



SUSTAINABILITY OF COOPERATIVES: THE IMPACT OF MOTIVATION

Daryl Jane Agbayani-Caballero

*Author is a faculty of the College of Business and Management, Central Mindanao University
Musuan, Maramag, Bukidnon, Philippines 8710
Email address: idareyou.djc@gmail.com*

KeyWords

Motivation, Sustainability, Cooperative, Trust, Openness, Playfulness, Humor, Interpersonal relations, Conflict management

ABSTRACT

Sustainability is the driving force that significantly helps the organizations survive in their respective industries. This appears to be the goal of organizations nowadays specifically those belonging to the cooperative industry. The cooperatives are exploring means to guarantee that their organizations will last long to continually provide them their needs and assist them increase their income. This sector serves as a powerful tool to alleviate living conditions of the members at the same time sustains economic growth; however, an extremely changing and competitive environment currently challenged this industry. This research work finds its essence through the genuine efforts to contribute knowledge to the current scenario. The purpose of this study is to examine the impact of motivation on the sustainability of multi-purpose cooperatives. This study employed mixed method research design. The survey conveniently selected a total of 641 cooperative officers among the 75 cooperatives in Bukidnon. The researcher conducted interviews with five officers holding key positions and focus group discussions among 30 members from five cooperatives. The findings show that motivation has significant impact on the sustainability of multi-purpose cooperatives. Limitations of this study include the utilized variables which are; trust and openness, playfulness and humor, and interpersonal relations and conflict management that were solely assessed by conveniently selected cooperative officers of Bukidnon. Overall the study concludes that if multi-purpose cooperative officers are motivated, economic sustainability will be possibly realized.

INTRODUCTION

Rationale

The dynamic and unstable environment of the business-related organizations are crucial challenges faced by organizations nowadays. These challenges vary from physical, social, technological and political aspects. The highly competitive environment enveloping profit-generating activities recently magnified this position. Moreover, choosing sustainability forms only the trivial part, implementing it in the organization is the most challenging part.

Promoting Sustainability is one of the current objectives among all organizations nowadays, so as creating favorable conditions, guaranteeing responsible behavior and employing creation (European Commission, 2012). The International Cooperative Alliance's (ICA) Blueprint which aims to position cooperatives as builders of economic, social, and environmental sustainability by 2020, recognizes sustainability as one of the five pillars.

Researchers investigating sustainability believe that the issues determining this concept is crucial not only for the future of the ecology but also for the present and future success of the economy (United Nations, 2008). There are several cooperatives though, that do not include sustainability as part of their core values and objectives traditionally. Thus, to better guide cooperatives, the Cooperative Decade blueprint established the goal of achieving a deep commitment to sustainability by 2020 (ICA, 2012).

Cooperatives are organizations set up to meet their members' needs. In principle, they are owned and democratically controlled by their members, but in practice, many have been controlled by the government (Department for International Development, 2010). They serve as watering holes to individuals, more dominantly in places where the absence of big spending power does not attract private investment to harness local skills and resources that can uplift the local economy. Furthermore, cooperatives serve as significant economic players that contribute to sustained economic growth. The top 300 global cooperatives have a combined turnover of US \$1.1 trillion. They employ over 100 million people and contribute to increased agricultural productivity, financial services and critical utilities such as electricity. Cooperatives can make a significant contribution to the economy (DFID, 2010).

In highly developed countries, governments recognized the social and economic benefits of cooperatives and had encouraged cooperative development with access to low-cost capital markets (Mellor, 2009). Cooperatives often have risen from the grass-roots, and spread nationally. In the United States, the rural electric distribution and farm credit systems are dominated by cooperatives with the support of the government (Haggblade et al., 2007).

However, given these entire positive outlooks, cooperatives continue to face currently numerous challenges arising from sustainability issues. The European Association of Cooperative Banks (2010) noted that the global financial crisis of recent years had resulted in interest towards sustainable alternatives. Among the challenges is to combine cooperative specificities with external guidelines to preserve their contribution to more sustainable development. Another challenge faced by many cooperatives is over-regulation by government compared to other private sector players where supposedly, a legal environment with sensible regulation is needed to protect democratic member control, autonomy, and voluntary membership (Allred, 2013).

The cooperative sector in the Philippines, given their past performance has proven to immensely contribute towards the realization of the national goals according to the report of the Cooperative Development Authority (CDA) (2011). In the country, however, although cooperatives continue to enjoy the trust and confidence of their members many face credit crunches. Cooperative movements encountered common problems such as lack of education and training, lack of capital, inadequate business, lack of loyal membership support, vested interest and graft and corruption among leaders, mismanagement, and lack of government support (Sibal, 2011).

In rural areas like Bukidnon, cooperatives work in some ways to serve as catalysts, not only in promoting economic development and but also in ensuring the general well-being of individuals. However, this local scenario is confronted with appalling issues of extinctions and mismanagement and is, in fact, becoming prevalent nowadays. Out of 382 registered cooperatives in Bukidnon, more than 32% or 126 are already in their dissolution stage or are bound for dissolution (CDA, 2016). Specifically, for example, in the Municipality of Maramag, some cooperatives are recorded to be under a critical status. For almost 30 registered multipurpose cooperatives; 7 are inactive, five are in a dormant status, and less than 10 operates business, not in line with their registration (CDA, 2013). This phenomenon is also true to other cooperatives in Bukidnon.

Having known that the cooperatives have the potential to alleviate the living conditions of their members and sustain economic growth, this study hopes to contribute to the dearth of studies on the cooperative sustainability especially in the local setting.

Framework

The proposition of this study concerning sustainability is supported by 3 models; *Qualitative Model of Sustainable Leadership by Seijaaka, et al. (2015)*, *Wheel of Change Model to Sustainability by Doppelt (2010)*, and *Human Aspect Model by Ulus and Hatipoglu (2016)*.

The *Qualitative Model of Sustainable Leadership of Seijaaka, et al. (2015)* suggests five essential contributory factors for sustainable business. The factors include social capital, resilience, strategic flexibility, resourcefulness, and personal value.

This model recognizes social capital as an important factor to attain sustainability in businesses. This factor is closely related to motivation which is emphasized by Ekvall (1996) to have indicators such as trust and openness among members in an organization, playful and relaxing environment, with favorable interpersonal relations and conflict management atmosphere. These particular indica-

tors may form a positive social capital. As defined by authors, social capital is about the value of social networks, bonding similar people and bridging between diverse people, with norms of reciprocity (Dekker and Uslaner, 2001; Claridge, T., 2004). It further refers to a culture of trust and tolerance, in which extensive networks of voluntary associations emerge' (Inglehart, 1997).

The Wheel of Change Model to Sustainability by Doppelt (2010) highlights seven solutions to achieve sustainability. The first three solutions deal with changing mind-set, organizing teams, as well as adopting visions and principles. The fourth and fifth solutions are about developing change and communicate with people with an emphasis on establishing means to design and test new ways of thinking and operating. The last two steps are on fostering learning and embedding sustainability in procedures and providing means to make sustainability grow and last.

This model emphasizes ways to sustainability such as the importance of teams, vision, change, communication, new ways of thinking, and embedding sustainability in procedures. Motivation may be linked to teams and communication. Ekvall (1996) in his study emphasized having good interpersonal relations and conflict management as well as creating a culture of trust and openness as well as the playful and relaxing environment. As cited by Jiang (2010), "working in teams and having effective communication can contribute to having good interpersonal relations and building a culture of trust and openness which are indicators of motivation. Teamwork is the smartest strategy for growth and the key to staff development (Beal, 2003; Krotz, 2003). It can improve social relations to overcome the sense of separation and low trust syndrome (Jin, 1993) and can make people share the same goals and responsibilities."

The human aspect model: interacting human factors during sustainability implementation of Ulus and Hatipoglu (2016) accentuates four essential factors to achieve organizational sustainability, these are; internal communication, bystander engagement, overcoming resistance to change, and participative engagement. This model further suggests that the most addressed human aspect is internal communication as it used to influence both resistance to change and employee engagement in sustainability. Through two-way communication, organizations expect to reduce employee resistance to change.

This model supports the proposition of this study as the factors to attain organizational sustainability such as internal communication, and participative engagement relates well to motivation. Through effective communication, the employees feel more empowered. Most importantly, when the lines of communication are open, the employees feel comfortable with the relationship they have with the management. In return, their motivation improves (Rampton, 2017). On the other hand, employee engagement increases dignity, respect, and self-actualization. As a result, they get motivated to work. To involve the employees in management is a vital source of motivation. Engagement increases the productivity of the organization, commitment of employees, and motivation to accept responsibility and accountability (Bhishma, 2010).

The **concept of sustainability** is increasing in importance among organizations, in fact, has been entirely embraced as a responsibility (European Commission, 2012; Radu, 2015; Delai and Takahashi, 2013; Salzmann et al., 2005; Asif et al., 2011).

There is a growing body of literature that recognizes three central aspects in sustainability reporting; these are; economic, social, and environmental. Recently, related literature has paid attention to the sustainability-related innovation practices, primarily on new ways to manage product in a more sustainable manner (Hallstedt et al., 2013; Wagner, 2008; Klewitz and Hansen, 2013). The multi-dimensional nature of sustainability is seriously recognized (Hahn and Scheermesser, 2006; Collins et al., 2010; Maletic et al., 2011; Fairfield et al., 2011; Caraianni et al., 2009). The business and organization field gave these three sustainability aspects superior weights since these are regarded as instruments in providing added value (Radu 2015; Caraianni et al., 2009, Rosneft, 2010). The United Nations (2005) acknowledged the three components of sustainability: economic, environmental, and social as these were emphasized in their Triple Bottom Line model or the overlapping circles of sustainable development.

This current study revolves around the notion that resources influence the sustainability of multi-purpose cooperatives in terms of its economic, social, and environmental aspects.

The **economic aspect of sustainability** of this study was measured in terms of; access to affordable loan services with terms and conditions that are favorable to members, financial assistance to family and own needs, financial assistance to support livelihood, aid in generating employment, regular distribution of dividends, dividends that are, at least, not decreasing, profitable business, increase in the number of members yearly, credible auditor/ audit committee that regularly checks financial statements, and policies on savings and loans that are strictly implemented.

Economic sustainability contains all the aspects of the economic interactions of the organization, including indicators used in financial accounting, as well as the intangible elements which do not usually show up in financial situations (Caraianni et al., 2010). Economic Sustainability refers to the impact of the organization's business practices and growth on the economic system (Jussila et al., 2012). The provision of patronage refunds and dividend payments is critically connected with the positive relationship between profitability, member satisfaction, and retention. One way to attract cooperatives is by providing economic services to raise real incomes. Members are usually drawn to a cooperative by its economic advantages (Mellor, 2009).

The **social aspect of sustainability** of this study was indicated in the following domains: opportunities for members to gather and bond among themselves, involvement in community activities, health-related benefits for the members, seminars/training to members, linkages with business or financial organizations, gender equality in empowering people especially women, equal treatment and access to persons with disabilities, equal treatment and access to indigenous group, human rights, ethical conduct and standards, as well as credible and effective grievance system and committee.

Social sustainability on the other hand, involves the interaction of the community with the organization including employee relations and fair wages (Goel & watts, 2010; Caraianniet al., 2010). This can be defined as a way to achieve protection and promotion

of human rights, diversity, health and safety, and equity among many others (Widok, 2009; McElroy et al., 2007). Workplace climate even in cooperative banks (Cuesta-González et al., 2006) must satisfy demands through policies on safety, stability, training, participation, and equal opportunities (Illia, et., al, 2010; Siebenhuner and Anold, 2007). Currently, there are no official measures to check on social performance. However, there are indicators deemed relevant such as involvement in community groups to measure organization's image reflecting on ethnic backgrounds of cooperatives such as attitudes, values, and norms (Hofstede, 2001). Social performance covers aspects on; education, skills, experience, consumption, employment, democracy and participation, gender equity, and information (Spangenberg, 2002).

The **environment aspect of sustainability** in this study was measured in terms of; proper waste management system, production or purchases of locally manufactured products, 4 Rs (reduce, recycle, re-use, recover), risk management system in case of natural disasters, policies involving cleanliness, policies involving environmental care, electricity & water usage, and involvement to seminars concerning environmental issues if available.

Environment sustainability aspect includes all means ensuring the preservation and improvement of natural resources. As stipulated in the Earth Charter, in supporting sustainable development actions, government, civil society, scholars, communities, companies and international associations are mandated to be involved in formulating and implementing firm environmental development and protection policies, together with research in education, raising awareness and changing social values (Ahmad et al., 2011). United Nations Millennium Development Goals of 2006 seriously considered environmental sustainability (Widok, 2009). Corporate environmentalism in the form of eco-efficiency has been given considerable attention in literature (Horwat, 2009; Côté et al., 2006; Hutchins and Sutherland, 2008).

Sustainability and Motivation. Sustainability in companies is dependent on motivating employees, consumers, and communities for they can make or break a company's sustainability efforts (Honeywell, 2015). Motivating people means enhancing their knowledge, supporting them, creating a happy environment, letting them participate, and rewarding them (Fischhoff, 2012). A significant result on corporate motivations reveals its impact on the implementation and management of organizational sustainability (Windolph et al., 2013). In the case of the Bank of America, employee initiative rise up to 12,000 active participants from 26 countries as the organization highlights employees' motivation (Honeywell, 2015). There exists a positive relationship between employee motivation with emphasis on empowerment and recognition and organizational performance. The more the employees are motivated to accomplish tasks, the higher is the organizational performance, growth, and success. (Quratul-Ain Manzoor, 2011).

Trust & openness, playfulness, interpersonal relations & conflict management serve as variables of motivation in this study which independently or as one influence sustainability of organizations. Great ideas that enhance corporate growth come from the people who do the activities for the companies especially those who directly serve customers and fights competition (Culpepper, 2014; Spender & Strong, 2010; Abbot et al., 2006). Hence, they should be nurtured to promote innovation (Yuan & Zhou, 2008; Baer, 2012). *Interpersonal relation and Conflict management* is a motivational factor that significantly supports organizational creativity and innovation which in turns yield a positive impact on the company. Interaction and shared perceptions brought about by group works provide increased innovation in the organization (Andrew et al., 2010; Steinberg, 2008; Neves and Eisenberger, 2014; Harris & Beyerlein, 2005) even in the field of Human Resource Management (Fay, et al., 2010; Leede & Looise, 2005). Innovation is impossible without effective communication which serves as a main determinant of it (Leeuwis & Aarts, 2010). Innovational success is likely to increase through a successful management of conflicts (Bledow et al., 2009; Rosing & Frese, 2013). *Playfulness and Humor* is another motivational factor that supports organizational creativity and innovation. Having fun in the workplace will encourage comfort in speaking more ideas (Isaksen & Akkermans, 2011; Axelsson and Sardari 2011; Ekvall, 1996). *Trust and Openness* as a motivational factor of organizational creativity and innovation serve as powerful tools to simplify challenges in the workplace. When employees feel trusted and heard, they did better on idea implementation (Ng et al., 2010; Ng & Feldman, 2012; Neves and Eisenberger, 2014).

Objectives of the Study

This study intends to examine the Influence of Resources on the Sustainability of Multi-purpose Cooperatives in Bukidnon as assessed by the officers; specifically, it desires to uncover the following;

1. The extent of Motivation in terms of Trust and Openness, Playfulness and Humor, and Interpersonal Relations and Conflict Management among multi-purpose cooperatives;
2. The level of Sustainability among multi-purpose cooperatives in terms of Economic, Social, and Environment; and
3. The impact of Motivation on the Sustainability of Multi-purpose Cooperatives

METHODOLOGY

Research Setting and Design

The setting of the study was in Bukidnon, a province in Northern Mindanao. The province is composed of 4 districts with 22 cities and municipalities distributed as follows; District 1 with 6, District 2 with 5, District 3 with 8, and District 4 with 3. All in all, the province has a total of 382 registered cooperatives however as of December 2016, only 256 of them are active, 126 were either dissolved, in the process of dissolution, or are bound for dissolution.

This study utilized mixed method, specifically; causal-comparative research design highlighting both quantitative and qualitative approach. This type of research attempts to determine the cause or consequences that already exist between or among groups of individuals or basically attempts to identify a causative relationship between an independent variable and a dependent variable (Kravitz, 1994; Salkind, 2010).

This research design measures the impact or the cause through quantifying the percentage increase in the sustainability that can be contributed by resources as well as how the relationship works between the variables. The researcher through the inputs of an expert in statistics used statistical software to draw information for variables of interest through descriptive and inferential statistics. This study explored stepwise multiple regressions to assess the relationship and impact of a dependent variable and several independent variables.

Respondents and Sampling Procedure

A total of 641 cooperative officers from the four districts of Bukidnon served as respondents in the quantitative data gathering of this study. This study made use of the technical definition of cooperative officers as cited in RA 9520 (Cooperative Code of the Philippines). As detailed, this includes; board of directors, committee members created by the general assembly, manager or chief executive officer, secretary, treasurer and members holding other positions as provided by their bylaws. These groups serve as the most relevant source of information as they regularly meet on a monthly basis or as the need arises to generate and discuss ideas, solutions, and strategies for the betterment of the cooperative.

This study utilized convenience sampling. This technique also known as availability sampling, is a non-probability sampling where the basis of the selection is the convenience in accessibility and proximity to the researcher. Many researchers prefer this technique because it is fast, inexpensive, simple and the subjects are readily available. This type became popular as this relies on data collection from population members who are conveniently available to participate in the study (Saunders et al., 2011). This sampling technique was employed in this study because a significant number of the cooperative officers will only be attained through scheduled or mandated meetings or seminar-workshops with them as participants. Participants were also invited to bring questionnaires to their co-officers who have not attended the said activity.

The sample size was determined using two (2) stage proportional sampling. Eighteen (18%) of the total population or 623 was the desired sample size and 18% also of the population in every district was targeted to come up with the total sample size. After coming up with the total sample size, the distribution of questionnaires took place. As a result, 641 survey instruments were subjected to analysis from 75 multi-purpose cooperatives of Bukidnon.

As determined, this research employed qualitative data gathering by selecting credible key informants in the cooperative industry. Their current positions in the cooperatives and the number of years spent in the cooperatives were the basis of their expertise towards this scholarly work. To sum, there were five officers holding key positions interviewed of which three are present chairpersons of established cooperatives in Bukidnon with one of them as the chairperson of the Provincial Cooperative Development Council (PCDC) of Bukidnon and the remaining two officers currently served as member of the Board of Directors. The key officers of this study have served an average of 30 years in the cooperative industry and 20 years average as cooperative officers.

Focus group discussion (FGD) was also utilized to assess the sustainability aspect of the multi-purpose cooperatives in Bukidnon as perceived by the members to match and compare results with that of the officers. Five cooperatives with six members each of good standing totaling to 30 participants were conveniently selected to participate.

Table 1 shows data of the distribution of sample size from the four districts of Bukidnon from a total of 173 multi-purpose cooperatives with 3,460 officers. The breakdown of the 641 survey respondents were as follows; 129 in District 1, 145 in District 2, 262 in District 3, and 105 in District 4. Out of 256 active registered cooperatives only 173 (68%) are operating as multi-purpose cooperatives

Research Instruments

The survey instrument was categorized into two parts. First part contains questions which assessed the extent of Motivation of multi-purpose cooperatives in Bukidnon. The second part contains 29 questions which assessed their Economic, Social, and Environmental Sustainability.

Motivation was assessed using a questionnaire containing variables influenced by Ekvall's (1996) dimensions of organizational climate that help, stimulate, or block creativity and innovation. Resources contains the variables Idea Time, Idea Support, Challenge and Dynamism; on the other hand, sustainability was assessed in the economic, social, and environmental aspects. The Sustainability questionnaire was influenced by the Questionnaire for Apex Cooperative Organizations by the United Nations Organization, Social Policy and Development Division (2009) in the social sustainability aspect of the multi-purpose cooperatives.

The FGD of this study used 6 questions to measure the sustainability aspect of the cooperatives. The questions were lifted from the validated and pre-tested questionnaire; in particular, two questions each to assess the economic aspect, social, and environmental aspects. The questions were transcribed into Visayan dialect and were duly certified and evaluated by an expert.

Validity and Reliability

Validity implies the extent to which the research instrument measures, what it is intended to measure. Reliability refers to the degree to which scale produces consistent results upon repeated measurements (Surbhi, 2017).

In establishing the validity of the survey instrument, it went through face validity review, initial content validation, and in-depth content critique and analysis by experts in the field of cooperatives, research, and organization. After the inputs of experts and finalization of the questionnaire, the reliability was determined through pretesting at selected cooperatives at Cagayan de Oro city with 30 cooperative officers and 15 members as respondents. Thirty (30) cooperative officers participated in Part 1 of the survey questionnaire. Part 2 of the questionnaires were equally participated by cooperative officers and members to check on the congruency of the answers in terms of sustainability, 15 out of the 30 officers were asked to continue with the part 2 while the members answered the remaining 15.

Part I which assessed resources resulted to be highly reliable with .963 Cronbach's alpha while part II which assessed the sustainability comprising of 29 items resulted to be highly reliable with .973 Cronbach's alpha. Over-all the questionnaire resulted to be highly reliable.

Data Gathering and Procedure

The researcher coordinated with the chairperson of the PCDC in Bukidnon for relevant data such as population size and scheduled activities of the Municipal Cooperative Development Councils to have efficient and effective data gathering procedures. The researcher sought consent from the chairperson of the PCDC to gather data among cooperative officers of Bukidnon. She also sought the cooperation and consent of CMU - College of Business and Management for convenient and efficient gathering as they were focusing their extension activities on cooperative officers during the data gathering period. These were initiated to get a significant number of respondents and to request representation in distributing questionnaires to their cooperatives. The survey instruments included a statement seeking consent from participants to participate in the survey otherwise they have the option to return them.

After retrieval, the researcher submitted the quantitative data for statistical treatment and analysis. For credible results, confirming the statistical outputs with the qualitative data gathered from key informants took place.

In conducting the FGD, the researcher conveniently selected five cooperatives from the 75 multi-purpose cooperatives whose officers participated in the previous data gathering activity. In selecting the six members in each selected cooperative to participate, certified letters signifying that they are active members and in good standing were sought. Members were also asked to confirm their consent to participate. A designated secretary and videographer joined in every conduct for documentation. The encoded transcriptions were then brought back to the participants for signatures expressing agreement on the document.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

On the extent of motivation among multi-purpose cooperatives in terms of trust and openness, playfulness and humor, and interpersonal relations and conflict management

Trust and openness. Table 1 provides the data on the extent of motivation among multi-purpose cooperatives in terms of trust and openness as perceived by the cooperative officers.

Table 1.
Frequency, Percentage, and Mean Distribution of the extent of motivation among multi-purpose cooperatives (Trust and openness)

Range	Responses	Frequency	Percentage
4.51-5.00	5 - Very large extent	99	15.44
3.51-4.50	4 - Large extent	255	39.78
2.51-3.50	3 - Moderate extent	252	39.26
1.51-2.50	2 - Little extent	35	5.41
1.00-1.50	1- None	1	0.10
Total		641	100

Overall Mean : 3.65
Description : often practiced
Standard Deviation : 0.69

Indicators	Mean	Description
1. I am comfortable speaking my ideas & opinions anytime to anyone in our organization especially in meetings.	3.81	often practiced
2. People at our organization respects and values each other's ideas &	3.58	often practiced

opinions.

3. I believe that the ideas or suggestions being selected are for the welfare of the majority and not for the interest of the few only. 3.57 often practiced

Indicators of Trust and Openness in this study include being comfortable in speaking ideas & opinions anytime to anyone especially in meetings, respecting and valuing each other's ideas & opinions, and believing that the ideas or suggestions selected are for the welfare of the majority. Results show that more than 15% of the cooperative officers trust and are open to each other in a very large extent. Almost 40% of the officers trust and are open to each other in a large extent. More than 39% of them trust and are open to each other in a moderate extent. Almost 6% of the officers trust and are open to each other in a little extent. And 0.10% of them do not trust and are not open at all.

The overall mean of the responses of this variable under motivation is 3.65 which imply that oftentimes the cooperative officers of Bukidnon experience trust and openness. All the indicators under this variable result to always practiced which means the following; they are comfortable speaking their ideas & opinions anytime to anyone especially during their general assembly and other stated meetings, the people in their organizations respect and value each other's ideas & opinions, and they believe that the selected ideas or suggestions are for the welfare of the majority.

Organizations need to assure a comfortable working environment for the employees when they feel trusted and heard, they did better on idea implementation which will result to positive work performance (Ng et al., 2010; Ng & Feldman, 2012; Neves and Eisenberger, 2014). In the country, cooperatives continue to enjoy the trust and confidence of their members (Sibal, 2011).

Playfulness and Humor. Table 2 furnishes data on the extent of motivation among multi-purpose cooperatives as perceived by the cooperative officers in terms of playfulness and humor.

Indicators of Playfulness and Humor in this study include the following; time spared for fun & relaxation as an organization, time for laughing & exchanging happy thoughts, and believing that laughter plays significant role in an organization thus cannot be avoided. Results show that more than 12% of the cooperative officers experience a playful and fun environment to a very large extent. More than 35% of the officers experienced a playful and fun environment to a large extent. Almost 44% of them experienced a playful and fun environment to a moderate extent. More than 8% of the officers experienced a playful and fun environment to a little extent. And 0.26% of them perceived that they do not experience playful and fun environment at all.

Table 2.
Frequency, Percentage, and Mean Distribution of the extent of motivation among multi-purpose cooperatives (Playfulness and Humor)

Range	Responses	Frequency	Percentage
4.51-5.00	5 - Very Large extent	79	12.27
3.51-4.50	4 - Large extent	227	35.36
2.51-3.50	3 - Moderate extent	280	43.73
1.51-2.50	2 - Little extent	54	8.37
1.00-1.50	1- None	2	0.26
Total		641	100
Overall Mean	: 3.51		
Description	: often practiced		
Standard Deviation	: 0.74		

Indicators	Mean	Description
1. We have time spared for fun & relaxation as an organization.	3.44	sometimes practiced
2. We usually laugh & exchange happy thoughts with each other.	3.53	often practiced
3. People in the organization believe that laughter plays an important role in an organization thus cannot be avoided.	3.55	often practiced

The overall mean of the responses of this variable under motivation is 3.65 which implies that oftentimes the cooperative officers of Bukidnon experience playfulness and humor. This as well implies that they have sufficient time spared for fun & relaxation as an organization, they have enough time and experience to laugh & exchange happy thoughts with each other, and they believe that laughter plays an important role thus can never be avoided in the organization.

Playfulness and humor is another motivational factor that supports organizational creativity and innovation. Having fun in the workplace will encourage comfort in speaking more ideas (Isaksen & Akkermans, 2011; Axelsson and Sardari 2011; Ekvall, 1996).

Interpersonal relations and conflict management. Table 3 furnishes data on the extent of motivation among multi-purpose cooperatives in terms of Interpersonal relations and conflict management as perceived by the cooperative officers.

Indicators of Interpersonal relations and conflict management in this study include the presence of confrontations & misunderstanding, the speedy resolution at times of conflict, usual type of conflict that arise, the effectiveness of the resolutions by the committee-in-charge, and the observed behavior of peopling liking each other. Results show that more than 8% of the cooperative officers have a favorable interpersonal relations and conflict management in a very large extent. Almost 31% of the officers have a favorable interpersonal relations and conflict management in a large extent. More than 50% of them have a favorable interpersonal relations and conflict management to a moderate extent. More than 10% of the officers have a favorable interpersonal relations and conflict management to a little extent. And 0.37% of them perceived that they do not have favorable interpersonal relations and conflict management at all.

Table 3.
Frequency, Percentage, and Mean Distribution of the extent of motivation among multi-purpose cooperatives (Interpersonal relations and Conflict Management)

Range	Responses	Frequency	Percentage
4.51-5.00	5 - Very Large extent	54	8.46
3.51-4.50	4 - Large extent	196	30.55
2.51-3.50	3 - Moderate extent	322	50.17
1.51-2.50	2 - Little extent	67	10.45
1.00-1.50	1- None	2	0.37
Total		641	100

Overall Mean : 3.36
Description : sometimes practiced only
Standard Deviation : 0.67

Indicators	Mean	Description
1. Confrontations & misunderstandings are almost none or not observed at all in our organization.	3.36	sometimes practiced
2. At times that conflict cannot be avoided; it does not last long thus resolved immediately.	3.32	sometimes practiced
3. Conflicts in the organization are only work-related and never personal.	3.33	sometimes practiced
4. Resolutions to conflicts provided by the committee in-charge are the most effective ones.	3.37	sometimes practiced
5. It is commonly observed that people in the organization like each other.	3.43	sometimes practiced

The overall mean of the responses of this variable under motivation is 3.36 which implies that only sometimes the cooperative officers of Bukidnon experience interpersonal relations and conflict Management. All the indicators under this consistently implies sometimes practiced which means there were observed confrontations and misunderstandings in the organization and the speedy resolution making was not much observed or felt. The conflicts were observed to include personal aspects and not purely confined in the workplace. The people were also observed to dislike each other at times.

Excessive criticism of new ideas is one of the challenges pointed out as a barrier to creativity and innovation. Interpersonal relation and conflict management is a motivational factor that profoundly supports organizational creativity and innovation which in turns yield a positive impact on the company. (Andrew et al., 2010; Steinberg, 2008; Neves and Eisenberger, 2014; Harris & Beyerlein, 2005) Innovation is impossible without effective communication as it serves as a principal determinant of it (Leeuwis & Aarts, 2010; Kivimaki et al., 2000; Antonelli, 2000).

The level of Sustainability among multi-purpose cooperatives in terms of economic, social, and environmental

Economic. Table 4 provides the data on the level of sustainability among multi-purpose cooperatives as perceived by the cooperative officers in terms of Economic.

There are ten indicators of economic sustainability in this study. These include access to affordable loan services with terms and conditions that are favorable to members and financial assistance to family, own needs, and to support the livelihood, as well as helping generate employment. The following are also included as indicators; regular distribution of dividends that are, at least, not decreasing, involvement in profitable business undertaking, yearly increase in the number of members, presence of a credible auditor/ audit committee that regularly checks financial statements, and strict implementation of policies on savings and loans. Results show that almost 18% of the cooperative officers assessed their cooperatives to be economically sustainable to a very large extent. Almost 35% of the officers assessed their cooperatives to be economically sustainable to a large extent. Almost 37% of them assessed their cooperatives to be economically sustainable to a moderate extent. More than 9% of the officers assessed their cooperatives to be economically sustainable to a little extent. And 0.94% of them assessed their cooperatives as not economically sustainable.

The economic sustainability of the cooperatives of Bukidnon is largely demonstrated with an overall mean of 3.60. Specifically this means that cooperatives provide access to affordable loan services with terms and conditions that are favorable to members. They are also noted to provide financial assistance to family, own needs, and to support livelihood and regularly distribute dividends as scheduled and are, at least, not decreasing. Their members are as well increasing yearly and they are involved in profitable business undertaking. However, some indicators fall on moderately demonstrated. In particular, this means that they do not help much in terms of helping generate employment through hiring people. There were also not much favorable responses in terms of having a credible auditor or audit committee that regularly checks financial. There is also not much strict implementation on imposed policies on savings and loans.

Table 4.
Frequency, Percentage, and Mean Distribution of the level of sustainability among multi-purpose cooperatives (Economic)

Range	Responses	Frequency	Percentage
4.51-5.00	5 - Very Large extent	115	17.91
3.51-4.50	4 - Large extent	224	34.99
2.51-3.50	3 - Moderate extent	236	36.83
1.51-2.50	2 - Little extent	60	9.33
1.00-1.50	1- None	6	0.94
Total		641	100
Overall Mean		: 3.60	
Description		: often practiced	
Standard Deviation		: 0.67	

Indicators	Mean	Description
The cooperative I am in . .		
1. provides access to affordable loan services with terms and conditions that are favorable to its members.	3.90	often practiced
2. provides financial assistance to family and own needs.	3.65	often practiced
3. provides financial assistance that can support livelihood.	3.55	often practiced
4. helps generate employment through hiring people in the cooperative.	3.30	sometimes practiced
5. regularly distributes dividends (as scheduled).	3.83	often practiced
6. provides dividends that are, at least, not decreasing.	3.74	often practiced
7. is involved in business undertaking that is profitable.	3.57	often practiced
8. increases in the number of members every year	3.67	often practiced
9. has a credible auditor/ audit committee that regularly checks financial statements (either, monthly, quarterly or annually)	3.42	sometimes practiced
10. has imposed policies on savings and loans that are strictly implemented	3.32	sometimes practiced

Cooperatives serve as significant economic players that contribute to sustained economic growth. They employ over 100 million people and contribute to increased agricultural productivity, financial services and critical utilities such as electricity (DFID, 2010). The organizations prioritized this having realized its positive relationship with profitability, member satisfaction, and retention. All these are connected to the provision of patronage refunds and dividend payments. One way to attract cooperatives is by providing economic services to raise real incomes. Members are drawn to a cooperative by its economic advantages (Mellor, 2009).

Participants' responses in terms of cooperatives' economic sustainability during FGD specifically revealed that all agree that their cooperatives provide access to affordable loan services with terms and conditions that are favorable to the members generally in terms of low-interest rates and financial loan for basic need specifically rice loan. They also agree in terms of the regularity in the distribution of dividends, specifically all cooperatives involved in the FGD distribute dividends annually and are distributed during general assemblies. The survey results reflected that the economic sustainability of multi-purpose cooperatives of Bukidnon is often practiced. This can also be supported by the above statements from members. Financial loans form mainly the reason why people involve themselves in cooperatives. Hence, the need and willingness of the members to avail such benefit in a convenient way with an affordable interest as well as the consistent contribution of dividends contributed best to the result of the said survey.

Social. Table 5 provides the data on the level of sustainability among multi-purpose cooperatives as perceived by the cooperative officers in terms of Social.

There are ten indicators of social sustainability in this study. These include; opportunities for members to gather and bond among themselves, rendered services to the community or involvement in community activities, health-related benefits for members, seminars/training to members, established linkages with business or financial organizations, gender equality in empowering people especially women to fully realize potential, equal treatment and access to persons with disabilities, equal treatment and access to indigenous group, respect for human rights, ethical conduct, and standards, and presence of a credible and effective grievance system and committee. Results show that almost 14% of the cooperative officers assessed their cooperatives to be socially sustainable to a very large extent. Almost 35% of the respondents assessed their cooperatives to be socially sustainable to a large extent. More than 40% of them assessed their cooperatives to be socially sustainable to a moderate extent. Almost 9% of the officers assessed their cooperatives to be socially sustainable to a little extent. And almost 3% of them assessed their cooperatives as not socially sustainable.

The social sustainability of the cooperatives is moderately demonstrated with an overall mean of 3.47. Specifically, this means that there are not much health-related benefits for members, not much provision of seminars or training to members, and not much-established linkages with business or financial organizations, and the presence of a credible and effective grievance system and committee is not much observed. On the other hand, some indicators are largely demonstrated, particularly these imply that there are opportunities for members to gather and bond among themselves, they have experiences on providing services to the community, they practice gender equality in empowering people especially among women, there are equal treatment and access to persons with disabilities and to indigenous groups, and they demonstrate respect for human rights, ethical conduct, and standards.

Table 5.
Frequency, Percentage, and Mean Distribution of the level of sustainability among multi-purpose cooperatives (Social)

Range	Responses	Frequency	Percentage
4.51-5.00	5 - Very Large extent	88	13.67
3.51-4.50	4 - Large extent	222	34.56
2.51-3.50	3 - Moderate extent	257	40.07
1.51-2.50	2 - Little extent	58	8.98
1.00-1.50	1- None	17	2.72
Total		641	100
Overall Mean		: 3.47	
Description		: sometimes practiced only	
Standard Deviation		: 0.69	

Indicators	Mean	Description
The cooperative I am in . . .		
1. provides opportunities for members to gather and bond among themselves.	3.52	often practiced
2. offers services to the community or is involved in community activities.	3.54	often practiced
3. has health related benefits for the members.	3.02	sometimes practiced
4. provides seminars/training to members.	3.39	sometimes practiced
5. has established linkages with business or financial organizations.	3.39	sometimes practiced
6. observes gender equality in empowering people especially women to fully realize their potential.	3.59	often practiced

7. provides equal treatment and access to persons with disabilities.	3.64	often practiced
8. provides equal treatment and access to indigenous group or persons belonging to ethnic tribes.	3.60	often practiced
9. respects human rights (e.g. no forced/child labor, etc.)	3.78	often practiced
10. observes ethical conduct and standards.	3.57	often practiced
11. has a credible and effective grievance system and committee.	3.19	sometimes practiced

Sustainability paradigm is still on winning the argument that environmental and social casualties cannot be controlled and are consequences of economic progress. In reality, most of the reporting now in organizations are noted to be confronted with environmental and social issues (Wagner, 2010; Koo et al., 2013). On the other hand, this is currently the objectives of companies nowadays as gains will not be permanent without thorough institutionalization of the social perspective in policy and procedure (Wilkinson and Cary, 2002; Dale et al., 2001). Women are still confronted with issues in terms of financial access to financial services (Kabeer et al., 2012). Recognizing and ensuring gender equality is still finding its way to success (Athumani, 2009; Teodosio, 2009).

Participants' responses in terms of cooperatives' social sustainability during FGD specifically revealed that majority have no medical benefits yet for the members; few said they have medical benefits however limited to dental and ophthalmology only. Others also expressed their cooperatives have emergency and burial loans only, however none relating to health. On the other hand, many said their cooperatives had not provided training designed for members thus they have availed membership training only before joining the cooperatives, while others expressed there are training however many have not attended, and few answered they had attended once and only one 2 answered they had joined several times already. The survey results reflected that the social sustainability of multi-purpose cooperatives of Bukidnon is sometimes practiced only and the above statements from members supported this data. There are only limited health benefits and minimal training for members related to the cooperative. The majority of the FGD participants expressed that most of the trainings are for the officers and only membership training before joining the cooperative was participated by all members.

Environmental. Table 6 provides the data on the level of sustainability among multi-purpose cooperatives as perceived by the cooperative officers in terms of Social.

Table 6.
Frequency, Percentage, and Mean Distribution of the level of sustainability among multi-purpose cooperatives (Environmental)

Range	Responses	Frequency	Percentage
4.51-5.00	5 - Very Large extent	73	11.35
3.51-4.50	4 - Large extent	160	24.98
2.51-3.50	3 - Moderate extent	257	40.13
1.51-2.50	2 - Little extent	136	21.28
1.00-1.50	1- None	15	2.26
Total		641	100

Overall Mean : 3.22
Description : sometimes practiced only
Standard Deviation : 0.84

Indicators	Mean	Description
The cooperative I am in . . .		
1. adopts an effective waste management system (proper segregation of wastes & proper disposal).	3.29	sometimes practiced
2. patronizes production or purchases of locally manufactured products.	3.31	sometimes practiced
3. values 4 Rs (reduce, recycle, re-use, recover) in our usual undertaking (e.g. packaging, decoration).	3.24	sometimes practiced
4. adopts a risk management system in case of natural disasters (ex. flood & fire).	3.01	sometimes practiced
5. implements policies involving cleanliness in our workplace or participates in community-driven cleanliness activities.	3.34	sometimes practiced
6. implements policies involving environmental care in our workplace or participates in community-driven planting drive or other environment related activities.	3.31	sometimes practiced

7. has policies/guidelines on electricity & water usage (ex. when to turn on/off lights)	3.21	sometimes practiced
8. sends participants to seminars or forums concerning environmental issues and awareness if there are available.	3.04	sometimes practiced

There are eight indicators of environmental sustainability in this study. These include; effective waste management system, production or purchases of locally manufactured products, valuing 4 Rs; reduce, recycle, re-use, recover, risk management system in case of natural disasters, implementation of policies involving cleanliness or participation in community-driven activities, implementation of policies involving environmental care or participation in community-driven planting drive. Other environment related activities are as well included such as efficient use of electricity & water usage and sending of participants to seminars or forums concerning environmental issues and awareness. Results show that more than 11% of the cooperative officers assessed their cooperatives to be environmentally sustainable to a very large extent. Almost 25% of the officers assessed their cooperatives to be environmentally sustainable to a large extent. More than 40% of them assessed their cooperatives to be environmentally sustainable to a moderate extent. More than 21% of the officers assessed their cooperatives to be environmentally sustainable to a little extent. And more than 2% of them assessed their cooperatives as not environmentally sustainable.

The environmental sustainability of the cooperatives is moderately demonstrated with an overall mean of 3.22 All indicators consistently display moderate demonstration. Expressly, there is not much observed practiced in terms of effective waste management system. There is also not much emphasis on the production or purchase of locally manufactured products. Valuing 4 Rs (reduce, recycle, re-use, and recover) is also not much observed. The presence of an effective risk management system in case of natural disasters is not much observed as well. There are also not much policies on cleanliness, environmental care, and community-driven participation instituted. Other environmental care measures are also not much observed such as efficient use of electricity & water usage and sending of participants to seminars or forums concerning environmental issues and awareness.

Sustainability paradigm is still on winning the argument that environmental and social casualties cannot be controlled and are consequences of economic progress. In reality, most of the reporting now in organizations are noted to be confronted with environmental and social issues (Wagner, 2010; Koo et al., 2013). United Nations Millennium Development Goals of 2006 wholly considered environmental sustainability (Widok, 2009). Corporate environmentalism in the form of eco-efficiency has been given considerable attention in literature (Horwat, 2009; Côté et al., 2006; Hutchins and Sutherland, 2008).

Participants' responses in the FGD specifically revealed that only some of them answered they had adopted appropriate waste management system in terms of waste segregation and waste disposal while the rest expressed their cooperatives have not adopted any of these systems yet while few of them answered they only have related activity such as the seminar on climate change. On the other hand, more than half of them said they had not adopted a risk management system in case of natural disasters, and few also said they have earthquake and fire drill, there were also few who answered they only have related activity such as community outreach like clean-up drive. The survey results that reflect on the environmental sustainability of multi-purpose cooperatives of Bukidnon as sometimes practiced is supported by the above statements from members. The varying responses among members signify that some cooperatives have incorporated environmental issues and have gone as far as disseminating it to the members while others have not prioritized it yet this far. For those who have incorporated it, it is mainly for prevention purposes and not much on the things to do during calamities.

Table 7 presents the stepwise multiple regression analysis of Motivation and Sustainability. As analyzed, Motivation has a significant impact on Sustainability. Majority of the variables were analyzed to be predictors.

Table 7.
Multiple stepwise regression analysis of Motivation and Sustainability

Model	Coefficients			t	Sig.
	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	.350	.109		3.219	.001
MO_PLA	.150	.028	.167	5.301	.000
MO_INT	.107	.037	.107	2.883	.004

a. Dependent Variable: SUSTAINAB

R = .837 R² = .701 F = 211.726 Sig.0.000

Translating it further, 2 out of the 3 independent variables of motivation can best predict sustainability as reflected in the correlation analysis. These variables playfulness and humor and interpersonal relations and conflict management.

An R2 of 70.1 % reflects the amount of variance explained by these variables relative to sustainability while 29.9% of the variance to other factor variables excluded in the study. To generalize, the F-ratio revealed that the overall regression model is a good fit for the data. The table shows that the independent variables statistically significantly predict the depended variable as indicated: $F = 211.726$, ($p < 0.000$).

The above result is also significantly supported by various literature. Sustainability in companies is dependent on motivating employees, consumers, and communities for they can make or break a company's sustainability efforts (Honeywell, 2015). Motivating people means enhancing their knowledge, supporting them, creating a happy environment, letting them participate, and rewarding them (Fischhoff, 2012). A significant result on corporate motivations reveals its impact on the implementation and management of organizational sustainability (Windolph et al., 2013). In the case of the Bank of America, employee initiative rises up to 12,000 active participants from 26 countries as the organization highlights employees' motivation (Honeywell, 2015). There exists a positive relationship between employee motivation with emphasis on empowerment and recognition and organizational performance. The more the employees are motivated to accomplish tasks, the higher is the organizational performance, growth, and success. (Quratul-Ain Manzoor, 2011).

The interviews conducted among key officers who earned their credibility from their current positions and number of years in the cooperatives validated the generated result revealed that cooperatives need motivation most particularly for their economic activities. Significantly, as mentioned, resources serve as direct solution to economic activities. Thus, if members will continue to enjoy economic advantages through provision of resources, cooperatives may be sustainable or may continue for a long time.

Conclusion

Motivation has a significant impact on sustainability. Majority of the variables under Motivation were analyzed to be predictors. These are playfulness and humor and interpersonal relations and conflict management.

This implies that when multi-purpose cooperatives strategize efforts to assure cooperative officers are motivated, cooperatives have a strong possibility to be sustainable or endure in the long run. Motivation includes; providing them an atmosphere that is full of trust and openness where they feel free to be playful and exchange humor and with an environment that cultivates interpersonal relations and successful in managing conflicts.

References

- Ahmad, W., Soskolne, C.L. and Ahmed, T., (2011). Strategic thinking on sustainability: challenges and sectoral roles. *Environment, Development and Sustainability*, 14(1), pp. 67-83.
- Allred, S. (2013) Cooperatives can play a key role in development, *The Guardian*, <https://www.theguardian.com/global-development-professionals-network/2013/jul/06/international-day-of-cooperatives>
- Alhaddi, Hanan (2015) Triple Bottom Line and Sustainability: A Literature Review *Business and Management Studies* Vol. 1, No. 2; September 2015 ISSN 2374-5916 E-ISSN 2374-5924 Published by Redfame Publishing URL: <http://bms.redfame.com>
- Aliu, Albert and Halili, Arbnor (2013) The Impact of Information and Communication Technologies as a Tool to Facilitate Growth in the Manufacturing Sector in Republic of Kosovo. *Procedia Technology*. Volume 8, 2013, Pages 465-470.
- Antony, J.P. & Bhattacharyya, S. (2010). Measuring organizational performance and organizational excellence of SMEs - Part 1: a conceptual framework. *Measuring Business Excellence*, 14(2), 3-11, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/13683041011047812>
- Apex Cooperative Organizations, United Nations Organization, Social Policy and Development Division (2009) Questionnaire www.un.org/esa/socdev/social/cooperatives/documents/iycquestionnaire.doc
- Asif, M., Searcy, C., Garvare, R. & Ahmad, N. (2011). Including sustainability in business excellence models. *Total Quality Management & Business Excellence*, 22(7), 773-786, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14783363.2011.585784>
- Beal, Brian (2003) Teamwork - the key to staff development, *Career Development International*, Vol. 8 Issue: 5, pp.235-240, <https://doi.org/10.1108/13620430310698563>
- Bedarkar, Madhura and Pandita, Deepika, (2014). A Study on the Drivers of Employee Engagement Impacting Employee Performance, *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences* Published 15 May 2014, Volume 133, Pages 106-115
- Caraiani, C., Guse, R.G., Lungu, C.I. and Colceag, F., (2009). Triple Bottom Line (TBL) reporting. New performance reporting tools in a knowledge based management approach. *Chronicles of Oradea University-Economics*, 18(3), pp. 838-843.
- Cascajo, Rocio (2005) Assessment of Economic, Social and Environmental Effects of Rail Urban Projects Transyt - Transport Research Centre Universidad Politécnic de Madrid
- Claridge, T., (2004). Social Capital and Natural Resource Management: An important role for social capital? Unpublished Thesis, University of Queensland, Brisbane,

Australia.

- Collins, E., Roper, J. & Lawrence, S. (2010). Sustainability Practices: Trends in New Zealand Businesses. *Business Strategy and the Environment*, 19, 479–494, [http:// dx.doi.org/10.1002/bse.653](http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/bse.653)
- Cooperative Development Authority (2016) List of Registered Cooperatives under R.A. 9520 as of December 31, 2016. Cagayan de Oro Extension Office
- Cooperative Development Authority (2013) List of Registered Cooperatives under R.A. 9520 as of December 31, 2013. Maramag Extension Office
- Cuesta-Gonzales, M., Muñoz-Torres, M.J., & Fernandez-Izquierdo, M.A. (2006). Analysis of social performance in the Spanish financial industry through public data. A proposal. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 69(3), 289-304
- Dale A., Duguid, F., Lamarca MG, Hough P, Tyson P, Foon R, Newell R, Herbert Y (2013) Co-operatives and Sustainability: An investigation into the relationship Co-operatives and Sustainability Report
- Dekker, P., & Uslaner, E. M. (2001). *Social capital and participation in everyday life*. London: Routledge.
- Delai, I. & Takahashi, S. (2013). Corporate sustainability in emerging markets: insights from the practices reported by the Brazilian retailers. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 47, 211-221, [http:// dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2012.12.029](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2012.12.029)
- Develtere, P., I. Pollet & F. Wanyama (eds.) (2008), "Cooperating out of Poverty: The Renaissance of the African Cooperative Movement," Geneva: ILO.
- DFID, (2010), 'Working with Cooperatives for Poverty Reduction', Briefing Note, UK Department for International Development, London [http:// www.co-op.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/2010/08/Cooperatives-Briefing-Note.pdf](http://www.co-op.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/2010/08/Cooperatives-Briefing-Note.pdf)
- Dhiman – Interbeing (2009). *Mindfulness in life and leadership: An exploratory survey*. Academy of Spirituality and Professional Excellence
- Dinu, V., (2011). Corporate Social Responsibility – Opportunity for Reconciliation between Economical Interests and Social and Environmental Interests. *Amfiteatru Economic*, XIII(29), pp. 6-7.
- Doppelt, B. (2010). *Leading change toward sustainability: A change-management guide for business, government and civil society*(2nd ed.). Sheffield, UK: Greenleaf Publishing Ltd.
- EACB (2010), *European Cooperative Banks in the Financial and Economic Turmoil: First Assessments*, Research Paper, Brussels.
- Eldeleklioglu J (2008). Adolescents time management skills, anxiety, age, and gender variables in terms of the examination. *Elementary Education Online*, 7(3): 656-663.
- Elger, D. (2007). Theory of performance. In S. W. Beyerlein, C. Holmes, & D. K. Apple, (Eds.), *Faculty guidebook: A comprehensive tool for improving faculty performance* (4th ed.). Lisle, IL: Pacific Crest.
- El-Youssef, Hanan (2014). *Blueprint Strategy "Tools to Measure Co-operative Performance & Impact"* CEARC – Saint Mary's University 2014
- European Commission (2012) *Women in economic decision-making in the EU: progress report*. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.
- Faber N, Jorna R, Van Engelen J. 2005. The sustainability of 'sustainability' – a study into the conceptual foundations of the notion of sustainability'. *Journal of Environmental Assessment Policy and Management*7(1): 1–33.
- Fairfield, K.D., Harmon, J. & Behson, S.J. (2011). Influences on the organizational implementation of sustainability: an integrative model. *Organization Management Journal*, 8, 4–2, [http:// dx.doi.org/10.1057/omj.2011.3](http://dx.doi.org/10.1057/omj.2011.3)
- Fan et al. (2010) Optimal multi-channel cooperative sensing in cognitive radio networks
- Fay, M., Iimi, A., and Perrissin-Fabert, B. (2010). "Financing greener and climate-resilient infrastructure in developing countries - challenges and opportunities". *EIB Papers*, (15:2), pp. 34-58.
- Fischhoff, B. (2012). Good decisions require good communication. *Drug Safety*, 35, 983-993.
- Girotra, K., Terwiesch, C. & Ulrich, K. T. (2010). Idea Generation and the Quality of the Best Idea. *Management Science*, 56, 15.
- Goel, S., Mason, W., Watts, DJ. (2010) Real and perceived attitude agreement in social networks. *Journal of personality and social psychology* 99 (4), 611
- Haggblade, S., Hazell, P.B.R. and Reardon, Thom-as (eds.), (2007). *Transforming the Rural Non farm Economy*. International Food Policy Research Institute, Washington D.C.
- Hahn, T. & Scheermesser, M. (2006). Approaches to Corporate Sustainability among German Companies. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, 13, 150-165, [http:// dx.doi.org/10.1002/csr.100](http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/csr.100)
- Hallstedt, S.I., Thompson, A.W. & Lindahl, P. (2013). Key elements for implementing a strategic sustainability perspective in the product innovation process. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 51, 277-288, [http:// dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2013.01.043](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2013.01.043)
- Harris, C.L. and Beyerlein, M.M. (2005) *Team-based Organization: Creating an Environment for Team Success*. In M. A. West, D. Tjosvold & K. G. Smith (Eds.), *The essentials of teamworking*, Wiley, Chichester, UK, pp. 149-171.
- Hirst, G., Van Knippenberg, D., & Zhou, J. (2009). A cross-level perspective on employee creativity: Goal orientation, team learning behavior, and individual creativity. *Academy of Management Journal*, 52: 280-293.
- Hockerts, K., Morsing, M., Eder-Hansen, J., Krull, P., Midttun, A., Halme, M., Sweet, S., Davidsson, P., Sigurjonsson, T. O., & Nurmi, P. (2008). *CSR-Driven Innovation: Towards the Social Purpose Business*. Frederiksberg: Center for Corporate Social Responsibility, CBS. Retrieved from: [http:// samfundsansvar.dk/file/318859/csr_driven_innovation_towards_social_purpose_business_september_2008.pdf](http://samfundsansvar.dk/file/318859/csr_driven_innovation_towards_social_purpose_business_september_2008.pdf)
- Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions, and organizations across nations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Horacio-Morales (2009), *A call for people's development: selected speeches from 1986-89*. National Council of Churches in the Philippines. National Council of Churches in the Philippines, 1990. University of Michigan, 2009, ISBN 971854853X, 9789718548530,182
- Hülsheger, U. R., Anderson, N., & Salgado, J. F. 2009. Team-level predictors of innovation at work: A comprehensive meta-analysis spanning three decades of research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94: 1128-1145.
- IBM Corporation. (2010). *Capitalizing on complexity* (pdf edition), Retrieved from [http:// public.dhe.ibm.com/common/ssi/ecm/en/gbe03297user/GBE03297USEN.PDF](http://public.dhe.ibm.com/common/ssi/ecm/en/gbe03297user/GBE03297USEN.PDF)
- ICA (2013), "Blue Print for a Co-operative Decade," (Available at [http:// ica.coop/sites/default/files/media_items/ICA%20Blueprint%20-%20Final%20-%20Feb%2013%20EN.pdf/](http://ica.coop/sites/default/files/media_items/ICA%20Blueprint%20-%20Final%20-%20Feb%2013%20EN.pdf/), accessed on 22nd March, 2014).
- Illia, L.; Romenti, S. & Zyglidopoulos, S. (2010). *CSR Communication. Exploring European cross-national differences and tendencies*. IE School of communication.
- ILO (2014), *Cooperatives and Sustainable Development: Analysis of Cooperative Voices and Sustainable Development Survey Report*
- International Co-operative Alliance (2012). *Global 300 Re-port2010: The world's major co-operatives and mutual businesses* (Available at

http://www.aciamericas.coop/IMG/pdf/global300_report2011.pdf.

- Janssen, O. (2005). The joint impact of perceived influence and supervisor supportiveness on employee innovative behaviour. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 78, 573-579.
- Jiang, X. How to Motivate People Work in Teams. (2010) *International Journal of Business and Management* Vol. 5, No. 10; October 2010 Published by Canadian Center of Science and Education
- Jin, P. (1993). Work Motivation and Productivity in Voluntarily Formed Work Teams: A Field Study in China. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 54, pp. 133-155.
- Jussila, I., Byrne, N., Tuominen, H. (2012). Affective Commitment in Cooperative Organizations: What Makes Members Want to Stay? *International Business Research*, vol 5, no. 10, 1
- Kantz, R., & James, W. M. (2005). HRM and Innovation. *Reinvesting Human Resource Management: Challenges and new Directions*, 259-262. Psychology Press.
- Krotz, J.L. (2003). Reward Your Employees for Teamwork in 2003. *Marketing Intelligence*.
- Kuenzi, M., & Schminke, M. (2009). Assembling the fragments into a lens: A review, critique, and proposed research agenda for the organizational work climate literature. *Journal of Management*, 35, 634-717.
- Laschinger, H.K.S, Wilk, P, Cho, J. & Greco, P. (2009). Empowerment, engagement and perceived effectiveness in nursing work environments: does experience matter? *Journal of Nursing Management*, 17, 636-646.
- Lingteringen, E. & Zadek, S. (2005). The Future of Corporate Responsibility Codes, Standards and Frameworks. Executive Briefing. GRI and AccountAbility, 4.
- Madrid, E. et al (2013) Managers' risk taking behavior and innovation performance: the mediating influence of employees' perceived risk taking climate Maletič, M.; Maletič, D.; Jens J. Dahlggaard, Su Mi, D; Gomišček, B, (2014) The Relationship between Sustainability- Oriented Innovation Practices and Organizational Performance: Empirical Evidence from Slovenian Organizations Organizacija, Volume 47 Research papers Number 1, February 2014
- March, Rocehelle (2016) Cultivating Purpose: Sustainability Innovation and Employee Engagement
- Maughan C. (2012). Monitoring and evaluating social impacts in Australia. CRC-REP Working Paper CW003. Ninti One Limited, Alice Springs
- McElroy M, Jorna RJ, van Engelen J. (2007), Sustainability Quotients and the Social Footprint, John Wiley and Sons Ltd and The European Research Press Ltd
- Mellor, John (2009), New Challenges and Opportunities In Low- and Middle-Income Countries Measurements for tracking Indicators of Cooperative success (metrics) Measuring Cooperative Success. United States Overseas Cooperative Development Council. United States Agency for International Development
- Neves, Pedro and Robert Eisenberger. (2014). "Perceived Organizational Support and Risk Taking." *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 29(2), 5-5
- Newman, P., & Jennings, I. (2008). *Cities as sustainable ecosystems: Principles and practices*. Washington, D.C: Island Press.
- Ng, T. W. H., & Feldman, D. C. (2012). A comparison of self-ratings and non-self-report measures of employee creativity. *Human Relations*, 65: 1021-1047.
- Ng, T. W. H., Feldman, D. C., & Lam, S. S. K. (2010). Psychological contract breaches, organizational commitment, and innovation-related behaviors: A latent growth modeling approach. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 95: 744-751.
- Perry-Smith, J. (2006). Social yet creative: The role of social relationships in facilitating individual creativity. *Academy of Management Journal*, 49: 85-101.
- Quratul-Ain Manzoor (2011) Impact of Employees Motivation on Organizational Effectiveness Dep. of Management Sciences, The Islamia University of Bahawalpur, Bahawalpur, Pakistan'
- Quilloy, K.P. (2015) Empowering Small Farmers through Cooperative: The Success Story of Subasta Integrated Farmers Multi-Purpose Cooperative." *International Review of Management and Business Research* 4(1): 361-375
- Radu, Maria. (2015) Empirical Study on the Indicators of Sustainable Performance –The Sustainability Balanced Scorecard, Effect of Strategic Organizational Change Academy Of Economic Studies, Bucharest, Romania
- Schwettmann J(2014), The Role of Cooperative in Achieving the Sustainable Development Goals –the economic dimension; UN DESA Expert Group Meeting and Workshop on Cooperatives, Nairobi, Kenya 8-10 Dec 2014, pp 1.
- Scott, J., Shields, C., Gardner, J., Hancock, A. and Nutt, A. (2011) Student Engagement with Feedback. *Bioscience Education e-Journal*, Vol.18, [Online]. Accessible at: <http://www.bioscience.heacademy.ac.uk/journal/vol18/beej-18-5SE.aspx>
- Sejjaaka, S., Mindra, R., & Nseroko, I. (2015). Leadership Traits and Business Sustainability in Ugandan SMEs: A Qualitative Analysis. *International Journal of Management Science and Business Administration*. 1. 42-57. 10.18775/ijmsba.1849-5664-5419.2014.16.1004.
- Sen, A Amartya, (2002), Why health equity?. *Health Econ.*, 11: 659-666. doi:10.1002/hec.762
- Sibal, J.V.(2011). A Century of the Philippine cooperative movement. Retrieved from <http://www.uwcc.wisc.edu/info/abroad/sibal.html>
- Siebenhuner, B. & Anold, M. (2007). Organizational learning to manage sustainable Development. *Business Strategy and the Environment*, 16, 339-353, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/bse.579>
- Spender, J.C., & Strong, B. (2010, August 23). Employees hold the key to innovation. *The Wall Street Journal*, p. I1.
- Steinberg L. (2008) A social neuroscience perspective on adolescent risk-taking. *Developmental Review* 2008 [PMC free article] [PubMed]
- Thum, M (2013) Do you know your personal values? *Personal Development*. <http://www.myrkothum.com/personal-values/>
- Ulus, M and Hatipoglu, B (2016). Human Aspect as a Critical Factor for Organization Sustainability in the Tourism Industry. Department of Tourism Administration, Boğaziçi University, Bebek/Istanbul 34342, Turkey; Published: 2 March 2016
- Urbach, T., Fay, D. and Goral, A. (2010) Extending the Job Design Perspective on Individual Innovation: Exploring the Effect of Group Reflexivity. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 83(4), 1053-1064.
- Windolph SE, Harms D, Schaltegger S (2013) Motivations for corporate sustainability management: contrasting survey results and implementation. *Corporate Social Responsibility Environ Management*
- Yuan, F., & Woodman, R. W. (2010). Innovative behavior in the workplace: The role of performance and image outcome expectations. *Academy of Management Journal*, 53: 323-342.
- Zhou, J., Shin, S. J., Brass, D. J., Choi, J., & Zhang, Z. (2009). Social networks, personal values, and creativity: Evidence for curvilinear and interaction effects. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94: 1544-1552.