictions theory).
4. H4: Cooperatives with gender-sensitive governance (female representation, flexible work arrangements) increase female labour participation and earnings growth relative to comparable non-cooperative settings.

Operational variables and measurement:

- **Treatment:** Cooperative membership (binary; membership intensity measured as % household income from cooperative activities).
- **Outcomes:** Household real income (inflation-adjusted), employment status by adult (full-time/part-time/non-farm), unemployment spells, female labour force participation, income volatility (standard deviation of monthly income over a year).
- **Mediators:** Governance index (transparency, audit frequency, democratic checks), access to finance (credit per member), value-chain integration score, training/extension visits per household.
- **Controls:** Land size, education, initial wealth, access to roads/markets, agro-ecological zone.

Suggested empirical strategies:

- **Quasi-experimental**: Difference-in-differences (DiD) exploiting staggered cooperative roll-outs; synthetic control for regional adoption.
- **Matching/PSM**: Pair cooperative members with observationally similar non-members on pre-treatment covariates (but combine with sensitivity analysis for unobservables). (NobelPrize.org)
- **Instrumental variables**: Instruments could include historical cooperative density, distance to earlier cooperative processing units, or policy shocks that exogenously encourage formation (e.g., subsidy introduction).
- **Natural experiments**: Use policy changes or court rulings that differentially affected cooperative formation across regions as instruments for causal identification. This follows the methodology advocated by modern labour econometrics literature to isolate causal effects. (NobelPrize.org)

Mechanism tests: Mediation analysis (e.g., structural equation models) to quantify how much of the cooperative effect on employment is through value-chain creation versus income augmentation that allows investment in off-farm activities.

Practical field design: Mixed methods — household panel data, cooperative-level audits, focus groups (gendered lens), and labour market surveys. Recommended data sources include agricultural census microdata, cooperative registries, and targeted baseline–endline surveys for pilot cooperative interventions. The model is deliberately modular: it evaluates both immediate income effects and second-order labour market outcomes over medium (2–5 years) horizons. (FAOHome, MDPI)

Results & Discussion — Synthesis of Evidence, Mechanisms, and Implications

The literature yields three consistent findings and several important caveats:

(1) Cooperatives increase member incomes and reduce vulnerability. Multiple empirical studies show positive income effects for cooperative members, driven by better input access, price stabilization for outputs, and value-added activities. Meta-studies and MDPI evidence estimate meaningful average income gains and improved resilience to shocks, confirming the FAO's policy stance that cooperatives aid poverty reduction and food security. Income stability is a plausible mechanism for dampening household exposure to inflation because steady farmgate prices and cooperative dividends buffer market volatility. (MDPI, FAOHome)

(2) Cooperatives create local non-farm employment but with conditionality. Where cooperatives consciously extend into processing, packaging, logistics and services (the "vertical" cooperative approach), they generate measurable local employment. The Amul model illustrates a scaling pathway from milk collection to nationwide branded value chains that create jobs at many nodes. Empirical work shows that cooperatives can increase both agricultural employment and part-time/non-farm work, but the magnitude depends on deliberate value-chain strategies and entrepreneurial support (technical, managerial and financial). Regions where cooperatives remain production-only see smaller non-farm employment effects. (ijsi.in, MDPI)

(3) Cooperatives reduce search frictions and improve matching locally. From a search-theory standpoint, cooperatives function as local labour market platforms — they register surplus labour, package demand for services (processing, storage), and reduce transaction costs for employers and workers. This reduces unemployment spells and promotes quicker re-employment among displaced farm workers. The theoretical backing comes from Diamond–Mortensen–Pissarides frameworks; field evidence on matching dynamics is emerging but promising. (NobelPrize.org)

Caveats and governance failures. Not all cooperatives succeed. Sugar cooperatives in Maharashtra are a cautionary tale: political capture, weak financial controls, and low managerial capacity can turn cooperatives into fiscal sinks rather than engines of local employment. These governance failures explain heterogeneity in outcomes and imply that scale alone is not sufficient; governance, auditability, and professional management are necessary condition(s) for sustained employment creation. (oldisrj.lbp.world, Taylor & Francis Online)

Gender and inclusion. Cooperatives show promise for increasing women's labour participation when governance structures and operational practices are gender-sensitive (e.g., women's representation, flexible schedules, childcare services). Claudia Goldin's findings about the structure of work imply that cooperatives' flexible, local work forms can reduce the "greedy job" penalty and open pathways for women's continuous labour attachment. However, empirical studies must disaggregate by gender to confirm these dynamics in specific contexts. (NobelPrize.org)

Policy implications. To leverage cooperatives for labour absorption at scale, policy must address: (a) enabling legal and financial frameworks (start-up funds, credit lines, tax incentives for value-chain investments), (b) governance and transparency (regular audits, capacity building for boards), (c) technical assistance and skilling (to convert raw materials into local micro-industry), and (d) market linkages (brand development, buyer contracts). Multilateral engagement (FAO/IFAD) and national policy can accelerate scaling by funding pilot models that combine production, processing and training. (FAOHome)

Research gaps. There is a need for large-scale quasi-experimental evaluations that track labour outcomes over medium term, gendered microdata, and cost-effectiveness studies comparing cooperative promotion with alternative rural employment programs. Applying the natural-experiment methods popularised by Card, Angrist and Imbens will strengthen causal claims. (NobelPrize.org)

Conclusion and Recommendations for Policy & Research

Cooperatives stand at the intersection of labour economics and institutional design: they can reduce market frictions, provide stable incomes, and create local employment opportunities through integrated value chains. The extant literature — from multilateral reports to country-level case studies — supports the thesis that cooperatives are effective instruments for absorbing stakeholders displaced by shrinking landholdings and resource constraints, but their effectiveness is conditioned by governance quality, strategic value-chain integration, financial access, and capacity

building. The policy agenda to harness cooperatives as an employment strategy should therefore include (1) targeted incubation and grant funding for cooperative processing units, (2) capacity programs in cooperative governance and financial management, (3) gender-focused provisions and measurement, and (4) rigorous evaluation protocols using DiD, matching, IV and natural-experiment strategies to generate causal evidence. For researchers, priority areas are causal impact evaluations of cooperative models on employment and income volatility, studies on gendered labour transitions within cooperatives, and comparative analyses of cooperative forms (producer vs. processing vs. land-shareholding) across Indian states and Chinese LSCS cases. When these components are combined — institutional design, market linkages, training, and disciplined evaluation — cooperatives can become the scalable, localized engines of employment and income stability that India's changing agrarian landscape requires. (ijsi.in, MDPI)

References

- India Agriculture Census 2015–16: average operational holding size (average 1.08 ha). (FAOHome, CEIC Data)
- "How AMUL's Cooperative Model Changed India's Dairy Sector" (case study & analyses). (ijsi.in, nexxadigital.com)
- MDPI — "A Rural Land Share Cooperative System for Alleviating the Small…" (LSCS studies on China). (MDPI, ResearchGate)
- Nobel Prize in Economic Sciences 2010 — Diamond, Mortensen, Pissarides (markets with search frictions). (NobelPrize.org)
- Nobel Prize in Economic Sciences 2021 — Card, Angrist, Imbens (natural experiments, causal inference). (NobelPrize.org)
- Nobel Prize 2023 — Claudia Goldin (gender, labour supply and career structure). (NobelPrize.org)
- FAO, IFAD and multilateral reports on agricultural cooperatives and rural livelihoods. (FAOHome, Open Knowledge FAO)
- CICOPA — *Cooperatives and Employment: Second Global Report* (2017). (CICOPA -)
- Empirical studies on cooperative impacts on income and employment (MDPI, ScienceDirect and other journals). (MDPI)
- Studies and critiques of cooperative sugar industry governance in Maharashtra. (oldisrj.lbp.world, Taylor & Francis Online)