

Management Practices of Multipurpose Cooperatives Operating in a Philippine Province

Asia Pacific Journal of
Multidisciplinary Research
Vol. 8 No.1, 16-26
February 2020
P-ISSN 2350-7756
E-ISSN 2350-8442
www.apjmr.com
ASEAN Citation Index

Melvin S. Sarsale¹, Dennis Anthony A. Kilongkilong²

¹Southern Leyte State University, Philippines

²University of San Jose-Recoletos, Philippines

¹melvin.sarsale@yahoo.com, ²dak_723@yahoo.com

Date Received: May 15, 2019; Date Revised: February 5, 2020

Abstract – Cooperatives had created business activities that contributed to the economic well-being of rural communities, however, only few continue to remain active and operating as some cooperatives were being closed or dissolved. In this paper, management practices of multipurpose cooperatives operating in a Philippine province using these dimensions, strategy, execution, culture, structure, talent, leadership, innovation and strategic linkages and partnerships were assessed. Descriptive research design was used. Only 6 out of 42 multipurpose cooperatives were chosen using clustered sampling. A total of 157 out of 184 (85%) respondents had participated in this study using a validated researched-made questionnaire. Findings revealed that small cooperatives had better manifestation of strategy, culture and structure in their practices than medium and large cooperatives. Strategy and execution and talent and innovation showed a very high relationship which clearly depicts that good execution requires good strategy and innovation needs great talent. Generally, small cooperatives had greater manifestation of all management dimensions in their practices than the rest of the cooperatives which may imply that small cooperatives had manifested the essential management practices in order to sustain business success. It is recommended that medium and large cooperatives should reexamine their existing practices particularly in managing talent, innovation and strategic linkages and partnerships so as to improve their business performance.

Keywords – execution, innovation, strategic linkages and partnerships, strategy, talent

INTRODUCTION

Cooperative's diversified activities covering almost all sectors had generated huge employment and contribution to world economy [1]. The presence of cooperatives increases business activities in some rural communities. However, the business environment that most of cooperatives established is far way different from of today. With significant changes in the business climate, some thrive while others fail. Some cooperatives cope with while there are some find closure as the best option.

According to the 2009 report of Cooperative Development Authority (CDA) and Department of Finance, only 23,836 of the 78,611 total registered cooperatives are operating which means a large number of cooperatives or equivalent to 70% remain unviable [2]. This also happens in Eastern Visayas where 347 out 809 or 43% were delisted and not operating as of September, 2016. In Southern Leyte, CDA reported that from almost 200 cooperatives listed in 1990 to 2015, only 96 remained active of which 28 were non-operational and 8 were dissolved. In this context, only

significant few survived and have proven their resilience to crisis over time [3].

A number of literature highlighted some problems such as lack of education and training, insufficiency and mismanagement of resources, inadequate volume of business and limited market due to stiff competition, members' inactive participation and delinquency, lack of government support, inadequate strategies, weak service delivery, organizational program sustainability and external relations as the reasons behind cooperative dissolution [2]-[8]. In summary, there were problems on management practices that led cooperative's performance in jeopardy. Studies evaluating performance of cooperatives in the Philippines had been conducted including their successes and failures as well as the reasons behind. However, only few studies focused on management practices and centered mostly on private companies.

Meanwhile, this study was anchored on the concept advanced by Nohria, Joyce and Roberson [9] that identifies essential management practices in order to sustain business performance. High-performing companies ought to master good management practices

in order to sustain profitable growth [10]. Stadler and Waltermann [11] suggested that there were certain factors that successful firms typically manifested such as efficient management of resources and learning processes, product diversification and effective risk and change management and financial policies.

As forwarded by Nohria, Joyce and Roberson [9], exemplary performance can be achieved and sustained if firms can excel four essential management practices, namely: 1.) strategy, 2.) execution, 3.) culture and 4.) structure, and also must exhibit excellence at least two of the four secondary dimensions which include: 5.) talent, 6.) leadership, 7.) innovation and 8.) mergers and partnerships. However, strategic linkages and partnerships, instead of mergers and partnerships will be used as this fits more to cooperatives.

Strategy. A well-defined strategy will thrive if it is clearly conversed and understood by the stakeholders [9]. It is anchored with a deep awareness of its clients and its capacity so as to be responsive to disruptions in the marketplace. A bold but doable strategy helps leaders to master both strategy and execution [12]. It describes how resources will be allocated to each planned activities for the realization of companies' goals and objectives [13]. It contains a distinct set of options that describe firm's actions [14].

Execution. Successful firms involve everyone in executing business strategies regardless of their roles along the process [15]. Leader's actions must be aligned with company's strategy with proper coordination to other employees at different organizational levels [16]. Consistently meeting customer's demand, streamlining processes to eliminate non-value adding activities thereby improving productivity, and empowering frontline services are very essential in attaining and keeping smooth execution.

Culture. Daft [13] wrote in his book that underlying beliefs, common understandings, core values and norms shared among employees constitute organization's culture that holds people in the organization together. High performance culture simply depicts how things should be excellently done in companies [17]. A customer and result oriented business culture stimulate every employee to always act at their best and errors and mistakes are used as source for learning and improvement purposes [10].

Structure. Organizational success is closely linked to its structure along with the efficient and effective distribution of responsibilities among its people [18]. Companies having defined structure encourage total productivity as employees will work well as

responsibilities are clearly laid-out [19]. Winning companies have simple structures and processes that avoid unnecessary bureaucracy. Organizational structure is based on processes that create most important value to customers [11]. Best people are in placed closest to the action. A good structure promotes cooperation and exchange of information throughout the organization.

Talent. Companies need great talents in realizing its vision [20]. These companies may have high rate of employee retention if they provide appealing compensation packages and challenging roles [21]. Firms must put importance in establishing training programs that will attract, keep and develop potential employees at all levels [11]. Moreover, keeping talents is crucially vital in all organizations mainly because employee turnover is costly and usually performing personnel fuel positive business results [22].

Leadership. A leader must foster a culture that stimulates innovation and individual creativity [23]. An effective leader provides guidance and shares knowledge to employees leading towards better performance [24]. Effective, conscious and authentic leadership is directly related to corporate performance and employees' commitment [25]. Leadership has an important contribution to cooperative sustainability [26].

Innovation. Innovativeness is not only limited to value creation but also include adoption of new means of doing business, strengthening organizational relations, and responsiveness to changing business climate [27]. To be competitive is to be innovative [28]. Moreover, innovation is essential in exploiting new opportunities and gaining competitive advantage [29].

Strategic Linkages & Partnerships. Successful cooperatives adopt a network and systems approach in advancing good governance and in seeking training opportunities [30]. Establishing strategic coalitions is not anymore, an option but a necessary in various industries [31]. Firms must constantly assess numerous prospects for strategic alliances to advance its business interests and to enhance its productivity and profitability [32].

A literature review on the application of these essential management practices among cooperatives was very limited. In fact, several authors used different dimensions of management practices in their studies as there is no overarching set of management practices that fits all firms [33] as these are more firm-specific as influenced by its existing situation [34]. A related study on cooperative's management practices made by Barad [35] revealed that some approaches were found to be traditional compared to private companies. Profit firms

regarded the importance of management practices in attaining success [36].

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

This study was conducted to assess the extent of manifestation of management practices of multipurpose cooperatives using these dimensions, namely, strategy, execution, culture, structure, talent, leadership, innovation and strategic linkages and partnerships. It aimed to describe the difference on the perception between management and staff on these management dimensions. It also aimed to establish the relations between and among these dimensions.

METHODS

Research Environment

This study was conducted among 42 active and operational multipurpose cooperatives in Southern Leyte, Philippines clustered based on its asset size into large cooperatives (above ₱15 million), medium cooperatives (₱2 million up to ₱15 million) and small cooperatives (below ₱2 million). To get the required estimates at the desired level of accuracy with the given resources, only top 2 per cluster were selected.

Research Respondents

There were two groups of respondents for this study: the management and staff. There were a total of 157 out of 184 respondents who actually participated in the survey which was equivalent to 85.33% of the total population of which 76 respondents came from the management and 81 from the staff. The management was composed of the board of directors (BOD), committee chairs, and managers while the staff were the rank and file employees excluding those whose functions were janitorial and general services in nature.

Research Instrument

The management survey research instrument, a validated researcher-made questionnaire, was utilized coupled with unstructured interviews among some of the respondents for the purpose of clarifying their responses or answering their queries regarding certain aspects of the questionnaire. This instrument which has eight dimensions, namely: strategy, execution, culture, structure, leadership, innovation, talent and strategic linkages and partnerships, was formulated to assess the extent of management practices employed by the cooperatives. Each dimension was composed of 8 indicators. Corresponding to each indicator were qualitative scales which corresponded to the following interpretations: 4= Very Great Extent (VGE), 3= Great

Extent (GE), 2= Moderate Extent (ME), 1= Not Practiced (NP).

Dry Run Procedure

In order to determine the functionality of the questionnaire as the main instrument of data collection, the researcher conducted a dry-run among employees in a cooperative that was not included in the actual study. The data gathered were tested for reliability and internal consistency using Cronbach's Alpha [37]-[38] with a result of 0.962 which shows high level of internal consistency of the indicators for a given factor and consequently, the instrument was refined for administration.

Data Collection Technique

With permission from the cooperative managers, the questionnaire attached with a letter explaining the nature and purpose of each set of questions was administered to the respondents. The researcher was present throughout the duration of accomplishment of the questionnaire by the respondents to answer whatever queries they may raise and to clarify some terms in the instruments whenever the need arises.

Data Analyses

Data from questionnaire were analyzed using weighted means to measure perceived scores of respondents' ratings on the extent of management practices along the enumerated dimensions. Mean rating for each indicator was obtained and interpreted as practiced to a very great extent ($\mu=3.26-4.00$), great extent ($\mu=2.51-3.25$), moderate extent ($\mu=1.76-2.50$) and not practiced ($\mu=1.00-1.75$). T-test was used to determine whether there exists a significant difference on the assessments made between two groups of respondents on the manifestation of management practices among cooperatives. Meanwhile, Pearson Correlation was used to determine the relationship between and among these dimensions.

Ethical Considerations

Ethical issues were properly considered in doing this research. Prior written permissions were sought from the regional director of the Cooperative Development Authority and the managers of the chosen cooperatives. Each questionnaire contains a letter enjoining for the active participation of the respondents at their own discretion. Anonymity, confidentiality and neutrality were always observed. Proper citations were done for all information and previous researches used in this study.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Manifestation of Management Practices

Table 1 highlights the extent of manifestation of management practices among cooperatives in Southern Leyte using the eight dimensions. However, the discussion on each dimension incorporates results of each indicator so as to facilitate more description about the manifestation of each dimension among cooperatives.

Strategy

The overall mean of 3.19 as presented in Table 1 obtained from the group average of 3.23 from large cooperative’s respondents, 2.98 from medium cooperative’s respondents and 3.37 from small cooperative’s respondents indicated that strategy was manifested to a great extent among cooperatives. These results corroborated to the conduct of annual strategic planning among the top level management ensuring that the cooperative’s actions were geared towards the achievement of its vision and mission and if they have really achieved their targets [39]. The regular meeting among and between management and staff of the cooperatives under studied served as a communication avenue for newly developed strategies and policies. Also, cooperatives manifested capabilities of doing business regardless of market conditions which clearly supported their resilience over time.

Large cooperatives strategies were primarily focused on expanding its horizon as clearly manifested in its financial capacity. Their capability to explore opportunities in the market was highly evident on its several satellite offices and branches capturing vast memberships. However, as these cooperatives expanded, the communication effectiveness is affected. This supports to the study of Hoffman, Hoek and Viscardi [40] which stated that as cooperative grows quickly, the distance between members and board rises and

might become unmanageable. On the other hand, medium cooperatives practiced only on a great extent most of the indicators under this dimension. This can be inferred that there were still areas under this dimension that were underexploited which means that the optimum result was not yet attained. This can be gleaned on the idea that cooperatives under this cluster were still on its developing stage as manifested on their level of capitalization and membership.

Small cooperatives highly manifested all indicators under this dimension except for its ability to conduct business operations regardless of market situations. This indicated that not at all times they can cope up with changes in business environment especially when there were certain factors that limited these cooperatives in adjusting to new situation particularly if it required lots of resources. These cooperatives have limited capitalization as shown in their financial position which supports that lack of managerial capital hinders the cooperative growth [41].

Execution

The data on the extent to which primary cooperatives manifest execution as management practice as reflected in Table 1 showed an overall mean of 3.15 derived from the group average of 3.16 from large cooperatives, 3.10 from medium cooperatives and 3.20 from small cooperatives interpreted as great extent.

Business organizations thrived by always creating a value to its customers. Without customers, businesses do not exist especially that cooperatives largely depends on active membership [42]. This philosophy is well understood by cooperatives as highly manifested in putting value on things that can delight their customers and in making efforts not to fail their customers. In cooperative setting, members were the owners and mostly the customers. Therefore, delighting the customers was same way as delighting the owners.

Table 1. Summative Manifestation of Management Practices

Dimensions	Large Cooperatives		Medium Cooperatives		Small Cooperatives		Item Average	Description	Standard Deviation
	Mean	Description	Mean	Description	Mean	Description			
Strategy	3.23	GE	2.98	GE	3.37	GE	3.19	GE	0.68
Execution	3.16	GE	3.10	GE	3.20	GE	3.15	GE	0.69
Culture	3.11	GE	3.06	GE	3.35	VGE	3.17	GE	0.70
Structure	3.06	GE	3.17	GE	3.34	VGE	3.19	GE	0.59
Talent	2.85	GE	2.87	GE	3.09	GE	2.94	GE	0.71
Leadership	3.00	GE	3.04	GE	3.18	GE	3.07	GE	0.71
Innovation	2.93	GE	2.97	GE	3.09	GE	3.00	GE	0.68
Strategic Linkages & Partnerships	2.95	GE	2.94	GE	3.14	GE	3.01	GE	0.68
Overall Mean and Description	3.04	GE	3.02	GE	3.22	GE	3.09	GE	

Legend: VGE – Very Great Extent; GE – Great Extent; ME – Moderate Extent; and NP – Not Practiced

It was then expected that cooperative members were well treated.

Most cooperatives under study offered lending services to the members at a rate higher than other lending institutions simply because of its higher operating costs [43]. This made its lending services less competitive that will eventually decrease for member's demand for loans [44]. The cooperatives' effort of striving to increase productivity twice as industry's average was not felt much as they were known to be member-focused and not industry-focused as majority of its annual budget focused more on its recurring operations to meet the needs of its customers. Decision making authorities among cooperatives were not within reach at all times especially in reacting quickly to changes in market condition especially that the board of directors and committees were not regularly around in the operations in which some of their functions demanded regular presence in the cooperative. Moreover, it can be inferred that frontline services were not totally empowered as there were some everyday decisions that needed to be sanctioned to the top management. Most of cooperative's work systems were still traditional and thus, eliminating all forms of excess and wastes were not upheld at all times. Being customer-oriented was common to all cooperatives.

Only small cooperatives consistently delivered products and services that meet customer's demand. This clearly suggested that these cooperatives were competitive in the kind of business they belong. It was apparent in their high interest rates for savings deposits compared to established commercial banks and other financial institutions. Although, their interest rates for loans were not that very competitive compare to other institutions, but still considered to be lowest among the cooperatives and even some of the banks within the province. Meanwhile, medium cooperatives do not uphold at all times their energy and resources in meeting the customer's demand which indicates that these cooperatives either have other compelling priorities or its resources could not warrant beyond their normal operating expenses.

Culture

Table 1 also shows the data on the extent of manifestation of culture among cooperatives. The factor mean of 3.17 derived from the clusters averages of 3.11, 3.06 and 3.35 which indicated that culture as one of the management practices among cooperatives was manifested with great extent.

Organizations can be characterized by their culture, the way it conducts their business, and the values shared among individuals across different organizational levels. In other words, culture somewhat sets the organizational standards. It is normal to every organization to get the best from their employees and to keep them enjoy at all times; however, the challenge remained on how effective these diverse employees responded of such kind of working environment. Having a customer-oriented culture was greatly manifested among the cooperatives as this is very much essential factor in achieving better performance [45]. It is common among cooperatives that they lacked programs that recognize employee's feats and even opportunities to use their talents. Furthermore, some of the cooperatives do not establish incentive program for exemplary employees and there were only rare occasions where employees can showcase their talents.

Rewarding employees based on their performance is not always practiced among cooperatives. This rewarding mechanism could have positive influence on employee's job satisfaction and job performance [46], however, was largely constrained to be implemented due to the availability of funds. Cooperatives have different cultures depending on the way how the top level management has set the tone for the organization. One thing common among them was their desires to have best employees remain loyal and effective at all times. However, winning companies have certain norms that will help the organization competitive in the business. Medium cooperatives employees still received their additional incentives even if performance target was not realized. This was contrary to what a winning company should practice which was to align rewards with performances.

Among the cooperatives under studied, only medium cooperatives do not uphold at all times a strong customer-oriented corporate culture. This can be gleaned on the number of employees they had vis-à-vis membership level in which some operational requirements are not met to have a very strong frontline services. Although small cooperatives have small number employees but they have also minimal daily customers and large cooperatives have huge number of employees to match to the number of daily customers. In other words, efficiency wise, both cooperatives have good support services in attending to the customer needs. However, due to economies of scale and large membership base, large cooperatives tend to have lower cost in delivering services to their members than smaller cooperatives [47].

Structure

The extent of how structure is manifested among cooperatives is also shown in Table 1. The factor average of 3.19 interpreted as great extent was derived from the cluster means of 3.06, 3.17 and 3.34.

Structure served as the foundation for organizational processes creating values for customers. A good structure is simple, and it promotes cooperation among workers. This was true to small cooperatives whose structure was not complex especially that their operations were not big enough requiring many units. Cooperation as well as sharing valuable information among employees is highly manifested among cooperatives which show good relationship among individuals within the organization. Based on table, the respondents viewed with great extent that their cooperatives were structured with consideration to processes that add customer values and according to the main customer segments. This result substantiates to the efforts of cooperatives of putting value on things that can delight their customers and not to fail them. There are cooperatives that do not totally empower their employees in making decisions although they are aware on the latest updates in the organization. This also validates to the previous result that decision making heavily relies to top level management but should interplay with other key stakeholders [48].

Talent

Table 1 also presents the data on the extent of how talent as management dimension was manifested among primary cooperatives which generated an overall average of 2.94 in this factor which means that management and staff perceived a great extent of manifestation of talent as one of the management practices among the cooperatives under studied.

Winning companies put premium in having best employees who will help in attaining its vision, mission and goals. Without this pool of talents, the organization will struggle. Firms must craft strategies to keep the talents they need. However, some cooperatives did not have upheld at all times a culture that attracts, keeps and develops new talents which corroborates that there were still areas of the human resource management system of the cooperatives seem to be lacking [49]. Some cooperatives experienced employee turnover especially that compensation outside the organization were more competitive and attractive. This poses great threat to cooperatives in maintaining and keeping the talent they needed in achieving the organizational goals and objectives.

Conversely, assigning supervisory and managerial jobs to high performing employees, designing tasks that will arouse interest among best performers and putting high value on potential employees were manifested to a great extent among the cooperatives. These indicators show the cooperatives' effort to retain employees who excelled in their respective jobs. These strategies valued high performing employees by boosting their morale and self-worth in the organization. Senior management active involvement in recruiting and developing talents and the provision of an effective reward system to high performing employees were not upheld most of the times among the clustered cooperatives. This means that these indicators were not totally practiced in some cooperatives under studied. Mamuye [21] stressed of proposing attractive benefits, giving exciting tasks and letting them to join in different areas of the company encourage employee retention. Moreover, aligning employee's values with the company values can also enhance in keeping great talents in the organization [50].

Leadership

As revealed in Table 1, the factor average of 3.07 based on the group averages of 3.00 from large cooperatives, 3.04 from medium cooperatives and 3.18 from small cooperatives, the cooperatives manifested leadership indicators to a great extent.

A strong leadership inspires unity and teamwork among the members and officers. Without reliable leaders, cooperatives will suffer leadership crisis that will eventually lead to failures and closures. The cooperatives have leaders who give room for self-management, who have a strong relationship with employees at all levels, who can seize opportunities before they become troublesome nightmares, who have good rapport with stakeholders and other agencies, who are devoted to the organization, who have the ability to build relationship with the people in the company and who show themselves as colleagues rather than managers. These indicators generally manifested to a great extent among the cooperatives. Without good leaders, survival of these cooperatives will be highly in questioned as leadership is one of the essential factors of cooperative's sustainability [51] emphasizing on their roles, commitment and dedication [29]. Moreover, the management are placed with the responsibility of the maximizing the value of the cooperatives [52]. Small cooperatives showed a very great extent manifestation on having leaders with good rapport with the stakeholders and other agencies and who presents themselves as fellow employees rather than masters. This result can be

attributed to the small size of these cooperatives which creates more opportunity to have a good rapport with other stakeholders as well as with its employees.

Innovation

As illustrated in Table 1, the results of the manifestation of innovation as one of the management practices among the chosen cooperatives which generated a factor mean of 3.00 computed from the weighted averages of 2.93, 2.97 and 3.09 from large, medium and small cooperatives respectively, the respondents perceived innovation as manifested to a great extent among the cooperatives under study.

In this era of global integration, innovation is not anymore an option but a must in order to keep abreast with the changing business climate. Cooperatives must uphold proactive action to respond the changing needs of the members as well as its playing field, more so, that innovation has a significant positive relationship with social performance [53]. The results from the indicators of this dimension clearly portrayed that the cooperatives have already embraced the innovation process but not as well-established as to other firms. This can be attributed to budgetary requirements of innovation especially in engaging technology advancements as well as on cooperative’s culture that focuses more on serving its members than on innovating and risk-taking [54].

On the other hand, small cooperatives show a very great extent in implementing planned innovations and in encouraging at all levels to make innovation. This can be attributed to having a small organization where most of the time an advantage especially in introducing changes as well as in monitoring those changes among the employees.

Strategic Linkages and Partnerships

Table 1 also portrays the result of the manifestation of strategic linkages and partnerships as one of the dimensions of management practices among the selected cooperatives. The factor mean of 3.01 is derived from the computed means of 2.95 for large cooperatives, 2.94 for

medium cooperatives and 3.14 for small cooperatives which means that the strategic linkages and partnerships was practiced in a great extent manner among the cooperatives.

Generally, findings from this dimension indicate that this was not yet fully maximized among the cooperatives. With the present trends especially among financial institutions where mergers were strategically pursued, this dimension must be taken advantage among cooperatives so as to advance the potential returns that can be generated through partnerships and linkages. They should widen their social links, reinforce business dealings, and build a rigorous business atmosphere [55]. Expansion platforms such as branching, collaboration, partnership, and community involvement are considered to be key strategies for longevity [26]. However, Centenaro and Laimer [56] found no relationship between cooperative’s involvements in a network to their performance.

T-test on the Extent of Manifestation of Management Practices

As presented in Table 2, there was no significant difference in the assessments made by management and staff in terms of strategy, execution and culture. This implies that both respondents have the same perception on the extent of employing these dimensions as management practice. However, in terms of structure, there showed a significant difference on the assessments made by two groups of respondents as indicated by its p-value of 0.023. This is because management rated the indicators of structure higher than staff which connotes that the awareness level of both management and staff differed in terms of structure as they viewed the existing practices differently.

Also, a significant difference was noted on the assessments made by both respondents on the indicators under talent showing a p-value of 0.001 which means highly significant. The management perceived talent as practiced to a very great extent while the staff viewed as practiced to a great extent.

Table 2. T-test on the Extent of Manifestation of Management Practices

Test Statistics	Strategy	Execution	Culture	Structure	Talent	Leadership	Innovation	Strategic Linkages & Partnerships
T	-0.010	0.421	1.778	2.305	3.406	3.368	2.691	4.012
p-value	0.992ns	0.675ns	0.077ns	0.023*	0.001**	0.001**	0.008**	0.000**

ns - not significant
 * - significant
 ** - highly significant

Table 3. Relationship between and among Management Dimensions

Management Dimensions	Strategy	Execution	Culture	Structure	Talent	Leadership	Innovation	Strategic Linkages & Partnerships
Strategy		.800**	.648**	.560**	.554**	.611**	.603**	.561**
Execution	.800**		.604**	.554**	.545**	.595**	.621**	.563**
Culture	.648**	.604**		.551**	.655**	.635**	.588**	.513**
Structure	.560**	.554**	.551**		.596**	.647**	.571**	.585**
Talent	.554**	.545**	.655**	.596**		.592**	.757**	.610**
Leadership	.611**	.595**	.635**	.647**	.592**		.631**	.619**
Innovation	.603**	.621**	.588**	.571**	.757**	.631**		.736**
Strategic Linkages & Partnerships	.561**	.563**	.513**	.585**	.610**	.619**	.736**	

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

This showed disparity on the existing practices of the cooperatives in terms of talent. This raised a question on the level of satisfaction of staff in terms of talent management of cooperatives. On the other hand, the management viewed leadership as practiced to a very great extent compare to the staff’s view which only practiced to a great extent. In this situation, their assessments were highly significantly different as shown in its p-value of 0.001. This implied that the management viewed the indicator as practiced higher than staff. In other words, this finding signaled that the expectation level of staff does not coincide with how management viewed it.

In terms of innovation, management responses were highly significantly different from staff as revealed in its p-value of 0.008. The management viewed it as practiced to a very great extent while staff viewed it as practiced to a great extent. In other words, the management rated the indicators higher than staff. Lastly, both types of respondents showed significant difference on their assessments on the extent of employing strategic linkages and partnerships were practiced in the cooperatives as reflected in the generated p-value of 0.000 which means highly significant. Naturally, the management rated the indicators higher than staff as they were more into this aspect.

Relationship between and among Management Dimensions

The relationship between and among management dimensions are shown in Table 3. It can be gleaned on the table that strategy and execution showed a very high relationship among all dimensions being analyzed. It means that these two dimensions are interconnected to each other significantly which sometimes called as the visionaries and the operators [12]. In other words, poor strategy can result to poor execution while a good

execution can be associated to a well-crafted strategy. Meanwhile, talent and innovation revealed a high relationship which clearly suggests that innovation requires great talent to be realized. Cooperative’s level of innovation is highly dependent on the talent they had in their organization. Conversely, highly-skilled employees are critical to the innovation function of the organization [57].

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

The results of the study supported the concept advanced by Nohria, Joyce and Roberson [9] that winning companies excel essential management practices in order to sustain superior performance. This means that organizations that exhibit excellence in strategy, execution, culture, structure, talent, leadership, innovation and strategic linkages and partnerships perform better and have higher chances of success in its operations than those that do not.

The study revealed that strategy, culture, and structure were manifested to a very great extent among small cooperatives. When it comes to strategy, the findings can be attributed to limited scope of business operations among small cooperatives in which top level management can religiously focus on these operations. Similarly speaking, small cooperatives tend to have a culture that upholds support among employees and clientele. This was due to small organizational size in which mutual concerns and benefits were most likely addressed immediately. Small organizations inclined to have a simple structure that can be easily understood among its people. Furthermore, small operations require simple structures with simple tasks. This will eventually lead to immediate response to clients’ needs resulting to high satisfaction rate. In other words, small cooperatives tend to be more efficient and effective in meeting member’s satisfaction. In summary, small cooperatives

exhibited great manifestation of management dimensions and better financial performance compare to other clustered cooperatives which evidently supports the concept on what essential management practices that winning companies have.

Furthermore, member's active participation plays a vital role in the cooperatives' success and failure. The cooperatives must devise its products and services in such a way that members, being considered as captured market, will patronize, thereby advancing interests of both parties. Aligning members' needs to cooperative's goals will create loyalty and active participation.

Since this study was limited to a number of cooperatives in a particular province, a further study can be undertaken to assess the management practices of cooperatives operating in other provinces with considerations to a greater number of participating cooperatives.

REFERENCES

- [1] Ravichandran, K. (2016). Entrepreneurial Competencies of Primary Agricultural Cooperative Credit Societies in Tamil Nadu, India. In Z. K. Sumalde, Cooperative Enterprises: Services, Practices, and Performance (pp. 43-58). Los Baños: ICOPED-CEM, UPLB.
- [2] Sibal, J. V. (2011). The Philippine Cooperative Movement: Problems and Prospects. Retrieved from <http://nepal1934.org/category/articles-and-statements/papers/cooperative-movement>.
- [3] Benos, T., Kalogeras, N., Wetzels, M., Ruyter, K. de, and Pennings, J. M. E. (2018). Harnessing a 'Currency Matrix' for Performance Measurement in Cooperatives: A Multi-Phased Study. *Sustainability*, 10(12), 4536.
- [4] Capina, V. L. (2016). Performance of the Multipurpose Cooperatives in the Province of Marinduque, Philippines. In Z. K. Sumalde, Cooperative Enterprises: Services, Practices, and Performance (pp. 201-216). Los Baños, Philippines: ICOPED-CEM, UPLB.
- [5] De Torres, J. A. A., Zapata, Jr., N. R., Madamba, J. A. B. and Mojica, L. E. (2016). Cooperative Business Failures in Batangas Province, Philippines: A Postmortem Analysis. In Z. K. Sumalde, Cooperative Enterprises: Services, Practices, and Performance (pp. 111-124). Los Baños, Philippines: ICOPED-CEM, UPLB.
- [6] Mhembwe, S. and Dube, E. (2017). The Role of Cooperatives in Sustaining the Livelihoods of Rural Communities: The Case of Rural Cooperatives in Shurugwi District, Zimbabwe. *Jamba Journal of Disaster Risk Studies*, 9(1), a341.
- [7] Quicoy, A. R. (2016). Cooperative Support to Enterprise Development: The Case of NIA-Region IV Employees Multi-purpose Cooperative, Laguna, Philippines. In Z. K. Sumalde, Cooperative Enterprises: Services, Practices, and Performance (pp. 17-32). Los Baños: ICOPED-CEM, UPLB.
- [8] Ripas, K. R., Rivas, M. M. R., and Madamba, J. A. B. (2016). Reinvigorating the Sta. Lucia Agrarian Reform Community Cooperative in Dolores, Quezon Province, Philippines: A Cornucopia of Options. In Z. K. Sumalde, Cooperative Enterprises: Services, Practices, and Performance (pp. 17-32). Los Baños: ICOPED-CEM, UPLB.
- [9] Nohria, N., Joyce, W. and Roberson, B. (2003). What Really Works. *Harvard Business Review*, 81(7), 42-52.
- [10] Gronholdt, L. and Martensen, A. (2009). Management Practices Driving Sustained Business Success. *Measuring Business Excellence*. 13(1), 47-55.
- [11] Stadler, C. and Walterman, P. (2012). *The Century Champions*.
- [12] Leinwand, P. and Roterling, J. (2017, November 17). How to Excel at Both Strategy and Execution. Retrieved from Harvard Business Review: <https://hbr.org/2017/11/how-to-excel-at-both-strategy-and-execution>.
- [13] Daft, R. L. (2013). *Management*. 11th Edition. Cengage Learning.
- [14] Vermeulen, F. (2017, November 8). Many Strategies Fail Because They're Not Actually Strategies. Retrieved from Harvard Business Review: https://hbr.org/2017/11/many-strategies-fail-because-theyre-not-actually-strategies?referral=03759&cm_vc=rr_item_page.bottom
- [15] De Flander, J. (2019, November 20). Strategy Execution – The Definitive Guide To Boost your Strategy Implementation Skills. Retrieved from <https://jeroen-de-flander.com/strategy-execution/>
- [16] Sull, D., Homkes, R. and Sull, C. (2015). Why Strategy Execution Unravels--- And What to Do About It. *Harvard Business Review*. 93(3), 57-66.
- [17] Rick, T. (2011). Top Ten + Key Elements in Creating a High Performance Culture.
- [18] Chokheli, E. (2015). Role of the Organizational Design in the Company's Success. *European Scientific Journal*. 90-94.
- [19] Maduenyi, S., Adunola O., Fadeyi, O. and Ajagbe, M. (2015). Impact of Organizational Structure on Organizational Performance. *International Conference on African Development Issues*.
- [20] Boštjančič, E. and Slana, Z. (2018). The Role of Talent Management Comparing Medium-Sized and Large Companies – Major Challenges in Attracting and Retaining Talented Employees. *Frontiers in Psychology*. 9, 1750.
- [21] Mamuye, N. (2018). Statistical Assessment of Employee's Turnover and Its Causes; In the Case of Moret and Jiru Wereda, North Shoa, Amhara, Ethiopia.

- American Journal of Theoretical and Applied Statistics, 7(4), 139-146.
- [22] Oracle. (2012). Talent Retention: Six Technology-Enabled Best Practices. Retrieved from Oracle: www.oracle.com
- [23] Hurduzeu, R. E. (2015). The Impact of Leadership on Organizational Performance. *SEA-Practical Application of Science*, 3(1), 7.
- [24] Iqbal, N., Anwar, S. and Haider, N. (2015). Effect of Leadership Style on Employee Performance. *Arabian Journal of Business and Management Review*, 5(5), 146.
- [25] Adams, W. A. (2014). Business Results and Effective Leadership - Effective Leaders Outperform Ineffective Leaders Every Time.
- [26] Bation, W. C. (2016). Sustainability of Oro Integrated Cooperative, Cagayan de Oro City, Philippines. In Z. K. Sumalde, *Cooperative Enterprises: Services, Practices, and Performance* (pp. 187-200). Los Baños, Philippines: ICOPED-CEM, UPLB.
- [27] Akgun, A., Ince, S., Imamoglu, S. Z., Keskin, H., and Kocaoglu, I. (2014). The Mediator Role of Learning Capability and Business Inovativeness between Total Quality Management and Financial Performance. *International Journal of Production Research*, 52(3), 888-901.
- [28] Baraz, B. and Sakar, A. N. (2011). Organizational Design and Innovation: A Comparative Analysis of Two Corporations. *International Journal of Business and Management Studies*, 3(1), 67-79.
- [29] Bakar, L. J. and Ahmad, H. (2010). Assessing the Relationship between Firm Resources and Product Innovation Performance. *Business Process Management Journal*, 16(3), 420-435.
- [30] Acharya, B. M. (2014). Factors Contributing to the Success of Cooperatives.
- [31] Baranov, E. (2013). Importance of Strategic Alliances in Company's Activity. *Scientific Papers Series Management, Economic Engineering in Agriculture and Rural Development*.
- [32] Olviga, T. R., Manipol, N. E. P., Arrienda II, F. Q. and Perilla, M. V. (2016). Women in Cooperatives: The Case of Alay Kapwa Rural Women Multi-Purpose Cooperative in Sariaya, Quezon, Philippines. In Z. K. Sumalde, *Cooperative Enterprises: Services, Practices, and Performance* (pp. 375-392). Los Baños: ICOPED-CEM, UPLB.
- [33] Wall, T. D. and Wood, S. J. (2005). Romance of Humance Resource Management and Business Performance and the Case for Big Science. *Human Relations*, 58(4), 429-462.
- [34] Edwards, T., Battisti, G. and Neely, A. (2004). Value Creation and the UK Economy: A Review of Strategic Options. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 5-6(3-4), 191-213.
- [35] Barad, K. (2012). An Empirical Study on Management Practices in Cooperative Sugar Factories of Gujarat. *SSRN Electronic Journal*.
- [36] Keller, G. F. (2011). Comparing the Effects of Management Practices on Organizational Performance between For-Profit and Not-For-Profit Corporations in Southeast Wisconsin. *Journal of Business and Economics Research*, 9(3).
- [37] Cronbach, L. J. (1951). Coefficient Alpha and the Internal Structure of Tests. *Psychometrika*, 16(3), 297-334.
- [38] Tavakol, M. and Dennick, R. (2011). Making Sense of Cronbach's Alpha. *International Journal of Medical Education*, 2, 53-55.
- [39] Salvosa, C. R. (2016). Organizational Capacities of Selected Cooperatives in the Upland Areas of Nueva Vizcaya, Philippines. In Z. K. Sumalde, *Cooperative Enterprises: Services, Practices, and Performance* (pp. 175-183). Los Baños: ICOPED-CEM, UPLB.
- [40] Hoffman, J., Hoek, M., and Viscardi, L. (2016). Opportunities to Enhance Cooperative's Long Term Success through Strategic Planning. Retrieved from <http://www.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:940093/FULLTEXT02>
- [41] Francesconi, G. N., and Wouterse, F. (2018). Building the Managerial Capital of Agricultural Cooperatives in Africa. *Annals of Public and Cooperative Economics*, 90 (1), 141-159.
- [42] Masuku, T. A., Masuku, M. B., and Mutangira, J. P. B. (2016). Performance of Multi-Purpose Cooperatives in the Shiselweni Region of Swaziland. *International Journal of Sustainable Agricultural Research*, 3(4), 58-71.
- [43] Abrar, A. | McMillan, D. (Reviewing Editor). (2019). The Impact of Financial and Social Performance of Microfinance Institutions on Lending Interest Rate: A Cross-Country Evidence. *Cogent Business & Management*, 6(9), 1540072.
- [44] Duguma, G. J. and Han, J. (2018). Effect of Deposit Mobilization on the Financial Sustainability of Rural Saving and Credit Cooperatives: Evidence from Ethiopia. *Sustainability*, 10(10), 3387.
- [45] Sisay, D. T., Verhees, F. J. H. M. and Trijpp, H. C. M. van. (2017). The Influence of Market Orientation on Firm Performance and Members' Livelihood in Ethiopian Seed Producer Cooperatives. *Agrekon*, 56(4), 366-382.
- [46] Nisar, Q., Ahmad, Z., Ali, L. and Ahmad, I. (2017). Impact of Rewards, Recognition and Job Stress on Job Performance and Job Satisfaction. *International Journal for Research in Business, Management and Accounting*, 3(4).
- [47] Gezahegn, T. W., Passel, S. V, Berhanu, T., D'Haese, M. and Maertens, M. (2019). Big is Efficient: Evidence from Agricultural Cooperatives in Ethiopia. *Agricultural Economics*, 50(5), 555-566.

- [48] Rwekaza, G. C. and Anania P. (2018). Co-operative Decision Making Structure and Its Effectiveness in Promoting Sustainable Co-operative Organizations in Tanzania: A Case of Selected Agricultural Marketing Co-operatives in Shinyanga Region. *Arts and Social Sciences Journal*, 9(1), 320.
- [49] Kasmuri, N. B. (2016). Development of Human Resource for the Malaysian Co-operative Movement. In Z. K. Sumalde, *Cooperative Enterprises: Services, Practices, and Performance* (pp. 85-94). Los Baños: ICOPED-CEM, UPLB.
- [50] Olubiyi, O., Smiley, G., Luckel, H. and Melaragno, R. (2019). A Qualitative Case Study of Employee Turnover in Retail Business. *Heliyon*, 5(6), e01796.
- [51] Binaoro, A. J. (2016). Assessment of Cooperative Officers' Leadership Competencies in Oroquieta City, Philippines. In Z. K. Sumalde, *Cooperative Enterprises: Services, Practices, and Performance* (pp. 71-84). Los Baños: ICOPED-CEM, UPLB.
- [52] Wakaisuka-Isingoma, J., Aduda, J., Wainaina, J. and Mwangi, C. I. (2016). Corporate Governance, Firm Characteristics, External Environment and Performance of Financial Institutions in Uganda: A Review of Literature. *Cogent Business & Management*, 3(1), 1261526.
- [53] Kyazze, L. M., Nkote, I. N., and Wakaisuka-Isingoma, I. | Ntim, C. G. (Reviewing Editor). (2017). Cooperative Governance and Social Performance of Cooperative Societies. *Cogent Business & Management*, 4(1), 1284391.
- [54] Brat, E., Martinez, I. B. and Ouchene, N. (2016). *Innovation: Priorities and Practices in Cooperatives*. Montreal. Alphonse and Dorimène Desjardins International Institute for Cooperatives – ADDIIC.
- [55] Liu, B., and Li, Z. (2018). Director-Generals' Human and Social Capital, and Management Performance of Farmers' Cooperatives: Evidence from China's Fujian. *International Journal of Management and Economics*, 54(2), 149-165.
- [56] Centenaro, A. and Laimer, C. G. (2017). Cooperative Relationships and Competitiveness in Supermarket Sector. *Revista Brasileira de Gestão de Negócios*. 19(63), 65-81.
- [57] Olaka, L. O. M and Okafor, L. C. (2018). Talent Management and Innovation in Indigenous Hotels in Port Harcourt, Rivers State. *IOSR Journal of Business and Management*. 20(3), 31-40.

COPYRIGHTS

Copyright of this article is retained by the author/s, with first publication rights granted to APJMR. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4>).