International Journal of Innovation Scientific Research and Review
Vol. 03, Issue, 05, pp.1167-1175, May, 2021
Available online at http://www.journalijisr.com

IJISRR

Research Article

ISSN: 2582-6131

THE IMPACT OF RESOURCES ON MULTI-PURPOSE COOPERATIVE SUSTAINABILITY

*** Daryl Jane Agbayani-Caballero**

College of Business and Management, Central Mindanao University, Musuan, Maramag, Bukidnon, Philippines 8710.

Received 11th March 2021; Accepted 12th April 2021; Published online 10th May 2021

ABSTRACT

Organizational sustainability appears to be the end-goal among organizations which includes the cooperative industry. They are exploring means to guarantee that their organizations will last long to continually provide them their needs and assist them increase their income. This industry 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 influence of resources 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 resources have significant impact on the sustainability of multi-purpose cooperatives. Limitations of this study include the utilized indicators of resources which are; challenge, idea time, idea support, and dynamism that were solely assessed by conveniently selected cooperative officers of Bukidnon. Over-all the study concludes that if multi-purpose cooperatives provide sufficient resources in terms of challenge, idea support, and dynamism to the officers, economic sustainability will be possibly realized.

Keywords: Sustainability, Resources, Idea Time, Idea Support, Challenge, Dynamism.

INTRODUCTION

Rationale

Numerous challenges faced by organizations nowadays are evidently brought about by the changing and unpredictable environment the organizations are in which ranges from the 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.

One of the current objectives of organizations is to promote sustainability, so as to create favorable conditions, to guarantee the responsible behavior and to employ 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 grassroots, 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, alegal environment with sensible regulation is needed to protect democratic member control, autonomy, and voluntary membership (Alldred, 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,

***Corresponding Author: Daryl Jane Agbayani-Caballero,**
College of Business and Management, Central Mindanao University, Musuan, Maramag, Bukidnon, Philippines 8710.

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.

Theoretical and Conceptual Framework

The proposition of this study concerning sustainability is supported by 4 models; Qualitative Model of Sustainable Leadership by Sejjaaka, et al. (2015), 360 degrees Organizational Sustainability Model of Hollingsworth (2009), 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 Sejjaaka, et al. (2015) suggests five essential contributory factors for sustainable business. The factors include social capital, personal value, resourcefulness, resilience, and strategic flexibility. Personal value is linked to resources. Ekvall (1996) emphasized in his study that indicators under resources include being happy with one's role, having enough time to think and discuss ideas, and being supported by his ideas. Resilience and strategic flexibility can also be linked to resources which contain the level of dynamism one can get as its indicator (Ekvall, 1996). Dynamism can be accordingly measured through the openness to change and the success in living with it and implementing it. The 360 degrees Organizational Sustainability Model of Hollingsworth (2009) emphasizes four different inter-related resources to determine sustainability which includes; the organization itself, human resources, community, and the environment. For an organization, the reality is that if any of the other three resources are not truly sustainable, neither is the organization. This model as well highlights employees' skills, attitude, ambition, new roles and responsibilities as essential keys. Specifically, this theory raises vital aspects such as the development of human resource, wellness or work-life balance in the organization, attainable ambitions of the people, desirable communities, neutral environment, and economic value generation. Furthermore, it stresses strong and influential vision, shared value system, and strategic plan. The Wheel of Change Model to Sustainability by Doppelt (2010) underscores 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. 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; Caraiani 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; Caraiani 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 (Caraiani 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; Caraianiet 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-Gonzálezet 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 Resources. In organizations, having the right resources in quantity and quality must be ensured to support its activities. Furthermore, resources play very significant roles in the aspect of innovation, productivity, competitiveness, and sustainability. Sufficient supply of these will promote and sustain the innovative activities at all levels in the organizations (Alves et al., 2007; Quiloy,2015).Many studies were already conducted to verify the role of resources in organizational innovation. In reality, innovation cannot begin without resources (Choi & Chang, 2009; Hargadon & Bechky, 2006; Srivastava & Gnyawali, 2011). Resources include mainly the four Ms such as; man, materials, machines, money and related addition such as; time, relevant information, technology and the availability of training. The resources in this study are composed of the variables; idea time, idea support, challenge, and dynamism. These factors amplify creativity ensuring the overwhelming amount contribution to the sustainability of an organization. To abridge, resources have enormous impact on any organization and many researchers confirmed this notion (Hargadon & Bechky, 2006; Srivastava & Gnyawali, 2011; Wong et al., 2007). To survive for longer period of time, networks among the organization play vital role to share resources and expertise with (Stewart & Fenn, 2006; Alves et al.,2007).These researches carry within them varying information about resources; in terms of availability (Choi & Chang, 2009; Choi et al., 2009, Choi, & Price, 2005),exchange (Hargadon & Bechky, 2006), diversity and quality (Srivastava & Gnyawali, 2011), and even the sagging ones in the context of innovation. Adequate resources will promote creativity and innovation among organizations (Latham and Braun, 2009; Alves et al., 2007). Time is a significant factor under resources that have an impact on the organization. It should be spent on discussions and thinking to encourage more creative outputs (Porzse et al., 2012; Girotra et al., 2010; Ekvall, 1996;). Time management influence performance (Porzse, et. al., 2012; Basaket al., 2008; Efil, 2007; Eldeleklioglu, 2008). Its aim is not to increase a limited time but to increase the quality of the activities carried out in the limited time (Erdem et al., 2005). Challenge is another factor under resources that influence organizational undertakings. It is the emotional involvement of the members in its vision, mission, and activities (Porzseet al., 2012; Ekvall, 1996) thus the clarity of these three is essential in commitment. Idea Support is also an indispensable factor under resources since it extremely affects the organization (Axelsson and Sardari 2011). Organizations should develop policies and programs if they want to be successful in innovating (Kantz & James, 2005; Yuan & Zhou, 2008). Participation in decision making and support for innovation emerged as the most influential predictors of implementation.

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 resources in terms of Challenge, Idea Time, Idea Support, Dynamism among multi-purpose cooperatives;
2. The level of Sustainability among multi-purpose cooperatives in terms of Economic, Social, and Environmental; and
3. The impact of Resources on the Sustainability of Multi-purpose Cooperatives

METHODOLOGY

Research Setting

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.

Research Design

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 used 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.

Table 1. Number of Multi-purpose Cooperatives in Bukidnon and sample size per district

District	Municipality	Multi-purpose Coops	No. of officers	Sample per municipality/ city	total sample size per district
Distict 1 (6 cities/ municipalities)	Baungon	5	100	14	129
	Libona	9	180	17	
	Malitbog	2	40	4	
	Manolo	10	200	40	
	Talakag	6	120	18	
	Sumilao	5	100	36	
	total	37	740		
District 2 (5 cities/ municipalities)	Cabanglasan	2	40	11	145
	Impasug-ong	6	120	36	
	Lantapan	5	100	23	
	Malaybalay	23	460	48	
	San Fernando	4	80	27	
	total	40	800		
District 3 (8 cities/ municipalities)	Damulog	1	20	4	262
	Dangcagan	0	0	0	
	Don Carlos	9	180	33	
	Kadingilan	6	120	8	
	Kibawe	11	220	50	
	Kitaotao	4	80	4	
	Maramag	14	280	72	
	Quezon	21	420	91	
	total	66	1,320		
District 4 (3 cities/ municipalities)	Kalilangan	7	140	28	105
	Pangantucan	7	140	21	
	Valencia	16	320	56	
	total	30	600		
TOTAL (all districts)		173	3,460		641

Research Instruments

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

Statistical Technique

The researcher sought the expertise of a professional statistician throughout the analysis of the data with the use of statistical software to organize data and calculate the descriptive and inferential statistics. Descriptive statistics such as mean, standard deviation, and frequency were used to describe and determine the extent of Resources and Sustainability. Stepwise multiple regressions were utilized to assess the impact of resources on the sustainability of multi-purpose cooperatives.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Table 2 provides the data on the extent of resources among multi-purpose cooperatives in terms of challenge

Table 2. Frequency, Percentage, and Mean Distribution of the extent of resources among multi-purpose cooperatives as perceived by the cooperative officers (Challenge)

Range	Responses	Frequency	Percentage
4.51-5.00	5 - Very Large extent	157	24.49
3.51-4.50	4 - Large extent	328	51.17
2.51-3.50	3 - Moderate extent	150	23.35
1.51-2.50	2 - Little extent	4	0.68
1.00-1.50	1- None	2	0.31
Total		641	100

Overall Mean : 3.99
Description : often times practiced

Indicators	Mean	Description
1. I am happy with my role in our cooperative.	4.03	often practiced
2. I want to stay long in our organization.	3.87	often practiced
3. I understand our vision & mission and I'm willing to take part in attaining it.	4.06	often practiced

Results show that more than 24% of the cooperative officers feel the challenge to a very large extent. More than 51% of the officers feel the challenge to a large extent. More than 23% of them feel the challenge to a moderate extent. .68% of the officers feel the challenge to a little extent and .31% of them did not feel the any challenge at all. The overall mean of the responses of this variable under resource is 3.99 which implies that the cooperative officers of Bukidnon oftentimes feel the challenge. Table 3 furnishes the data on the extent of resources among multi-purpose cooperatives in terms of idea time.

Table 3 Frequency, Percentage, and Mean Distribution of the extent of resources among multi-purpose cooperatives as perceived by the cooperative officers (Idea time)

Range	Responses	Frequency	Percentage
4.51-5.00	5 - Very Large extent	104	16.15
3.51-4.50	4 - Large extent	213	33.23
2.51-3.50	3 - Moderate extent	294	45.87
1.51-2.50	2 - Little extent	30	4.68
1.00-1.50	1- None	1	0.08
Total		641	100

Overall Mean : 3.61
Description : often practiced

Indicators	Mean	Description
1. We are given enough time to think for ideas and suggestions.	3.62	often practiced
2. We are given enough time to discuss our ideas and suggestions.	3.59	often practiced

Results show that more than 16% of the cooperative officers experienced the provision of ideal time to a very large extent. More than 33% of the officers experienced the provision of ideal time to a large extent. Almost 46% of them experienced the provision of ideal time to a moderate extent. Almost 5% of the officers experienced the provision of ideal time to a little extent and 0.08% of them did not

experience the provision of idea time at all. The overall mean of the responses of this variable under resource is 3.61 which implies that the officers of Multi-purpose Cooperatives of Bukidnon oftentimes experience the provision of idea time. Table 4 furnishes the data on the extent of resources among multi-purpose cooperatives as in terms of idea support.

Table 4 Frequency, Percentage, and Mean Distribution of the extent of resources among multi-purpose cooperatives as perceived by the cooperative officers(Idea support)

Range	Responses	Frequency	Percentage
4.51-5.00	5 - Very Large extent	73	11.35
3.51-4.50	4 - Large extent	209	32.53
2.51-3.50	3 - Moderate extent	260	40.56
1.51-2.50	2 - Little extent	94	14.66
1.00-1.50	1- None	6	0.90
Total		641	100

Overall Mean : 3.39
Description : sometimes practiced only

Indicators	Mean	Description
1. Material Resources are provided to support ideas and suggestions.	3.55	often practiced
2. Financial Resources are provided to support ideas and suggestions.	3.47	Sometimes practiced
3. Manpower resources are provided to support ideas and suggestions.	3.27	sometimes practiced
4. Policies are implemented and procedures are in placed to support ideas and suggestions.	3.26	sometimes practiced

Results show that more than 11% of the cooperative officers acknowledged that their ideas were supported to a very large extent. Almost 33% of the officers acknowledged that their ideas were supported to a large extent. Almost 41% of them acknowledged that their ideas were supported to a moderate extent. Almost 15% of the officers acknowledged that their ideas were supported to a little extent. and 0.90% of them acknowledged that their ideas were not supported. The overall mean of the responses of this variable under resource is 3.39 which imply that only sometimes the officers of Multi-purpose cooperatives of Bukidnon experience the provision of idea support. Table 5 furnishes the data on the extent of resources among multi-purpose cooperatives in terms of dynamism.

Table 5 Frequency, Percentage, and Mean Distribution of the extent of resources among multi-purpose cooperatives as perceived by the cooperative officers (Dynamism)

Range	Responses	Frequency	Percentage
4.51-5.00	5 - Very Large extent	93	14.56
3.51-4.50	4 - Large extent	253	39.52
2.51-3.50	3 - Moderate extent	257	40.09
1.51-2.50	2 - Little extent	32	4.94
1.00-1.50	1- None	6	0.88
Total		641	100

Overall Mean : 3.62
Description : often practiced

Indicators	Mean	Description
1. People in the organization are open to change.	3.76	often practiced
2. The organization is successful in managing /implementing change.	3.50	sometimes practiced
3. There are lots of beautiful happenings and experiences in our organization.	3.59	often practiced

Results show that almost 15% of the cooperative officers contained dynamism to a very large extent. Almost 40% of the officers contained dynamism to a large extent. More than 40% of them contained dynamism to a moderate extent. Almost 5% of the officers contained dynamism to a little extent. And 0.88% of them perceived that they do not contain any dynamism. The overall mean of the responses under resource is 3.61 which mean that oftentimes the cooperative officers of Bukidnon feel the dynamism. Table 6 provides the data on the level of sustainability among multi-purpose cooperatives in terms of Economic.

Table 6. Frequency, Percentage, and Mean Distribution of the level of sustainability among multi-purpose cooperatives as perceived by the cooperative officers (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

Indicators The cooperative I am in . .	Mean	Description
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

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. Table 7 provides the data on the level of sustainability among multi-purpose cooperatives in terms of Social.

Table 7 Frequency, Percentage, and Mean Distribution of the level of sustainability among multi-purpose cooperatives as perceived by the cooperative officers (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

Indicators The cooperative I am in . . .	Mean	Description
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

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. Table 8 provides the data on the level of sustainability among multi-purpose cooperatives in terms of Social.

Table 8. Frequency, Percentage, and Mean Distribution of the level of sustainability among multi-purpose cooperatives as perceived by the cooperative officers (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

Indicators The cooperative I am in . . .	Mean	Description
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

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. Table 9 presents the stepwise multiple stepwise regression analysis of Resources and Sustainability. As analyzed, Resources has a significant impact on Sustainability. Majority of its variables were analyzed to be predictors.

Table 9. Multiple stepwise regression analysis of Resources and Sustainability

Coefficients

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std Error	Beta		
(Constant)	.350	.109		3.219	.001
RE_CHA	.207	.033	.196	6.226	.000
RE_SUP	.100	.032	.118	3.175	.002
RE_DYN	.074	.034	.077	2.177	.030

a. Dependent Variable: SUSTAINAB

R = .837	R^2 = .701	F = 211.726	Sig.0.000

An R2 of 70.1 % reflects the amount of variance explained by these three-factor 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. Several literatures support strong linkages of Sustainability to Resources. In organizations, having the right resources in quantity and quality must be ensured to support activities furthermore, plays a very significant role in the aspect of innovation, productivity, competitiveness, and sustainability. Furthermore, sufficient supply of these will promote and sustain the innovative activities at all levels in the organizations (Alves et al., 2007; Quiloy,2015). Many studies were already conducted to verify the role of resources in organizational innovation. In reality, innovation cannot

begin without resources (Choi & Chang, 2009; Hargadon & Bechky, 2006; Srivastava & Gnyawali, 2011). Resources include mainly the four Ms such as; man, materials, machines, money and other related additions such as; time, relevant information, technology and the availability of training. 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 resources 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

Resources has a significant impact on sustainability. Majority of the variables under Resources were analyzed to be predictors. These are challenge, idea support, and dynamism. This implies that when multi-purpose cooperatives strategize efforts to assure cooperative officers are provided with resources cooperatives have a strong possibility to be sustainable or will last long. Provision of resources include; letting them feel positively challenged and happy with their roles in the organization; supporting their ideas in terms of finances, material, manpower, and policies, as well as being open to change and successfully implementing it in the organization.

REFERENCES

Alldred, S. (2013) Co-operatives can play a key role in development. TheGuardian.https://www.theguardian.com/globaldevelopmentprofessionalsnetwork/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 Red fame Publishing URL: http://bms.redfame.com

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

Bollas-Araya, H., Segui-Mas, E., & Polo-Garrido, F. (2014). Sustainability reporting in European cooperative banks: An exploratory analysis. REVESCO Nº 115 -Segundo Cuatrimestre.

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

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.

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.

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

DFID, (2010), 'Working with Cooperatives for Poverty Reduction', Briefing Note, UK Department for International Development, Londonhttp://www.coop.ac.uk/wpcontent/uploads/2010/08/Cooperatives-Briefing-Note.pdf

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.

European Commission (2012) Women in economic decision-making in the EU: progress report. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.

Gilson, L. L. (2008). Why be creative: A review of the practical outcomes associated with creativity at the individual, group and organizational levels. In J. Zhou & C. E. Shalley (Eds.), Handbook of organizational creativity (pp. 303-322). New York: Erlbaum.

Hall J, Wagner M. 2012. Integrating sustainability into firms' processes: performance effects and the moderating role of business models and innovation. Business Strategy and the Environment 21(3): 183–196.

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

Hollingsworth, (2009) Building 360 Organizational Sustainability. Journal of US-China. Public Administration, August 2015, Vol. 12, No. 8, 627-634 doi: 10.17265/1548-6591/2015.08.004

Hsu, M. L., & Fan, H-L. (2010). Organizational innovation climate and creative outcomes: Exploring the moderating effect of time pressure. Creativity Research Journal, 22, 378-386.

Hurren, Kevin (2015). The Unexpected Benefits of Political Correctedness in Creative Workplaces. http://nbs.net/knowledge/the-theory-of-creativity/

International Cooperative Alliance (2013), "Blue Print for a Co-operative Decade," http://ica.coop/sites/default/files/media_items/ICA%20Blueprint%20-%20Final%20-%20Feb%2013%20EN.pdf/, accessed on 22nd March, 2014).

International Co-operative Alliance (2012), Global 300 Re-port2010: The world's major co-operatives and mutual businesses. http://www.aciamericas.coop/IMG/pdf/global300_report2011.pdf

Jansen, J. J., Van Den Bosch, F. A., & Volberda, H. W. (2006). Exploratory innovation, exploitative innovation, and performance: Effects of organizational antecedents and environmental moderators. Management Science, 52, 1661-1674.

Klewitz, J. & Hansen, E.G. (2013). Sustainability-oriented innovation of SMEs: a systematic review. Journal of Cleaner Production, http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2013.07.017

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.

Olughor, R.J. (2015), Effect of Innovation on the Performance of SMEs Organizations in Nigeria, Management, Vol. 5 No. 3, 2015, pp. 90-95. doi: 10.5923/j.mm.20150503.02.

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

Salzmann, O., Ionescu-Somers, A. & Steger, U. (2005). The Business Case for Corporate Sustainability: Literature Review and Research Options. European Management Journal, 23(1), 27–36, http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.emj.2004.12.007

Schaltegger, S.; Lüdeke-Freund, F. & Hansen, E. (2016): Business Models for Sustainability: A Co-Evolutionary Analysis of Sustainable Entrepreneurship, Innovation, and Transformation, Organization & Environment, Vol. 29, No. 3, 264-289.

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.

Sibal, J.V.(2011). A Century of the Philippine cooperative movement. Retrieved from http://www.uwcc.wisc.edu/info/abroad/sibal.html

Wagner, M. (2010). The role of corporate sustainability performance for economic performance: A firm-level analysis of moderation effects. *Ecological Economics*, 69, 1553–1560, Public Administration, China University of Geosciences, Wuhan 430074, China

Zhou, J., & Shalley, C. E. (2010). Deepening our understanding of creativity in the workplace: A review of different approaches to creativity research. In S. Zedeck (Ed.), *APA Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology*, 1: 275-302.

****