IJAFLS
e-ISSN: 2602-4381
International Journal of Agriculture, Forestry and Life Sciences
Original Article | Open access | Int J Agric For Life Sci (2021) 5(2): 129-138

Analysis of relations with members of Antalya province fisheries cooperatives

Evrim Beyhan ŞEN ŞENSOY[1*], Serpil YILMAZ[1]

[1*]Akdeniz University, Faculty of Fisheries, Konyaaltı-Antalya-Turkey

*Corresponding author: evrimsen1@gmail.com

Abstract

Producer organizations, which are structures that are also accepted as the development criteria of countries nowadays, are established to provide social and economic needs of their members. Because the organizations are multi-purpose, they are preferred by producers as they undertake many tasks from regulating fisheries market to protecting rights of producers and from providing training services related to production and sales to meeting the needs. For this reason, in this research, face-to-face surveys were conducted with 75 members of 14 active fisheries cooperatives in Antalya. The survey application period, which is research's data collection phase, was planned as fishing season and occur between November 2017 and March 2018. In the study, sample size of fisheries cooperative members was determined by simple random sampling and factor analysis method, one of the multivariate statistical analyzes, was used to determine the factors forming relationship between cooperatives and members. According to research results; although the main reason why to participate in cooperatives is aim of obtaining economic and technical support, activities of cooperatives are considered insufficient by members. Conversely, though sufficient support is not given, conditions are limited, and success is not achieved as much as expected, efforts to stand and increasing memberships of cooperatives is considered as a positive result in terms of fisherman organisation in Antalya.

Keywords: Fisheries cooperatives, Organisations, Fisheries, Antalya

Introduction

The producer organization has important functions in fisheries production, storage, transportation, domestic and foreign markets in eliminating unfair competition between small and large enterprises. It is only possible with an effective organization, members can obtain production inputs at affordable prices, to increase their income, and to market their products in good conditions (İnan, 2008). For this reason, organization, which is accepted as one of the indicators of the level of development of countries, is of great importance for the fisheries sector of our country, as it is in different sectors. However, besides that, one of the most important problems of the fisheries sector is producer organizations.

Fisheries cooperatives established by Law No. 1163 undertake many tasks such as regulating the fisheries market, protecting the rights of producers and meeting their needs.

Member composition of the organization formed by the fisheries sector in Turkey is mostly small-scale fishermen (Ünal et al., 2009, Yılmaz 2009, Olguner et al., 2015). However, the fishermen's organization in Turkey still has not reached the desired level (Ünal and Yercan 2006). For this reason, it is emphasized in many studies that organizations, most of which are created by small-scale fishermen, are ineffective organizations (Zengin and Güngör 2017) and should be supported because they cannot provide full performance (Kurtoğlu 2006, Akyol and Ceyhan 2010, Dartay and Canpolat 2017, Yılmaz and Şen 2018).

Cite this artile as:
Şen-Şensoy E.B. and Yilmaz S. 2021. Analysis of relations with members of Antalya province fisheries cooperatives. Int. J. Agric. For. Life Sci., 5(2): 129-138.
ORCID and Mail:
[1]Şen-Şensoy E.B: 0000-0001-7643-089X (evrimsen1@gmail.com);
[1]Yilmaz S.: 0000-0003-2300-8091 (serpilyilmaz@akdeniz.edu.tr).
Received: 29.07.2021 **Accepted:** 30.11.2021 **Published:** 14.12.2021
Year: 2021 **Volume:** 5 **Issue:** 2 (December)
Available online at: http://dergipark.gov.tr/ijafls

Today, there are 572 fisheries cooperatives and 31241 members in these cooperatives in our country. Although the fisheries cooperatives in Antalya province constitute 24,5% of the total fisheries cooperatives, their number is increasing day by day (Anonim, 2021). In Antalya province, which has significant contributions to the fisheries sector, there are 14 fisheries cooperatives with 694 members and 1 Antalya Regional Fisheries Cooperative Union, which was formed by the merger of 10 cooperatives. Although the province of Antalya, chosen as the study area, has a good fisheries history, the lack of organizational culture, the insufficient effectiveness of cooperatives in fisheries activities and the problems experienced in organization and member relations are of great importance.

In this study, it is aimed to reveal the factors affecting the organization of fishermen in Antalya through fisheries cooperatives. In this context, the effect of the variables that lead fishermen who are members in fisheries cooperatives in Antalya to organize has been examined. As a result of the research, it has been tried to offer solutions in order to eliminate the existing and potential problems in the organization of fishermen.

Material and Method

Since the main population of the study consists of fishermen who are members of fisheries cooperatives in Antalya Province, face-to-face surveys were conducted one of the research methods for primary data. The survey application period, which is research's data collection phase, was planned as fishing season and occur between November 2017 and March 2018.

For this purpose, pilot survey studies were conducted by using the records obtained from the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry Antalya Directorate of Provincial, Antalya Fisheries Cooperatives and public institutions.

After evaluating the pilot survey data, necessary arrangements were made in accordance with the purpose of the study and the Neyman method was used for the statistical analysis of the survey data obtained in determining the sample volume of the cooperative members who own the fishing boats.

The simple random sampling formula used with this method (Yamane, 1967).

$$n = \frac{(N\ z^2\ p\ q)}{(N\ d^2)\ +\ (z^2\ p\ q)}$$

Where;

n: Number of samples,

N: The total number of units of the sampling frame,

z: The standard normal value found depending on the chosen confidence level (the study was studied with 99% confidence)

p: The probability of the event of interest (as the study basically tried to measure the organizational tendencies of the members and the organizational perception depending on it, it was defined as the probability that any selected fisherman would find the producer's organization successful)

q: Probability that the event of interest will not occur (defined as the probability that any selected fisherman will find the producer's organization a member to fail)

d: Shows the accepted sensitivity in the sampling (worked with 4% deviation in the study)

In the research, it is planned to obtain data with the problems of the members about fishing, support requests, reasons for being a member, the level of awareness, their perceptions, thoughts, evaluations and suggestions about the cooperative. A five-point Likert scale was used for questions about these situations.

During the analysis of the data, the frequency and tables for discrete variables were prepared using the SPSS 22 program and presented as a summary. In addition, factor analysis was also used, which aims to obtain a small number of identifiable significant variables from a large number of variables measuring the same structure among the variables (Kalaycı, 2005; Kleinbaum et al., 1997).

In factor analysis, a correlation matrix is created for all variables in the first stage, and in the second stage, factors are rotated to maximize the relationship between factors and variables by extracting the variables from the correlation matrix based on the correlation coefficients (Özdamar, 2010).

$$X1\text{-}M1 = L11F1+L12F2+.....L1kFk+ \varepsilon 1$$
$$X2\text{-}M2 = L21F1+L22F2+.....L2kFk+ \varepsilon 2$$
$$XP\text{-}MP = LP1F1+LP1F2+.....LPkFk+ \varepsilon P$$

In the equation, Lij = coefficient of factors (factor load), i:variable, j:specifies factor load (weight). The new variables derived in the analysis are expressed as "Factors". It is aimed to reveal the random factors that reflect the classification, which are not observed from the variable in the data matrix (P), which are observed with the analysis and are correlated (X), but are revealed by the combination of the variables.

For this reason, in the research, the reasons for the organization of the members of the fisheries cooperatives, which have many variables, and their thoughts about the organization, were tried to be determined by obtaining significant and few variables by factor analysis method. In factor analysis, measurement is made with the Kaiser Meyer-Oklin (KMO) test to determine the degree of suitability of the analysis of explanatory variables. The KMO sampling adequate criterion is an index used to compare the magnitude of the observed correlation coefficients with the size of the partial correlation coefficient. Considering that the applicability of the factor analysis technique decreases as the KMO value decreases, a KMO value of 0.90 is excellent, good at 0.80, moderate at 0.70, low at 0.60, and unacceptable if it is below 0.50. is evaluated as. The main criteria taken into account when deciding on the number of factors are the eigenvalue and variance criteria. Generally, factors with an eigenvalue above 1 are chosen in practice (Joseph vd. 2009).

In this research, the reasons for the members of the fisheries cooperatives to become members of the cooperative were collected under 26 headings and factor analysis was applied to the data obtained using the likert scale.

Results and Discussion

In Antalya Province, there are 14 fisheries cooperatives on the 640 km long coastline from Kaş district to Gazipaşa district (Table 1.).

According to the records obtained from the Antalya Provincial Directorate of Agriculture and Forestry, the newest established fisheries cooperatives in the province according to the year of establishment are Kemer Fisheries Cooperative and Serik Fisheries Cooperative, the oldest established Yeşil Antalya Fisheries Cooperative, Alanya Fishery Cooperative, Kaş Fisheries Cooperative. Cooperative, Denizyaka Fisheries Cooperative and Manavgat Fisheries Cooperative (Table 1.).

Table 1. Fisheries cooperatives interviewed and their establishment years

District Name	Cooperative Name	Foundation Year
Muratpaşa	Yeşil Antalya Fisheries Cooperative	1990
Konyaaltı	Yeni Liman Fisheries Cooperative	1995
Konyaaltı	Kemer Fisheries Cooperative	2016
Aksu	Aksu Fisheries Cooperative	2010
Alanya	Alanya Fisheries Cooperative	1990
Finike	Finike Fisheries Cooperative	1995
Gazipaşa	Gazipaşa Fisheries Cooperative	2004
Kaş	Kaş Fisheries Cooperative	1990
Kaş	Kalkan Fisheries Cooperative	2004
Manavgat	Denizyaka Fisheries Cooperative	1990
Manavgat	Manavgat Fisheries Cooperative	1990
Manavgat	Side Fisheries Cooperative	2015
Serik	Belek Fisheries Cooperative	2004
Serik	Serik Fisheries Cooperative	2016

It is possible to come across many studies on the socio-demographic characteristics of the members of fisheries cooperatives. Some of these are Doğan and Gönülal (2011), Karademir and Emin Arat (2014), Dartay and Canpolat (2017), Çımat and Duran (2018).

In this study, which was conducted in Antalya, the ages of the members of the aquaculture cooperatives ranged from 26 to 70, and the average age was 50, when the ages of the members were examined from socio-demographic characteristics. According to the results in Table 2, the majority of the population of Fisheries Cooperative members is young/middle-aged. As a matter of fact, in the master's thesis study conducted by Göncüoğlu (2008), it was emphasized that 22.9% of the young age common group and 40.6% of the middle age group. It was concluded that most of the members of Antalya Province Fisheries Cooperatives are in the young/middle-aged segment, as in this study.

It was determined that 93.3% of the Fisheries Cooperative members participating in the survey were married (Table 2.). According to this situation; It can be said that most of the fisheries cooperative members are married.

When the educational status of the cooperative members surveyed in the research is examined, it is seen that the formal education period of the members is low. Members have received formal education mainly at primary level (Table 2). However, it was determined that some of them continued to secondary school and high school in various ways. As a result of this analysis, as in the results obtained in a study conducted in 2014, the education level of the cooperative members is similarly low (Karademir and Arat, 2014).

Cooperative members are grouped as families of 2-3, families of 4, and families of 5-8 people, according to the family population size. According to the results of the analysis made in this context, it has been determined that the members mostly consist of families of 4 with a ratio of 45% (Table 2.).

When the housing status of the fisheries cooperative members interviewed was examined, it was determined that 73.3% of them were homeowners according to the results of the analysis (Table 2.). Rental prices of Fisheries Cooperative members, who are renters, vary between 250 TL and 1000 TL.

Most of the fisheries cooperative members have social security. As a matter of fact, Table 2 shows that 76% of the members have social security. The majority of those who do not have social security work in the tourism sector, which was active during the fishing ban period. The members have social security during the tourism season and their social security ends again when the season ends.

Table 2. Socio-demographic characteristics of the fisheries cooperative members interviewed

Range of Age	**Number**	**%**
26-45	24	32,0
46-55	28	37,3
56+	23	30,7
Total	**75**	**100,0**
Marital status		
Married	70	93,3
Single	5	6,7
Total	**75**	**100,0**
Education		
Illiterate	1	1,3
Primary School	31	41,4
Middle School	21	28,0
High School	16	21,3
University	6	8,0
Total	**75**	**100,0**
Family Size		
2-3	19	25,3
4	34	45,4
4+	22	29,3
Total	**75**	**100,0**
Housing Status		
Host	55	73,3
Renter	20	26,7
Total	**75**	**100,0**
Social Security Status		
Available	57	76,0
Absent	18	24,0
Total	**75**	**100,0**

As seen in Table 3, the memberships of the members of the fishery cooperatives to the cooperative vary between 1 year and 28 years, and the average membership period is 11 years. In another study conducted in Istanbul, it was reported that the majority of cooperative members have a membership period of 1-10 years (Karademir and Emin Arat 2014). It has been determined that most of the membership periods of fisheries cooperatives in Antalya are between 1-10 years. The fact that the establishment of the cooperative was newly established during the said period also has an effect.

Table 3. Cooperative membership durations of the fisheries cooperative members interviewed

Cooperative membership durations (Year)	**Number**	**%**
1-10	39	52,0
11-20	28	37,3
21-28	8	10,7
Toplam	**75**	**100,0**

In the research, it was determined that the majority of the members of fisheries cooperatives, with a rate of 68%, were pleased with being a member (Table 4).

Table 4. The pleased of being a member of the fisheries cooperative members interviewed

Satisfaction with being a member	**Number**	**%**
Very pleased	7	9,3
Pleased	51	68,0
Partially pleased	14	18,7
Not pleased	2	2,7
Not pleased at all	1	1,3
Total	**75**	**100,0**

In the study, the signs of success of the cooperative according to the members of the fishery cooperatives were tried to be explained with 5-point Likert scale questions. Among the signs of success of the members' cooperatives, they answered that there is unity and solidarity between the members and the managers of the cooperative, planned and conscious work, good marketing, and product processing. In addition, answers were received from the members that the management team is strong and good, the cooperative has no debt, the companies and traders cannot defraud the producers, the organization is good and they work honestly (Table 5). In this context, it is revealed that among the signs of success of the members' cooperatives, "the unity and solidarity between the members and the cooperative managers, the strong and good management team, honest and planned and conscious work" are more important.

Table 5. The reasons for the success of the cooperative according to the interviewed fisheries cooperative members

The reasons fort he success	**Ave rage**	**Std. deviation**	**Never Agree**		**Don't agree**		**Undeci ded**		**Agree**		**Totally agree**		**Total**	
			N	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%		%
There is unity and solidarity between the members and cooperative managers	4,11	0,649	1	1,3	2	2,7	-	-	57	76,0	15	20,0	75	100,0
Planned and conscious work	3,99	0,762	3	4,0	1	1,3	1	1,3	59	78,7	11	14,7	75	100,0
Good marketing	3,92	0,834	3	4,0	2	2,7	5	6,7	53	70,7	12	16,0	75	100,0
The product is being processed	3,71	0,941	5	6,7	3	4,0	8	10,7	52	69,3	7	9,3	75	100,0
Strong and good management team	4,08	0,653	1	1,3	1	1,3	4	5,3	54	72,0	15	20,0	75	100,0
The cooperative has no debt	3,84	0,823	2	2,7	5	6,7	5	6,7	54	72,0	9	12,0	75	100,0
Inability of companies and traders to defraud manufacturers	3,76	0,803	3	4,0	3	4,0	8	10,7	56	74,7	5	6,7	75	100,0
Good organization	3,96	0,829	3	4,0	2	2,7	3	4,0	54	72,0	13	17,3	75	100,0
Working honestly	4,07	0,684	1	1,3	2	2,7	3	4,0	54	72,0	15	20,0	75	100,0
Return of activities	3,87	0,827	3	4,0	3	4,0	4	5,3	56	74,7	9	12,0	75	100,0
Regular payments of members	3,80	1,273	5	6,7	6	8,0	6	8,0	50	66,7	8	10,7	75	100,0

In the study, factor analysis, which is a multivariate statistical analysis, was applied in order to obtain a small number of identifiable and significant variables from a large number of variables that measure the same structure among the variables of the survey results of the cooperative members, and the thoughts of the members about the organization they belong to and the reasons for being a member were examined.

In the research, the reasons for the members of the fisheries cooperatives interviewed to be a member of the cooperative was examined with 26 questions using a 5-point Likert scale. Factors related to these causes are given in Table 6.

As a result of the analysis, the Cronbach alpha value was found to be 0.87. It is important for the reliability of the test that the value found is close to 1. The factors related to the reasons for becoming a member in the cooperative are given in Table 6.

In the factor analysis, the eigenvalue was taken as a criterion and 4 factors with values greater than 0.40 were determined. While these 4 factors explained 74% of the variance, these factors were summarized as cooperative activities, economic support of the cooperative, technical support of the cooperative, and contributing to the unity and solidarity of the cooperative.

According to this result, the members of the cooperative preferred the first factor, primarily, because it is a fair administration, a democratic (equal voice) administration, it benefits me, it has a very good control and control system, it provides development, it enables us to act jointly (producers, etc.). Because, according to the results of the reason for being a member was grouped as "cooperative activities".

In factor 2, the cooperative members primarily preferred the options, because the sale of the product is guaranteed (easily

marketable, use of marketing services), i sell the product at a good price (high profit), i obtain inputs at low prices, to reduce risk and use available resources (sales and storage space, workforce, they gave the opportunity to use the inputs in the best way. According to the results of the analysis, the reason for being a member was grouped as “economic support of the cooperative”.

In Factor 3, the reason for becoming a member is grouped as "technical support of the cooperative", according to the analysis result, since the cooperative members prefer their options primarily because it is easy to find credit, provides technical support for production, can supply consumer goods cheaply and supports educational activities.

In the 4th factor, the cooperative members preferred their options because we increase our economic power by acting together and the idea that unity is stronger. According to the results of the analysis, the reason for being a member is grouped as "contributing to the unity and solidarity of the cooperative" (Table 6.).

Table 6. Factor weights obtained as a result of factor analysis of the reasons for the members of the fisheries cooperative interviewed to be a member of the cooperative.

Reasons to become members	**Factor Weights**			
	1	**2**	**3**	**4**
Because I sell the product at a good price (high profit)		0,856		
As the marketing activity		0,887		
Because the sale of the product is guaranteed (because it can be easily marketed, benefit from marketing services)		0,881		
Since I procure the inputs at a low price		0,770		
To take advantage of the support provided	0,512	0,479		
Because the risk is low (to reduce the risk)		0,668		
Because it's easy to find a loan			0,826	
Since I can obtain consumables cheaply			0,757	
Since it provides technical support for production		0,416	0,771	
As we increase our economic power by acting together				0,775
Since it allows the best use of available resources (Sales and storage space, workforce, inputs)		0,617	0,402	
Since there is an open and transparent management in the cooperative	0,799			
Since it supports educational activities	0,476		0,570	
Since it is sensitive to social responsibilities (Creating public opinion)	0,783			
Since it is a democratic (equal voice) form of government	0,843			
Since it is an independent structure	0,860			
Since it enables us to act jointly (Solidarity between producers)	0,701			
Because it provides development	0,732			
To ensure the continuity of fisheries	0,700			
Because of its influence in the region	0,709			
Because it gives reputation around me	0,491		0,568	
Managers are honest and have moral values	0,800			
From the idea that unity is strength	0,682			0,544
Because it is a fair administration	0,868			
Because it benefits me	0,809			
Because it has a very good control and control system	0,814			
Eigenvalue	**12,159**	**4,256**	**1,551**	**1,268**
Variance	**34,823**	**18,591**	**14,082**	**6,479**
Cumulative Variance	**34,823**	**53,414**	**67,495**	**73,975**
Cronbach α		**0,870**		

Again, the opinions of the members of the fisheries cooperatives interviewed about the cooperative, in which a 5-point Likert scale was used, were examined with 45 questions and factor analysis was applied with the information obtained. The Cronbach alpha value was found to be 0.79. The factors related to the reasons for becoming a member in the cooperative are given in Table 7.

In the factor analysis, the eigenvalue was taken as a criterion and 5 factors with a value greater than 0.40 were determined. These 5 factors explained 68.9% of the variance. These factors are summarized as the activities of the cooperative management, the success of the head of the cooperative and his assistants, the interaction of the cooperative, the importance that the member gives to the cooperative and the sustainability of the membership.

According to this result, the cooperative members preferred options in the first factor, primarily, the general assembly meeting time and day are announced, every issue is discussed in detail at the general assembly, participation in the general assembly is high, decisions are taken democratically in the general assembly, the cooperative activity report is clearly and detailed. According to the results of the analysis, their thoughts about the cooperative they are a member in were grouped as "activities of the cooperative management".

In the second factor, the cooperative members preferred the options: the head of the cooperative is successful, the head of the cooperative is educated and knowledgeable, the cooperative employees do their job well, the head of the cooperative is good at speaking, the head of the cooperative is experienced. According to the results of the analysis, their thoughts about the cooperative they are a member in were grouped as "the success of the cooperative president and his assistants".

In the 3rd factor, the cooperative members preferred the options that the cooperative develops fisheries in the region, the cooperative contributes to the development of the region, the cooperative supports the infrastructure works of the region, the cooperative has cooperation and cooperation with other similar cooperatives. According to the results of the analysis, their thoughts about the cooperative they are a member in were grouped as "cooperative interaction".

Cooperative members are happy to be a member of the cooperative in factor 4, the members trust the cooperative, I was impressed by the family members and fishermen when they decided to become a member, cooperative membership is important in our family and I recommend them to my environment. According to the results of the analysis, their thoughts about the cooperative they are a member of were grouped as "the importance that the member gives to cooperatives".

In factor 5, while the cooperative members prefer the options, i will continue to be a member in the future, the cooperative general assembly is held regularly and on time, according to the analysis result, the option of being a member of the cooperative is determined to be inversely related and their thoughts about the cooperative they are a member in are “sustainability of the membership” grouped as.

The opinions of the fisheries cooperative members interviewed about the cooperative were compiled from various sources and examined with 45 questions. The 5 factors obtained as a result of the factor analysis were tried to be summarized as the activities of the cooperative management, the success of the head of the cooperative and his assistants, the interaction of the cooperative, the importance given by the member to the cooperative and the sustainability of the membership (Table 7.).

Table 7. Factor weights obtained as a result of factor analysis of the opinions of the fisheries cooperative members interviewed about the cooperative

Thoughts	Factor Weights				
	1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
I will continue to be a member in the futures	0,495				0,526
I recommend it to my environment				0,635	
I will be in administration in the future.		0,450			
Cooperative president is experienced		0,712			
Cooperative president is educated, knowledgeable	0,403	0,803			
Cooperative president's speech is good	0,506	0,719			
Cooperative management consists of honest, reliable people	0,644	0,552			
I find the cooperative successful		0,640	0,466		
Cooperative can actually be even more successful					0,677
Cooperative does not distinguish between members	0,759				
Thanks to the cooperative, my income level increased			0,648		
The cooperative gave me self-confidence					
Cooperative president is successful		0,830			
The board is working successfully	0,413	0,641	0,437		
Cooperative workers do their job well	0,416	0,727			
Cooperative manager and his assistants are successful	0,477	0,683			
The cooperative management has good communication with its members	0,671	0,493			
The buildings of the cooperative are sufficient			0,628		
I can easily meet with cooperative managers whenever i want		0,667			
I trust the cooperative	0,682				
Cooperative membership is important in our family				0,627	
There is no unfair advantage and corruption in the cooperative	0,601				
Cooperative general assembly is held regularly and on time	0,533			0,586	0,478
There is no fight in the general assembly work	0,528			0,631	
General assembly meeting time and day are announced	0,850				
High attendance at the general assembly	0,787				
The cooperative activity report is presented in an understandable and detailed manner	0,757		0,421		
Every issue is discussed in detail at the general assembly	0,810				
Decisions in the general assembly are taken democratically	0,768				
Necessary records (books) are kept regularly in the cooperative	0,714				
I am happy to be a member of the cooperative				0,662	
I have experience in cooperative			0,615	0,494	
Influenced by family members when deciding to become member			0,405	0,607	
I was impressed with other fishermen when deciding to become a member				0,608	
I will be a member of other agricultural organizations (Chamber of Agriculture, TKK etc.)				0,463	
Members trust the cooperative	0,449			0,671	
I like to collaborate		0,607			
It is easy to become a member in the cooperative					-0,508
The cooperative supports the infrastructure works of the region			0,559		
The cooperative contributes to the development of the region			0,731		
Cooperative is independent				0,681	
The state supports the cooperative			0,682		
The cooperative develops fisheries in the region			0,779		
The cooperative has cooperation and cooperation with other similar cooperatives.			0,527		
Increases the income of cooperative members			0,587	0,529	
Eigenvalue	**19,758**	**3,968**	**3,153**	**2,203**	**1,919**
Variance	**20,872**	**17,018**	**13,649**	**12,162**	**5,189**
Cumulative Variance	**20,872**	**37,890**	**51,539**	**63,702**	**68,891**
Cronbach α		**0,791**			

Conclution and Recommendation

According to the research results; it is observed that the fishermen engaged in hunting activities in Antalya are small-scale enterprises. For this reason, the members stated that they needed state support.

In the study, the evaluation of the success criteria of the producer organization that the members are involved in was examined. In this context, when evaluated by scoring the success criteria of the cooperative, which includes Fisheries Cooperatives Members; it has been revealed that more importance is given to the unity and solidarity between the members and the cooperative managers with a maximum of 4.11 out of 5, then the honest, strong and good management staff, and the planned and conscious work.

Although it is determined in the research that 68% of the members are satisfied with being a member of the cooperative they are affiliated with, the members evaluate the activities of the cooperatives as insufficient. The members have a general view that the organizations cannot fully realize the expected success due to the limited organizational conditions. According to the aforementioned members, in order for Fisheries Cooperatives to be successful, their problems must be solved and their needs met. Among the suggestions that come to the fore are the state support and the unity and solidarity of the members and their awareness.

The factor analysis method was also used in the study. The reasons for members to become members of producer organizations were examined by the research method. According to the results of the analysis, the factors affecting the reasons for the members of fisheries cooperatives to become a member of the cooperative; the technical and economic support of the cooperative has been determined as being included in the unity and solidarity of the cooperative and benefiting from cooperative activities. As a matter of fact, it has been revealed that the producers in the research region can more easily solve many procedures that need to be fulfilled by becoming members with producer organizations.

In the research, the factors affecting the thoughts and evaluations of the members about the organization they are involved in were also examined with factor analysis. According to the results of the analysis, the factors affecting the thoughts and evaluations of the members of the fisheries cooperative about the cooperative; the success of the head of the cooperative and his assistants, the interaction of the cooperative with the members, the importance that the member gives to the cooperative, the activities carried out by the cooperative management.

In the study, although EU-type organizations are taken as an example for the producer organizations in our country, it has been revealed that many of these factors cannot be met by the organizations and the desired success cannot be achieved due to the structural and functional differences with the producer organizations in the EU. Fisheries organizations in the European Union; it protects the producer and directs the fisheries market. In addition, the elements that make up the organization in the producer organization in the EU are complementary to each other with their duties and responsibilities. Producer organizations, which are structurally different from our country, also carry out lobbying activities in order to give direction to agricultural policy. Agricultural Cooperatives in the EU can even come together to establish new producer organizations to benefit from the EU funds used to regulate the markets. In our country, as in EU countries, it would be beneficial to make legal arrangements that will bring producers together and facilitate organization.

Solving the problems that make the activities of producer organizations inadequate in the long term can be achieved by the joint work of producer organizations, ministries and universities with the aim of rational and sustainable fishing. In addition, there is a need for more studies that will produce solutions to the problems in the field of organization. Insufficient studies on the organization of fishermen make it important to support these studies.

Acknowledgement

This research was supported by Akdeniz University Scientific Research Projects Coordination Unit as part of her doctoral thesis.

Conflict of Interest

The authors declare that there are no conflicts of interest regarding the publication of this paper.

References

Akyol, A., Ceyhan, T. and Ünal, V. (2006). The roles of fisheries cooperatives and associations in Marmara Region in bluefish fishery. E.U. Journal of Fisheries & Aquatic Sciences, 23 (3-4):379-383.

Anonim, (2021). Fisheries Cooperatives Central Union Official Site. https://www.sur.coop/hakkimizda.aspx. Access date: 16.07.2021

Çımat, A. and Duran, T. (2018). Main problems faced by fisheries cooperative enterprises in Muğla province and Solution proposals. Electronic Journal of Social Sciences, 17(66): 433-453.

Dartay, M. and Canpolat, İ. (2017). Keban Dam Lake (Elazig/ Turkey) is a member in aquaculture cooperatives socio-economic structure of fishermen. Ege Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences, 34(1): 41-46.

Doğan, K. and Gönülal, O. (2011). Gökçeada (Aegean Sea) fisheries and the socio-economic structure of fishermen. Karadeniz Fen Bilimleri Dergisi, 2(5): 57-69.

Göncüoğlu, H. (2008). Socio-demographic characteristics, organizational tendencies and problems. Master's thesis, Ege University, İzmir, 111 p.

İnan, H. (2008). Agricultural Cooperatives in Turkey and the EU Model. Istanbul Chamber of Commerce Publications. İstanbul.

Joseph, F., Hair J.R., William C.B., Barry J.B. and Rolph E.A. (2009). Multivariate data analysis. 7th edition. London: Pearson Publishing. 816 p.

Kalaycı, Ş. (2005). SPSS Applied multivariate statistical techniques. Ankara: Asil Broadcast Distribution.

Karademir, M. and Arat, M.E. (2014). Problems and solutions in fisheries cooperatives: The example of Istanbul province. Marmara University Proposal Journal, 11(41) 133-156.

Kleinbaum, D.G., Kupper, L.L., Muller, K. and Nizan, A. (1997). Applied regression analysis and other multivariate methods. Boston: Duxbury Press. 798 p.

Kurtoğlu, Z.İ. (2006). Organization of the Eastern Black Sea inland aquaculture enterprises. SÜMAE Yunus Research Bulletin, 6:3.

Olguner, T., Yılmaz, S. and Şen, E.B., (2015). The Place and Importance of Fishery Cooperatives in Aquaculture Marketing in Turkey: The Case of Antalya. International Journal of Development Research, vol.5, pp. 3149-3151.

Özdamar, K. (2010). Statistical andri analysis with package programs (Multivariate analysis), 7th Edition Kaan Bookstore. Eskişehir.

Ünal, V. and Yercan, M. (2006). The fisheries cooperatives in Turkey and importance for fishermen. Ege University Journal of Fisheries & Aquatic Sciences. 23(1-2): 221-227.

Ünal, V., Güçlüsoy, H. and Franquesa, R. (2009). A comparative study of success and failure of fishery cooperatives in the Aegan, Turkey. Journal of Applied Ichtyology. 25: 394-400.

Yılmaz, S. and Şen, E.B., (2018). Importance of Producer Organizations in Fishing Activities in Turkey-Eu Process, World Auaculture Society, Montpellier, FRANCE.

Yılmaz, S., Erdilal, R. and Kebapçıoğlu, T. (2009). Producer associations from economic organizations in the aquaculture sector. Akdeniz Üniversitesi Ziraat Fakültesi Dergisi, 22(2): 223-232.

Zengin, M. and Güngör, G. (2017). The role of fisheries cooperatives in fisheries management: The case of Marmara Sea, Turkey. Turkish Journal of Aquatic Sciences. 32(2): 102-119.