OPERATIONAL PRACTICES OF COOPERATIVES IN COTABATO AND THEIR SUSTAINABILITY

Amira G. Pagadatan[1]

[1] *Cooperative Development Specialist, Provincial Cooperatives Development Office, Amas, Kidapawan City, Philippines*

ABSTRACT

This research delved on the operational practices of cooperatives in Cotabato which involved as respondents the 300 chairperson and manager of cooperatives. Firstly, Study 1 focused on the cooperative profile and the cooperative operational practices and their level of effectiveness to sustainable development. Secondly, Study 2 tried to interlink the operational practices and the cooperative operational practices to sustainable development. Finally, Study 3 traversed to the cooperative's development sustainability and attempts to draw policies and intervention plan that could be utilized by the cooperative sector to champion the roadmap to the cooperative sustainable development. The method of descriptive regression and correlation was employed.

The result reveals that cooperative profile regardless of their years in operation, type, and asset size do not significantly influence to sustainable development of the cooperative. Conversely, all the cooperative operational practices like management style, member's engagement and participation, capital build-up, support system, leadership effectiveness, market position and competition, innovation and adaptation, and organizational culture showed high significance to sustainable development. Further, it was also found out that the cooperatives in Cotabato are mostly affiliated to multipurpose cooperatives, followed by credit cooperatives. Additionally, result also revealed that these cooperatives are mostly micro and very few are large and are operating for more ten years.

Keyword: - *Operational practices, cooperatives, sustainability, and Cotabato.*

1. INTRODUCTION

Cooperative business endeavor helps promote economic development. Its role in uplifting the life of the members and driving both local and national economic growth is highly regarded. It became the largest socioeconomic movement in the world to augment the resources for community needs left unmet by other businesses (Teves, 2002).

Cooperatives are vital players in molding the economy, hence, it is of paramount importance to examine the factors that may influence their operations (Paradero, Te, and Casinillo, 2022). If the operational practices of cooperatives continuously grow as group business enterprises, they will achieve satisfying sustainable development.

Cooperatives are pursuing the balance between profit and meeting the economic and social aspirations of members to improve the standards of living and welfare of the people (International Co-operative Alliance, 2013). The cooperative sector can contribute to improving the lives of members once its operation is proper. Many countries that have achieved economic progress have a thriving and dynamic cooperative sector that contributes significantly to their economies' growth (Matua, Karanja, and Namusonge, 2013).

In the Philippines, cooperatives intend to primarily achieve social and economic needs and aspirations by making equitable contributions to the capital required, patronizing their products and services, and accepting a fair share of the risks and benefits under the universally accepted cooperative principles (Philippine Cooperative Act 9520, 2008). It aims to instill within cooperators the value of self-reliance and self-responsibility toward progress and sustainable development.

The cooperatives in the country are envisioned to help attain sustainable development goals (Castillo, 2018). The extent to which the cooperative can contribute to enhancing the lives of its members largely depends on

the quality of the cooperatives' internal organization. For this reason, assessments were conducted to learn the organizational performance of coops (Ramos, 2018). However, the results were not widely disseminated, which remained a knowledge gap on how far cooperatives are fairly operating (Sibal, 2011). Thus, this study hopes to shed light on the distinct characteristics of those whose operations were quite successful, in contrast to those that failed in their operations.

2. METHODOLOGY

In this study, the research design used is the descriptive survey. By making used of the descriptive survey, the researcher employed a mixed method approach through adopting both quantitative and qualitative approaches. The quantitative method involved data collection procedures that resulted primarily in numerical data which were analyzed by statistical methods. Dornyei (2007), took survey researches which use questionnaires as examples of the quantitative method.

The study was conducted in the three districts of the Cotabato Province. The first district comprises the municipalities of Alamada, Libungan, Pigcawayan, Midsayap, Aleosan, and Pikit. The second district includes the municipalities of Arakan, Antipas, President Roxas, Magpet, Makilala, and the chartered city of Kidapawan. The third district is composed of the municipalities of Banisilan, Carmen, Kabacan, Matalam,M'lang and Tulunan.

The respondents of the study are the cooperatives in the three districts of the Province of Cotabato. In this study, total enumeration and purposive sampling with the use of quota was employed. Thus, only 30 percent of each type of cooperatives were taken as respondents. All managers and Board of Directors of the selected cooperatives were among the respondents.

The data gathered were recorded, tabulated, summarized, analyzed, and interpreted based on the problems of this study. Data were analyzed with the used of descriptive and inferential statistics.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Cooperative Profile in Cotabato

Number of Years in Operations

Out of the 100 cooperatives, 40 had been operating for less than 5 years, another 40 had been operating for 6 to 10 years, 72 cooperatives existed for11 to 15 years, 9 operated for 16 to 20 years, and 39 survived for 21 years and above. The data show that cooperative entities had been established over decades and continue to operate up to this moment. The data conferred that people continuously establish and engage to cooperatives as manifested by the 20 recently opened coops. This implies that people continue to believe that cooperatives could bring transformation to the lives of its members. This goes along to the statement of Burgos & Mertens, 2017), that almost in every country, cooperatives are the instrument to combat poverty and unemployment.

Finally, the data revealed that most of the cooperatives or 36% have been in operation for eleven to fifteen years, and19.5 % have been in existence for more than twenty-one years, which strongly indicates that most cooperatives are long time been part of an important phase in the growth of the cooperative movement in the Philippines.

As unveiled in the presented data, it implies that cooperative purposes apparently meet the social and economic satisfaction of members whatever type it is. The result and implications conform to the statement of Mhembwe (2017), that cooperative association of persons as united entity strive to meet their common social, economic, and cultural needs as well as their aspirations through a jointly owned and democratically controlled enterprise. Membership and participation in cooperatives have positively impacted the lives of Filipino individuals and groups (Mdulid, 2015; Tomaquin, 2014).

Type of Cooperative

It can be gleaned from the table that majority of the participants are engaged in Multi-purpose Cooperative with a frequency of 105 respondents. This goes along with the report of Muthyalu (2013), that several districts in the Philippines have a greater number of multipurpose cooperatives and a high level of reliance on cooperatives, with the majority of farmers obtaining agricultural inputs through cooperatives. Further, multi-purpose cooperative combines two or more business or economic activities and generates a common pool of funds to provide financial assistance to its members for productive and provident purposes (CDA, MC- 2015-07).

The result also revealed that credit cooperative is the second most affiliated cooperative with frequency of 34 respondents. With the objective of collectively providing means to comfort financial difficulties, cooperators pooled their resources to address financial problems. Nurturing the cooperatives collective effort, credit cooperatives became viable and even some small enterprise which encountered difficulty in obtaining credit from formal financial

institutions have turned to credit cooperatives for their financial needs. Cooperatives greatly contribute in making communities resilient to various financial vulnerabilities, as they not only extend loans to their members but at the same time, provide assistance and services to further support their communities. As cooperatives are able to reach the unbanked segments of society, create jobs, and further social integration, they are a catalyst for socio-economic development especially in the countryside (CIC President and CEO Ben Joshua A. Baltazar, 2023).

Conversely, Consumer Cooperative is regarded as the least affiliated coop with only 4 respondents. This could be attributed to the statement of Plakias and Enstminger (2023) that consumer cooperatives are largely understudied, thus additional research is encouraged to help inform consumer cooperative development efforts and make the business model accessible.

By Asset Size

With regard to the asset-size of cooperatives in Cotabato, Micro-cooperatives with an asset of up to 3 million is mostly comprised by the respondents with 136 frequencies. This is with direct contrast to the large cooperatives with an asset size of one-hundred million and above with only 4 frequencies.

This result implies that most of the cooperatives in Cotabato are micro cooperatives and very few are large cooperatives. Castillo (2015), stated that when the number of micro and large cooperatives are directly reverse, the distribution based on assets is not normal. Hence, the large majority of the sector is very poor. This implication is further supported by Cammayo (2020), that the members of the cooperative sector are mainly coming from small and low-income segment of the community.

Table 4. Profile of the Cooperatives.

By Year in Operation	**Frequency N=300**	**Percentage % (100)**
Less than five years	60	20.0
Six to ten years	60	20.0
Eleven to fifteen years	108	36.0
Sixteen to twenty years	33	11.0
Twenty-one years above	39	13.0
By Type	**Frequency N=300**	**Percentage % (100)**
Agrarian Reform Beneficiaries	6	2.0
Consumer Cooperative	6	2.0
Credit Cooperative	51	17.0
Multipurpose Cooperative	156	52.0
Producer Cooperative	27	9.0
Others (Transport, Marketing, Agriculture, etc.)	54	18.0
By asset Size	**Frequency N=300**	**Percentage % (100**
Micro (up to 3 million)	204	68.0
Small (3 million up to 15 million)	60	20.0
Medium (above 15 million to 100 million)	30	10.0
Large (100 million above)	6	2.0

Cooperatives' Effectiveness on Operational Practices

The second research problem focused on the level of effectiveness of the cooperative operational practices in terms of management style, members' engagement and participation, capital build-up, support system, leadership effectiveness, operational efficiency, market position and competition, innovation and adaptation, and organizational culture.

Management Style of Cooperative

Table 5 presents the level of operational practices of the cooperatives in terms of management style which has a weighted mean of 4.27 with a descriptive value of very highly practiced. Although, empowering

employees/members to take initiative and contribute to decision-making has a weighted mean of 4.26 with an adjectival description of moderately effective, this is partly because it is the BODs that primarily decides matters pertaining to the concern of the cooperative through board meetings.

However, the overall weighted mean described as highly effective implies that management style is extremely necessary in the cooperative operational practices. Management practices reflect their own benchmarks and better ways of utilizing cooperatives' resources for all members' greater benefits and advancement (Tomaquin, 2014).

Members Engagement and Participation

Table 5b presents the level of operational practices of the cooperative members' engagement and participation, which has a weighted mean of 4.61 and a descriptive value of very highly practiced. This means that the members of the cooperatives encourage their members to influence the overall success and sustainability of the cooperative.

They also encourage the members to actively participate in decision-making process within the cooperative. Moreover, they recognize the beliefs of members that their opinions and contributions are valued and integrated into the cooperative's operations. Furthermore, they practice facilitating collaboration and teamwork among its members. Allowing members to feel satisfaction with the opportunities provided to engage in cooperative activities and initiatives.

The observations denote that the coop personnel highly practiced ways to encourage engagement and participation of members. They facilitate ways to attain success and sustainability of the cooperative which conforms the claim of Tremblay, Hupper, and Waring (2019) that co-operatives engender success from the cooperation of the members.

Capital Build-up

Shown in Table 5c is the level of effectiveness of the cooperative operational practices in terms of capital build-up. This parameter reveals a very effective result with a weighted mean of 4.27. Although the emphasis on effective accumulation of capital resources for future growth has given lesser degree of effectiveness, it is still regarded as effective.

This result revealed that finance resources contribute effectively to the ability of the cooperative in investing for expansion to meet its evolving needs. Hendar (2010), as cited by Ibrahim, et al. (2015), pointed out that capital build-up programs of every cooperative are vital to both the cooperatives and the members.

Support System

Table 5d presents the effectiveness of the operational practices of the cooperative in relation to support system which has a range of 4.30 with a descriptive value of very effective. Facilitating collaboration and teamwork among employees is an indispensable practiced and providing outright solution to address pressing needs of the cooperative are the very effective practice revealing 4.33 and 4.46 range, the latter being the most.

The result denotes that the cooperators provide outright responses in addressing the needs and challenges within the organization through teamwork among employees to achieve the organizational goals. This implication goes with the emphasis of Pabuayan and Quilloy (2015) that complementing support and services is the need for enabling mechanisms that will put the plans into actions. Additionally, cooperative support system focuses on the development and support for democratically managed models of enterprise to meet the needs of the local communities.

Leadership Effectiveness

Table 5e transpires the result of a weighted mean 4.66 with a description of very effective. It could also be noted, that none of the parameters indicated a mean other than very effective. Defining the vision and goal of the cooperative and confidently steering its direction to success are the foremost practices that effective leadership manifests.

This implies that leadership effectiveness highly contributes to the operational practices of the cooperative. An important contribution to cooperative sustainability (Bation, 2016), is the presence of capable and dedicated leaders

Market Position and Competition

It can be gleaned from Table 5f that the parameter has a weighted mean of 3.99 with an adjectival equivalent of effective. Same is true with the other five variables in the table which are all described as effective.

Differentiating the products or services of the cooperative to stand out in the market and keeping the cooperative up-to-date with coop-related information to enhance the market position are two less given emphasis among other variables with 3.91 and 3.98 weighted mean, respectively. However, it appears as both effective, which aligns with the statement of Amadasun (2022), that when market-driven strategic factors are employed and attention is focused on the cooperative's internal and external core capacities, the cooperative could sustain competitive growth.

Innovation and Adaptation

Table 5g shows the respondent's responses on the level of indicators on the operational practices of the cooperative in relation to innovation and adaptation which has a weighted mean of 3.99 with a descriptive value of effective. All five variables on this parameter have a descriptive value of effective.

With regard to the operational practices of cooperative, innovation and adaptation is indispensable to development sustainability. As Akgun (2014) emphasized, innovation 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.

Organizational Culture

As revealed in Table 5h, all the parameters have a weighted mean equivalent to an adjectival description of very effective. Thus, this also resulted to a description of very effective cooperative operational practice in terms of organizational culture with 4.38 weighted mean.

The promotion of a culture of collaboration and teamwork among employees or members and the alignment of the cooperative's values and mission with the organizational culture are mostly observed in the operational practices of the cooperative in terms of organizational culture. For cooperatives, adherence to a well-defined Identity Statement (purpose, values, and principles) is claimed to be the driving force in achieving sustainable outcomes (Dale et al., 2013).

Table 6. Level of Effectiveness of Cooperative Operational Practices (COP) and Sustainable Development (SD)

No	Statement	Mean	Description
1	Management Style	4.27	Very Effective
2	Member Engagement and Participation	4.61	Very Effective
3	Capital Build-up	4.27	Very Effective
4	Support System	4.30	Very Effective
5	Leadership Effectiveness	4.66	Very Effective
7	Market Position and Competition	3.99	Effective
8	Innovation and Adaptation	3.99	Effective
9	Organizational Culture	4.38	Very Effective
	Overall weighted Mean	4.30	Very Effective

Cooperative Sustainable Development

Social Impact

Table 7 shows the level of the cooperative sustainable development in terms of social impact which has a weighted mean of 4.30 with the descriptive value of highly sustainable. As presented in this table, all the variables in this parameter revealed highly sustainable result.

The implementation of the programs that contributed to the community's social welfare is mostly exercised is the among other variables with a weighted mean of 4.46, whilst, engagement of stakeholders to address social issues was least observed. With a very sustainable result on this variable, this implies that social interest was met. Sustainable development is to satisfy social interest like poverty reduction; gender equality; access to education, water and sanitation, and energy; health; and food security (ICA, 2013).

Economic Viability

Presented in Table 7b is the level of development sustainability of the cooperatives in terms of economic viability. This parameter has yielded a weighted mean of 4.46 with a description of highly sustainable. Except for

the creation of economic opportunities for its stakeholders which revealed a weighted mean of 4.00 with a description of sustainable, all other variables in this parameter indicated highly sustainable result.

This manifests that cooperatives can serve the "yardstick" role as socio-economic foundations to set the economy on the path to sustainability. For Matua et al. (2013), many countries that have achieved economic progress have a thriving and dynamic cooperative sector that contributes significantly to their economies' growth.

Technological Adaptability

Table 7c reveals the responses of the respondents on the sustainability of the operational practices of cooperative in relation to technological adaptability which has a weighted mean of 3.98 with the descriptive values of sustainable. The result implies that implementation of technology enhances the cooperative's performance and advancements. This conforms also to the statement of the authors Deyanoya et al. (2022) that the potential for success of cooperatives startups as well as their distinctiveness.

Environmental Sustainability

Table 7d indicates the responses of the respondents on the sustainability of the operational practices of cooperative in relation to environmental sustainability which has a weighted mean of 3.89 with the descriptive values of sustainable. This implies that the cooperatives adhere with the principle and practices of an environmentally friendly cooperative. It further implies that the stakeholders are not only compliant with waste disposal and environmental resource conservation regulations but also promote environmental awareness among themselves. McElroy (2015) emphasized that context-based environmental accounting provides a tool for all sustainable business to follow.

Cooperative Profile and its Relationship on Sustainable Development

The fourth research problem delved on finding the relationship between the cooperative profile and sustainable development. The set of data in the correlation matrix in Table 8 exposes the significant relationship between the types of cooperatives and sustainable development. Particularly, the data show that a highly significant relationship exists between the **types of cooperatives** and **social impact (r= -0.205** with p=0.004) as well as economic viability (r= -0.231** with p=0.001)**. The results indicate that the probability values are less than the set 1% level of significance. Therefore, **the stated hypothesis that there is no significant relationship between the types of cooperatives and sustainable development is rejected.**

Table 8. Correlation Matrix showing the relationship between Cooperative Profile and Sustainable Development.

Cooperative Profile		**Social Impact**	**Economic Viability**	**Technological Adapt-ability**	**Environmental Sustainability**
Number of Year of Operation	Spearman's rho	.036	.076	-.033	-119
	Sig. (2 tailed)	.613	.284	.642	.092
	N	200	200	200	200
Type of Cooperative	Spearman's rho	**-.205****	**-.231****	-102	-.079
	Sig. (2 tailed)	**.004**		.151	.269
	N	200	**.001** 200	200	200
Asset size of Cooperative	Spearman's rho	-1.26	-.125	-107	-111
	Sig. (2 tailed)	.077	.078	.033	.119
	N	200	200	200	200

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

However, it is further noted that the correlation values are negatively significant on social impact (r= -0.205** with p=0.004) as well as economic viability (r=-0.231** with p=0.001). The results also indicate inverse correlation, which indicates that the cooperators are not encouraged in the decision-making process to address **social**

issues and **social actions** of the cooperatives. Furthermore, they **had not fully met its sustainability as well as the creation of economic opportunities** for its stakeholders and management of the **financial resources** for long-term sustainability. Moreover, low correlations (r=-0.205 to r=-0.231) were observed between the indicated factors.

This implies further that the types of cooperatives could be a valuable point for promoting sustainability in terms of enhancing economic prosperity through skills development and equipping knowledge and tools needed for responsible financial management. For this purpose, Novkovic, (2021) suggest that there is a need to understand the perspective of the social foundations of cooperatives' contributions to income distribution also the necessities of housing, knowledge, and healthcare.

Cooperative Operational Practices and Sustainable Development

Management Style and Sustainable Development

The data in the correlation matrix in Table 10 discloses the significant relationship between management styles and sustainable development. Remarkably, the finding reveals that management styles and Social Impact (r=0.198** with p= 0.000), economic viability (r=0.316** with p 0.000), technological adaptability (r= 0.254** with p=0.000), and environmental sustainability (r=0.258** with p=0.000).

Moreover, weak positive relationship to moderate positive relationship (r=0.198 to 0.316) were observed in management styles and all factors used in sustainable development. Further, it found that these factors had probability values lower than the set 0.01 significance level. Hence, it rejects the hypothesis that there is no significant relation between Cooperative's Operational Practices and Sustainable development. This means that all the values are positive, indicating that improvements in management style are associated with improvements in social impact, economic viability, technological adaptability, and environmental sustainability.

Member Engagement and Participation And Sustainable Development

The data in the correlation matrix in Table 10 discloses the significant relationship between membership management and participation and sustainable development. Remarkably, the finding reveals that Membership management and participation and Social Impact (r=0.281** with p= 0.000), economic viability (r=0.286** with p 0.000), technological adaptability (r= 0.269** with p=0.000), and environmental sustainability (r=0.168** with p=0.000).

Moreover, no relationship to weak positive relationship (r=0.168 to 0.286) were observed in membership management and participation and all factors used in sustainable development. Further, it showed that these factors had probability values lower than the set 0.05 significance level. Hence, it rejects the hypothesis that there is no significant relation between the Cooperative Operational practices and sustainable development.

This implies that moderate positive correlation between Social Impact suggests that initiatives or organizations should prioritize activities that demonstrate clear social benefits by highlighting community involvement, showcasing positive outcomes, or actively involving members in social causes to enhance their engagement and participation. In economic viability suggest that organizations should focus on sustainable financial practices, such as effective resource allocation and revenue generation strategies, to ensure long-term viability and encourage ongoing participation from members.

Further, technological adaptability and member underscores the importance of leveraging technology to facilitate member interactions and involvement by Investing in user-friendly platforms, digital communication channels, and innovative tools can help organizations better engage their members and adapt to evolving technological trends. Although Environmental Sustainability is weaker compared to other factors, it still suggests that organizations should integrate sustainability initiatives into their operations and communicate their commitment to environmental responsibility to appeal to environmentally-conscious members and align with broader societal values.

Capital Build-up and Sustainable

Table 10 shows the relationship between capital build-up and sustainable development in a correlation matrix. Particularly, the findings reveal that there is a significant relationship between management style and social impact (r=0.268** and p=0.000), economic viability (r=0.288** and p=0.000), technological adaptability (r=0.292** and p=0.000), and environmental sustainability (r=0.257** and p=0.000). Further, it could be noted that

the probability values are less than the 1% level of significance. Hence, the stated hypothesis for this section is rejected.

Moreover, weak positive relationship (r=0.257 to 0.292) were observed in Capital Build up and all factors used in sustainable development. Further, it found that these factors had probability values lower than the set 0.01 significance level. Hence, it rejects the hypothesis that there is no significant relation between cooperative operational practices and sustainable development.

Support System and Sustainable Development

On the relationship between support system and sustainable development is shown in Table 9c in a correlation matrix. Particularly, the findings reveal that there is a significant relationship between support system and social impact (r=0.324** and p=0.000), as well as economic viability (r=0.294** and p=0.000), technological adaptability (r=0.342** and p=0.000), and environmental sustainability (r=0.311** and p=0.000). Additionally, all factors had probability values that are less than the 1% level of significance. Therefore, the stated hypothesis for this section is rejected.

Leadership Effectiveness and Sustainable Development

The data on the relationship between leadership effectiveness and sustainable development is still shown in Table 8 in a correlation matrix. Particularly, the findings disclose that there is a significant relationship between management style and social impact (r=0.431** and p=0.005), economic viability (r=0.487** and p=0.000), technological adaptability (r=0.456** and p=0.000), and environmental sustainability (r=0.400** and p=0.000). Moreover, all factors had probability values that are less than the 1% level of significance. Therefore, the stated hypothesis for this section is rejected.

Market Position and Competition and Sustainable Development

The relationship between market position and sustainable development in Table 8 shows that there is a significant relationship between market position and sustainable development in terms of social impact (r=0.465** and p=0.005), economic viability (r=0.539** and p=0.000), technological adaptability (r=0.495** and p=0.000), and environmental sustainability (r=0.393** and p=0.000). As noted, all factors had probability values that are less than the 1% level of significance. Therefore, the stated hypothesis for this is rejected.

Innovation and Adaptation and Sustainable Development

On the relationship between innovation and adaptation and sustainable development, the findings reveal that there is a significant relationship between management style and social impact (r=0.318** and p=0.005), economic viability (r=0.472** and p=0.000), technological adaptability (r=0.515** and p=0.000), and environmental sustainability (r=0.409** and p=0.000). As noted, all factors had probability values that are less than the 1% level of significance. Therefore, the stated hypothesis for this section is rejected.

Table 10. Correlation Matrix showing the relationship between Cooperative Profile and Sustainable Development.

Cooperative Profile		**Social Impact**	**Economic Viability**	**Technological Adapt-ability**	**Environmental Sustainability**
Number of Management Style	Spearman's rho	0.198**	0.316**	0.254**	0.258**
	Sig. (2 tailed)	0.005	0.000	0.000	0.000
Membership Engagement and Participation	Spearman's rho	0.281**	0.286**	0.269**	0.168**
	Sig. (2 tailed)	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	N	300	300	300	300

Capital Build-up	Spearman's rho	0.268**	0.288**	0.292**	0.257**
	Sig. (2 tailed)	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	N	300	300	300	300
Support System	Spearman's rho	0.324**	0.294**	0.342**	0.311**
	Sig. (2 tailed)	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	N	300	300	300	300
Leadership Effectiveness	Spearman's rho	0.431**	0.487**	0.456**	0.400**
	Sig. (2 tailed)	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	N	300	300	300	300
Market Position and Competition	Spearman's rho	0.465**	0.539**	0.495**	0.393**
	Sig. (2 tailed)	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	N	300	300	300	300
Innovation and Adaptation	Spearman's rho	0.318**	0.472**	0.515**	0.409**
	Sig. (2 tailed)	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	N	300	300	300	300
Organizational Culture	Spearman's rho	0.421**	0.455**	0.443**	0.472**
	Sig. (2 tailed)	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	N	300	300	300	300

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed
*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

4. CONCLUSIONS

Based on the findings of the study, the researcher found out that the cooperatives in Cotabato continuously grow as manifested by the number of cooperatives operating in less than five years and are mostly categorized as micro cooperatives. The result implies that the cooperative sector needs technical interventions to make the organization more viable and competent.

The researcher also concluded, that all parameters of the Cooperative Operational Parameters (COP) are of paramount importance to the development sustainability of the cooperative sector.

6. REFERENCES

Akgun, A. et al. 2014. The Mediator Role of Learning Capability and Business Inovativeness between Total Quality Management and Financial Performance. International Journal of Production Research.

Amadasun, Donald E. 2022. Effect of Market-driven S Strategies on Competitive Growth of SMEs in Lesotho. Journal of innovation and Entrepreneurship.

An Act Amending the Cooperative Code of the Philippines to Be Known as the "Philippine Cooperative Code of 2008", Republic Act 9520, Article 23 (February 17, 2009).

Bakar, L. J. and Ahmad, H. (2010). Assessing the Relationship between Firm Resources and Product Innovation Performance. Business Process Management Journal.

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.

Beishenally, N. & Eum, H. 2021. How do Cooperatives Drive Change? Sustainable Development Goals Framework for Cooperatives. ICA CCR Conference Paper, Seoul.

Bernard, H. R. 2002. Research methods in anthropology: Qualitative and quantitative approaches (3rd ed.). Walnut Creek, CA: Alta Mira Press.

Brown, L., Carini, C., Gordon-Nembhard, J., Hammond Ketilson, L., Hicks, E., McNamara, J., Novkovic, S., Rixon, D., & Simmons, R. (Eds.). 2015. Cooperatives for Sustainable Communities: Tools to Measure Co-operative Impact and Performance. University of Saskatchewan.

Baue, B. 2019. Compared to What? A Three-tiered Typology of Sustainable Development Performance Indicators: From Incremental to Contextual to Transformational. UNRISD Working Paper.

Bitonio, J. 2020. Factors of Success in Cooperative Operations. ARD, CDA Dagupan Extension Office.

Burgos, A., & Mertens, F. 2017. Participatory Management of Community-based Tourism: A Network Perspective. Community Development.

Cammayo, Eva U. 2019. Risk Management of Micro Cooperatives in Cagayan Valley.

Castillo, E. 2018. Co-operative: A Tool for Solving Poverty and Unemployment. Republic of the Philippines – Cooperative Development Authority. Retrieved from https://cda.gov.ph/updates/co-operative-a-tool-forsolving-poverty-and-unemployment.

CDA. 2015. Memorandum Circular No. 2015-07. Guidelines Governing the Registration of Multipurpose Cooperatives.

CDA. 2015. Why There Should be More Cooperatives in the Philippines. Feature. The manila Bulletin. Published. March 10.

Cotabato Provincial Ordinance No. 210. 2000. An Ordinance Establishing the Provincial Cooperatives Development Office in the Province of Cotabato. Sangguniang Panlalawigan, Amas, Kidapawan City.

Credit Information Corporation. 2023. Press Release: CIC to Highlight Vital Role of Coops in Financial Inclusion, Greater Access to Credit in Upcoming Webinar for national Cooperative Month Celebration.

Dale, A., Duguid, F., Garcia Lamarca, M., Hough, P., Tyson, P., Foon R., Newell, R., & Herbert, Y. Al. 2013. Co-operatives and Sustainability: An Investigation into the Relationship.

De Lautour, V. and Cortese, C. 2016. Co-operatives: governance and accountability systems for a better world? Journal of Accounting and Organizational Change.

Deriada, A.L. 2005. Assessment of Cooperative Movement in a Developing Country: The Philippine Experience. Forum of International Development Studies.

Diaz de Leon, D., Diaz, Fragoso O, Rivera, I., and Rivera, G. 2021. Cooperatives of Mexico: Their Social Benefits and their Contribution to Meeting the Sustainable Development Goals.

Dornyei, Z. 2007. *Research Methods in Applied Linguistics*, Oxford University, New York.

Deutsch, M. 2006. Citation. A Theory of co-operation and competition. Human Relations.

Hurduzeu, R. E. 2015. The Impact of Leadership on Organizational Performance. SEA-Practical Application of Science.

Laureta, Melvin S. 2020. Economic Contribution of Capital Build-up Programs of Cooperatives in the Province of Ilocos Sur. University of Northern Philippines, Tamag, Vigan City, Ilocos Sur.

Matua, S.M., Karanja, K. and Namusonge, G.S. 2013. Role of Performance Management Practices on the Performance of Financial Cooperatives Based in Nairobi Country Kenya. International Journal of Education and Research, 1, 1-10.

Mc Elroy, M. *2008. Social Footprints: Measuring the Social Sustainability Performance of Organizations. Ph.D. Thesis. University of Groningen.*

Mdulid, F. A. 2015. Institutional Viability of the Cooperatives in Northern Samar and the Variates Affecting it. International Journal of Scientific & Technology and Research.

Mhembwe, S. & Dube, E. 2017. The Role of Cooperatives in Sustaining the Livelihoods of Rural Communities: The Case of Rural Cooperatives in Shurugwi District, Zimbabwe, *Jàmbá: Journal of Disaster Risk Studies*.

Muthyalu, M. 2013. Analyze the Performance of Multipurpose Cooperatives in Input and Out Agricultural Marketing in Adwa Woreda, Tigray Region, Ethiopia. African International Journal of Research in Management.

Novkovic, S. 2021. Cooperative identity as Yardstick for Transformative Change. Annals of Public and Cooperative Economics. Malaysian Journal of Co-operative Studies.

Pabuayan, Isabelita M. and Quilloy, K. 2015. The Philippine Co-operative Enterprises Towards Sustainable Development: A Perception Study.

Paradero, Angelina L., Te, Damilo M. and Casinillo, Leomarich F. 2022. On Determinants of Cooperatives' Perceived Effectiveness in Terms of Financial and Social Performance. Philippine Social Science Journal.

Pirson (2017). Humanistic Management: Protecting Dignity and Promoting Well-being. Cambridge University Press.

Plakias, Zo T. & Entsminger, Jason S. 2023. Consumer Cooperatives: Purpose and Possibilities. Handbook of Research on Cooperatives and Mutuals. Edward Elgar Publishing.

Ramos, R.C. 2018. Performance of Multi-Purpose Cooperatives in the City of Tarlac. Review of Integrated Business and Economics Research.

Republic Act No. 9520. 2009. An Act Amending the Cooperative Code of the Philippines to be Known as the "Philippine Cooperative Code of 2008". Chapter I General Concepts and Principles. Art. 4. December 16, 2008.

Republic Act No. 11535. 2021. An Act Making the Position of a Cooperatives Development Officer Mandatory in the Municipal, City and Provincial Levels, Amending for the Purpose RA 7160, Otherwise Known as the Local Government Code of 1991", as Amended.

Rockstrom, J. et al. 2015. Planetary Boundaries: Guiding Human Development on a Changing Planet.

Sam, R.A. and Abubakar-Sam, S. 2013. Farmers' Cooperatives in the Conflic Ridden Areas: The Maguindanao, Southern Philippines Experience. Journal of Social Science for Policy Implications.

Sarsale, M. and Kilongkilong, D. 2020. Management Practices of Multipurpose Cooperatives Operating in a Philippine Province. Asia Pacific Journal of Multidisciplinary Research.

Taimni Krishan, 2001. Cooperatives in Asia: From Reform to Reconstruction International Cooperative Alliance, Geneva.

Tchami G. 2007. *Handbook on Cooperatives for Use of Workers' Organizations*, International Labor Organization, *Geneva*.

Teves, Gary. 2002. Government Financial Institutions and Cooperatives. Partner for Progress. 6th National Cooperative Summit. Cagayan de Oro City.

Tongco MDC. 2007. Purposive sampling as a tool for informant selection. Ethnobotany Research & Applications.

Tomaquin, R.D. 2014. The Impact of Cooperatives as an Economic and social Institution in the Fishing Villages of Surigao del Sur (Philippines). American International Journal of Research in Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences.

Tremblay, E., Hupper, A., and Waring, T. 2019. Co-Operators Exhibit Greater Behavioral Cooperation than Comparable Business: Experimental Evidence. Journal of Cooperative Organization and Management.

Trochim, W.M.K. and Donnelly, J.P. (2008). The Research Methods Knowledge Base. 3rd Edition, Atomic Dog, Mason, 56-65.

White, K. 2017. Reasons Why Co-ops Fail. (and How to Ensure Yours Wont). Cooperatives First.