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Co-operative Discourse:  
A Multi-Level Analysis

Suparade Karalak

Abstract

This research investigates the discourse of co-operative management and leadership. It explores the social construction of the concept of the ‘co-operative’ and the philosophy that underpins co-operative ideology, culture and values. The research employs a discursive research methodology. More specifically, discourse analysis is applied to a sample of speeches \((n=23)\) given by prominent co-operative figures between 1823 and 1997. These texts are analysed using three discursive methods, namely: content analysis, narrative analysis and intertextuality analysis. These approaches are utilised to explore different levels of discourse, i.e.: the micro-level (the interrogation of words and sentences using content analysis); the meso-level (the examination of embedded stories and plots within texts using narrative analysis); and the macro-level (the exploration of underlying patterns and recurring themes across texts using intertextual analysis).

There are two main findings of this research. First, there is an emphasis on the notion of ‘heroic/ideal’ leadership within the texts which runs contrary to the espoused core values of shared responsibility and democratic member-based control within co-operatives. Second, and somewhat paradoxically, the discourse of co-operatives is becoming more businesslike and entrepreneurial in nature while the rhetoric of profit-making organisation is generally becoming more inclusionary, participative and democratic.

The research highlights that there is an inherent tension within the co-operative movement between wanting to retain traditional values and the need to incorporate contemporary business practices (e.g. hierarchical leadership) and business values (i.e. capitalistic ideals). Given that co-operatives are caught between traditional commitments and adjusting to external requirements of being profitable, there are implications for identity and there is a need to rethink some of the assumptions, concepts and values which underpin co-operative discourse. Beyond the substantive contribution, this research also offers insights into the scope for, and benefits of, applying a multi-method, multi-level approach to discursive study of organisational phenomena.
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CHAPTER 1:

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Emergence of the Co-operative

After the second half of the eighteenth century, which was followed by 'the Industrial Revolution', large fortunes were made by adventurous employers, bankers, cotton lords and mine-owners whilst poverty and distress increased among the new and large class of wage earners. This class was created as a result of the fact that wealth was being unequally distributed (Cole and Postgate, 1938; Engels, 1958; Bonner, 1961; Hall and Watkins, 1937). Hall and Watkins (1937:34) argue that with the invention of new machines, unemployment spread all over the country; for the workers who were still employed, a drastic cut in wages was evident. In the metal and mining industries, thousands of workers were dismissed; in the textile trades, short time became almost universal for those who were able to keep their jobs at all (Cole, 1938).

This is where the ideology of co-operation came into being as the system of people voluntarily associated, worked together on equal terms to eliminate their economic exploitation by middlemen. As succinctly expressed by a nineteenth century advocate of co-operation, 'I shall have my hand in no man's pocket and no man shall have his hand in mine' (Chatt, 1996:5). Its roots can be found primarily in England, France, Ireland and Germany.

The founder of the co-operative movement was Robert Owen, a successful nineteenth century Welsh industrialist who followed his vision of a 'New Moral World', and established a model factory in New Lannark, based on a 'self-help system' where people made their own clothes and eventually become self-governing while at the same time receiving free education and accommodation (Birchall, 1994:10). The co-operative
movement has come a long way from this type of small self-help community and has
developed to include popular forms of business organisations across occupations and
nationalities. In the *Co-operative Identity of Statement*, a co-operative is defined as an
autonomous association of persons united voluntarily to meet their common economic,
social, and cultural needs and aspirations through a jointly owned and democratically
controlled enterprise (MacPherson, 1995).

An analysis based on Salamon and Anheier’s report (1994) of social group
categorisation in Japan was made by Ishizuka (2002:244) to characterised the main
elements of Japanese social economy thus allowing him to classify co-operative
organisation into two main types: ‘Business type’, e.g. co-operatives, mutuals,
associations, business unions, employers’ associations and workers’ self-government
enterprises, and ‘Non business type’, e.g. labour unions, consumers’ associations, medical
care institutions and welfare organisations. The elements found to be characteristic of
Japanese social economy including co-operatives were ‘not for profit’, ‘creation of
economic value’, ‘independence’, ‘open door’ and ‘democracy’. These characteristics are
supported by similar current information on the Co-op main website
(www.coopzone.coop) as referred to below.

Co-operative organisations differ from other businesses in three ways: purposes,
control structure and allocation of profit (www.coopzone.coop). First, co-ops and credit
unions meet the common needs of their members, whereas most investor-owned business
exists to maximise profit for shareholders. Second, co-operatives use a system of one-
member/one-vote, not one-vote-per-share and this helps them to serve the common
interest and to ensure that people, not capital, control the organisations. Finally, co-
operatives share profits among their members-owners on the basis of how much they use
the organisation, not on how many shares they hold. These distinctive characteristics are
also considered to be ‘co-operative advantage’ (discussed later).

In addition to these three factors, what differentiates co-operative societies from
other third sector organisations has been their commitment to ‘co-operative principles’ as
stated in the Identity of Statement. These fundamental values are self-help, democracy,
equality, equity and solidarity, and the co-operative members’ belief in the ethical values
of honesty, openness, social responsibility, and caring for others (MacPherson, 1995).
Contemporary co-operatives’ principles include: 1) Voluntary and Open Membership; 2)
Democratic Member Control; 3) Member Economic Participation; 4) Autonomy and
Independence; 5) Education, Training and Information; 6) Co-operation among Co-operatives and 7) Concern for Community (See more details in Appendix 1).

1.2 Co-operative as an Alternative to Capitalism

Within social economy, apart from co-operative societies, there are numerous types of organisations including foundations, associations, joint-stock or private limited companies with social purposes (Mancino and Thomas, 2005:357) and recently there has been an emergence of social enterprises (see later discussion). Given its social-orientated goal and mission, along with its characteristic principles such as freedom to participate in productive processes, democracy and shared responsibility for outlining general objectives and fair profit distribution (Garcia-Gutierrez, 1991:197), the co-operative, together with the rest of the organisations that comprise the social economy, can be considered a worthy alternative to both the public and the private capitalist economy.

The European Social Economy Conference (2002) clearly recognises that all forms of Social Economy business have, in many sectors, become viable alternative to the maintenance of a welfare state. This is because of their capacity to generate employment, and more importantly, to encourage a capacity for enterprise. It is also because they aim to facilitate social cohesion and integration by opening up creative business opportunities to collectives in particular vulnerable social-economic situations, because they meet new social needs overcoming insufficiencies in an inadequate system of social protection to meet specific needs, and because in driving forward a different globalisation which is just as viable, they provide a link between economic growth and social cohesion.

In the contemporary commercial world where capitalism and technology continue to evolve, there is an emphasis on capital, profit-maximisation, pursuit of self-interest and career development. Consequently, in many parts of the economy, employees, workers, consumers and those with weaker economic status are victims of the defects of the free market economy such as unfair competition and the black market. Against this backdrop, co-operative societies provide creation of employment, the mobilisation of resources and the generation of investment.

Co-operatives help establish orderly marketing channels and bring balance to markets where producers would have minimal bargaining power in highly concentrated industries (Hogeland, 2006:17). Likewise, they provide a reliable and fair priced source of production supplies, keeping other firms in the marketplace fair and honest in terms of competition. Furthermore, they help to strengthen rural communities. An example of this is Vesta Co-op Café that allows local people to interact and meet up thus saving them from driving 20 miles to the nearest (Baxter, 2004: 22-23). Co-operation as a way of life goes beyond the limits of safeguarding the interests of members and strives for a co-operative order of society. It is usually referred to as a weapon for fighting the evils of capitalism, a shield against communism and a school of ‘democracy’.

Co-operatives’ contributions to the community and economy have been widely recognised by outstanding bodies such as the European Union, the United Nations (2004) and the International Labour Office (2002) (Fernandez Guadano, 2006: 109) and because of this people unite together as an ‘alternative to capitalism’. There is no doubt that co-operatives deserve considerable merit, creditability and attention given their social-orientated purposes.

1.2.1 Co-operative scopes

The notion of co-operation has proven to be widely accepted and popular with co-operative organisations operating worldwide at a capacity of over 800 million people around the world (www.ica.coop). Large segments of the population across different continents are members of co-operatives: in Finland, S-Group has a membership of 1,468,572 individuals which represents 62% of Finnish households and in Canada, 1 in 3 individuals is a member of a co-operative (33%), particularly the Desjardins co-operative movement in Quebec which has over 5 million members (Source: SOK Corporation Annual Report 2004).

Co-operatives within many countries are considered as significant economic actors: in Denmark, consumer co-operatives in 2004 held 37% of the market (Source: Coop Norden AB Annual Report 2004) and they create and maintain employment: in

---

2 http://www.s-kanava.fi/
3 http://www.coop.se/
Italy, 70,400 co-operative societies employed nearly 1 million people in 2005 (Source: Camere Di Commercio d'Italia, “Secondo rapporto sulle imprese cooperative”).

Today, the International Co-operative Alliance (ICA) has 223 member organisations from 89 countries active in all sectors of the economy. Together these co-operatives represent more than 800 million individuals worldwide (cited in www.coop.org). The movement expanded worldwide first in Europe and America followed by the Asian Pacific continents. Examples include the German Credit Union (by Raiffeisien and Schulze-Delitzsch, 1818-88) and Co-operative Housing, Irish Farmer Co-operation, French Consumer Co-operative, Rural Electric Co-operative in the US (Richard Pence, 1984) and Anand Dairy Co-operative which is the largest co-operative in the world today and is located in India.

1.2.2 Co-operative advantages

Under co-operative management and leadership, organisations are fundamentally run by the principles of democratic control and ownership, where trust is a crucial means of co-ordination and control (Borgen, 2001:209) as is also member participation. Each individual principle outlined in the Identity Statement (Appendix 1) is considered essential to co-operative existence and identity.

‘Trust’ is seen as one co-operative advantage as less cost is required for monitoring and checking for exploitation and good quality (Spear, 2000:521; Fairbairn, 2003:13). Spear (2000:507-523) points out that, in addition to the trust factor, co-operatives have advantages in health, education, and welfare markets, as they are market orientated with additional social benefits. Third, the spirit of self-help is an effective instrument for assisting weaker actors to combat excessive market power.

Fourth, solidarity within the community strengthens relations within the community and builds social capital to develop a better civil society and improve economic performance. Social capital here refers to the unique features of a social organisation, such as networks, norms and trust, which facilitate co-ordination and co-
operation for mutual benefit, fostering collective action and civic participation, thus helping to build dynamic communities (Lizarralde and Etxeberria, 2005:70).

Finally, participation and co-op values: co-operatives are participative by definition and they empower people and thereby make a more effective use of the resources that those people bring to an organisation; empowerment of users and the ethical values of co-operatives can bring intrinsic rewards for members from owning and trading with their enterprise. The list of its advantages expands through horizontal and vertical integration (guaranteed suppliers and buyers from co-operative firms and members), social efficiencies generating positive externalities, and effectiveness in responding to market failure and state crisis.

1.2.3 Co-operative drawbacks

Unfortunately, many co-operatives are facing problems and issues today that suggest that sustaining and extending these advantages is difficult and requires considerable effort and dedication from both members and leaders of co-operatives. These drawbacks result directly from a lack of commitment to co-operative principles and values, fundamentally a leadership issue where trust and responsibility have often been compromised by the board of directors, indicating the failure of democracy and the unbalanced relationship between management and elected lay directors (Itoken, 1996; Siverstensen, 1996; Lees and Volkers, 1996; Bartus, 1996; Parnell, 1999, 2000; Munker, 2000).

There has also been a lack of member participation. The recent data on UK Consumer co-operatives (Davies and Donaldson, 2001) shows a range of 1-5% of members participating in board elections and most societies report less than 1% of members voting in meetings. There was some evidence of effects – with larger organisations tending to have a lower participation level (Spear, 2004:39). There has also been evidence of a lack of involvement of certain groups of members, particularly women and young people. The National Co-operative Business Association’s survey reports indicate that 25% of credit unions have more than five women as directors and 20% have a woman as board chair (Wirtz, 2005:17). Furthermore, Wadsworth (2004:26) points out some of the recent negative factors that are impacting co-operatives, their members and potential members: major business and co-op failures; ethical meltdowns that have rocked the business world and hurt the public perception of all business – co-ops included; co-ops
struggling for effective leadership; and rising competition from multinational corporations.

Having outlined the purposes, distinctive principles and values, advantages and limitations, it is beneficial to compare co-operative performance to other non-profit organisations. As there are many social forms of organisation, it is interesting to compare those that have adopted the same democratic governance model. One contemporary emerging area of the non-profit sector full of promise is 'social enterprise', emphasising both social and economic objectives, equally.

1.3 Social Enterprise – a New Breed of Non-profits or Reflection of Co-operatives

Social Enterprise (SE) is a business with primarily social objectives whose surpluses are principally reinvested for that purpose in the business or in the community, rather than being driven by the need to maximise profit for shareholders (The Department of Trade and Industry, 2002). SE is not a new idea but one that is closely related to the co-operative’ model which has been around for more than 150 years. During the last 25 years, SEs have been growing fast in response to the needs of citizens, particularly within the labour market, seeking to help poorly qualified unemployed people who are at risk of permanent exclusion from the market return to work and to society in general through a productive activity (Manciono and Thomas, 2005:357; Kasim and Hudson, 2006:24) and work integration (Vidal, 2004:11; Spear and Bidet, 2005:196). This is supported by a SE report writer, William Mann (2004:21) who says that ‘we are trying to engage people who wouldn’t voluntarily knock on the college door. There are a lot of people out there with “black economy” construction skills, who might do a day’s labouring here and there, often to top up their social security money’.

1.3.1 Social enterprise performance - particularly in the UK

The social economy field forms an important part of many developed economies – ranging from 3.3 to 16.6% of employment in different countries in Europe (Ciriec, 2000) and yet little research has been done on entrepreneurship in this sector (further similarities between co-operatives and SEs). The Global Entrepreneurship monitor has also revealed that social entrepreneurship and social enterprise create five times as many jobs and just over six times the amount of turnover as mainstream entrepreneurial business (European Venture Capital Journal, April:2000; Harding: 2004:43). SEs are one of the fastest
growing business phenomena in Britain, and they are starting to make an impact on construction (Mann, 2004:20). Also, the SE monitor reveals that 6.6% of the UK population is engaged in setting up or managing a business that trades with a ‘social purpose’ (European Venture Capital Journal, 2004:20).

Social enterprise involves a highly diverse range of enterprises encompassing differing legal forms, working in different sectors with differing social and environmental objectives, of different sizes and with a range of geographic markets (Kasim and Hudson, 2006:293). With such a diversity of activities including not-for-profit organisations, charities, foundations, co-operative and mutual societies often choosing to describe themselves as SEs, a definition has not yet been agreed upon by any authors. However, one distinctive definition of SEs is businesses that trade for a social purpose that combines innovation and entrepreneurship and seek to be financially sustainable by generating revenue from trading (The Union of Co-operative Enterprise, 2004), differentiating SE from others via its trading activities.

Another definition that differentiates SEs from other businesses, as explained by Andrew Mawson, the founder of Community Action Network: ‘A Charity operates on traditional philanthropic principles, while a social enterprise applies business principles and ideas to social questions, creating sustainability rather than dependence’ (Finn, 2004:58). Third, the extent to which social orientated focus is different from others, including co-operatives, is that it focuses on a more narrow operational definition of SEs that is framed more specifically in business and revenue generation terms and seen to be more market driven, client driven, self-sufficient, commercial or business like (Dart, 2004:414). Thus, unlike other traditional non-profit organisations, SEs tend to go to great length to present themselves as not being distinct from private business organisations as they wish to be seen as possessing rigorous performance objectives, not least in financial management terms (Low, 2006:380).

Johnson (2001) notes that SEs differ from other traditional non-profit organisations in that they blur boundaries between non-profit and for-profit and that they enact hybrid non-profit and for-profit activities. Finally, SEs operate mainly in Western countries (Mancio and Thomas, 2005:357; Spear and Bidet, 2005: 195) while co-operatives are more common in less developed countries (Spear, 2006:33). These last two points are debateable since co-operatives are also considered to have dual character: social and economic (Fairbairn, 2003:2-5). Many well-known successful co-operatives exist in many
Western European Countries (Mancino and Thomas, 2005:357) e.g. Spain (Mondragon Co-operatives), Italy (Social Co-operatives) and in Scandinavia, the United States and Canada.

1.3.2 SEs and co-operatives – similarities

Despite, their differences, it is important to evaluate to what extent SEs are similar to other non-profit organisations and in particular, co-operative organisations. To do that their characteristics will have to be outlined, then later compared to those of co-operatives.

Thompson and Doherty (2006: 362), based on 11 case studies, have outlined the determining characteristics of SEs as follows: 1) they have social purpose; 2) assets and wealth are used to create community benefit; 3) they pursue this with (at least in part) trade in the market place; 4) profits and surpluses are not distributed to shareholders, as is the case with a profit-seeking business; 5) ‘members’ or employees have some role in decision-making and/or governance; 6) the enterprise is seen as accountable to both its members and a wider community, and finally 7) there may be double or triple bottom line paradigms to demonstrate both financial and social returns – rather than accepting high returns in one and lower returns in the other.

The first, second, fourth, fifth and sixth principles of SEs are exactly the same as those of co-operatives which give priority to social purpose. Thus, profits and surpluses are not distributed to shareholders but are reinvested in social and community-based activities and the democratic participation of members/employees is fundamental to its governance. For the seventh characteristic, it has been argued by a number of co-operators (Fairbrian, 2003:2-5) that a co-operative consists of dual characters: social and economic. Thus, the only apparent difference is that SEs are involved largely in trading activities.

However, in recent years, there has been evidence indicating that certain types of co-operatives have also adopted their hybrid character where the social and the economic
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6 These 11 cases are examples of social enterprises including Genesis (East Midlands, UK) – community, Suma (UK) – health and organic food, KaBoom (USA) – child welfare, Play Pumps (South Africa) – Child welfare, Trade Plus Aid (Ghana) – Humanitarian Relief, Cafedirect (UK) – fair-trade, Honey Care (Africa) – fair-trade hives, Easybeinggreen (Australia) – environment, Trinity Partnership and social enterprise (UK) – economic development, Train 2000 (UK) – Women Employment, The Merseyside Dance Initiative (UK) – personal development.

7 Success is measured not just by financial achievement but also by social and environmental performance. Some organisations use a double bottom line – making the criteria either the economy and the environment or the
both have equal priority. In some cases, however, the latter is given priority over the former and these forms of co-operative also trade within the stock market (Katz, 1999 and Nilsson, 1999). One further interesting factor that indicate that SEs are in fact co-operatives is that they both share an emphasis on the importance of education as a predictor of social entrepreneur activity (European Venture Capital Journal, 2004:20) which is one of the co-operative’s fundamental principles stated in the Identity of Statement (see detail Appendix 1).

Furthermore, a fundamental objective shared by both SEs and Co-operatives is the desire to solve social exclusion problems in social markets by engaging in job training and placement. In fact, co-operatives in the past were established as self-help communities to solve labour exploitation problems. Mancino and Thomas (2005: 358) actually went as far as using the term ‘social co-operatives’, integrating the notion of SEs and co-operatives in pursuit of a corporate mission for the benefit of all or part of the community.

To be precise, SEs can be considered a reflection of co-operatives or even another branch of co-operatives that has broken away and aims to be commercially competitive thus allowing them to obtain more value added and adopt better technology and strategy. However, there is evidence that some existing co-operatives are diverging towards PLC status to increase commercial flexibility (Katz, 1999; Nilsson, 1999; Co-operative UK, 1976-2001) and the majority of them tend to be Agricultural Co-operatives in Canada and the Midwestern United States since 1990 (Fairbairn, 2003). Co-operatives can enjoy maximum benefits from the emergence of SEs where any developments, study and research can directly benefit and be applied to co-operatives’ activities, too.

1.3.3 Debate and challenges of SEs

There is still debate about the thin line between SEs and other non-profit organisations, e.g. charities can be blurred (Finn, 2004:58). An internationally renowned specialist in entrepreneurship research commented, ‘I gave up trying to measure it (social entrepreneurship) – it’s too difficult to pin down’ (Harding, 2004:40). Different people use the term ‘social enterprise’ to mean different things (Social Enterprise Unit Seminar, ACCORD³, 2003:1-5). There has always been a question of whether SE is the answer to

---

³ Australian Centre For Co-operative Research and Development
Website: www.accord.org.au/social/commentaries/social_enterprise.html
everything, ‘Can the SE take us to the promised land? (Quayside Debate, November, 2006). The question still requires more time and study to answer since SE is a new topic where there still is plenty of room for further research and development.

Another indecisive issue at present, is that many social enterprises must choose between a charitable public image and an entrepreneurial organisation at status, when in fact they would like both (Davies, 2004:33). The reason for this is that if they are registered as charities, SEs are financially constrained, with limited opportunities for growth, entrepreneurship or access to capital. If incorporated as private companies, they risk losing public trust – not because a private enterprise is intrinsically unworthy, but because outsiders do not view profit-seeking companies as fundamentally altruistic.

Furthermore, there has been a debate about whether non-profit organisations have the potential to increase income, diversify their revenue and become more sustainable by investing in SE as SE can divert important resources away from non-profit organisations and erode the sector’s mission (King, Rosenman and Posner, 2006). These latest points raise a common concern and question whether all non-profits, including co-operatives and SEs, should work together in order to explore the maximum human and intellectual resources that share the same fundamental goal, that is, the promotion of social interests.

Despite SEs’ rigorous business activities during the start-up period, it is always a challenge for them to sustain this effort. This is because it is relatively easy to start a non-profit organisation; reportedly, Americans launch as many as 115 new non-profits a day. But it is tough to build a large, sustainable organisation, says Vanessa Kirsch, an authority on the subject (Gergen, 2006:2). Tom Tierney, a respected social entrepreneur, says that another challenge for non-profits is to recruit talent; his studies show that by 2016 non-profits may need as many as 80,000 new leaders (Ibid, p.2). Also, SEs share the same concern as co-operatives when it comes to the question of whose interests the managers are serving (Davies, 2004:33).

Similar to co-operatives, it is difficult for SEs to generate a solid management and leadership framework since different societies have different purposes and structures. However, with the co-operatives’ strong and inflexible traditions and culture, it is
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9 Business School, University of Huddersfield 2006, http://www.hud.ac.uk/schools/
10 Annual Conference of Alliance for Nonprofit Management - Profit Social Enterprise: The Debate, Saturday, July 16 2006, Featuring: Charles King of Housing Works and Mark Rosenman of Union Institute & University
questionable whether their development and activities can progress effectively and efficiently in comparison to SEs and others non-profit organisations.

1.3.4 Co-operatives benefit from SEs

As mentioned earlier, the study and research of social enterprise can be significantly beneficial to co-operatives since they share many aspects, including a social purpose, profit distribution, democratic control and the pursuit of commercial activities to some extent. The challenges faced by SEs can alert co-operatives to re-examine their current performance and compare it with other non-profits and private organisations. However, co-operatives, being the traditional form of non-profit organisation, dedicate substantial commitment to principles and values which are being translated into co-operative management and leadership.

However, since their early establishment, co-operatives tend to have a strong tradition of disengagement from any form of capitalistic activities. For example, at the beginning of Robert Owen’s creation of the self help community, any form of monetary exchange was forbidden and workers received goods in exchange for their labour. SEs seem to be on the point of proving to co-operatives that social and financial objectives can be complementary. This, to a significant extent, either directly or indirectly opens the mindset of co-operative tradition by encouraging co-operatives to be more commercially active since the profits they make will eventually reinvested for social benefit anyway.

Not only SEs, but many other charities and foundations have recently become involved in several commercial-based activities in order to increase their revenues. For example, Save the Children, an international development agency, sells a line of men’s neckwear and Delancy Street Foundation (in San Francisco) recruits ex-convicts and former substance abusers to work in its restaurant as part of their rehabilitation (Dees, 1998:56). Thus, a distinction between co-operatives and SEs or other non-profits is blurred at present.

Questions have been raised as to whether there is a difference between business organisations giving money to charity and SEs and co-operatives making profits but reinvesting in the community and its members. Co-operatives can indeed learn not just from SEs but also from other non-profits. It is fair to say that SEs are a new breed of non-profit organisations where financial excellence is valued along with total dedication to social investment, a reflection of co-operatives.
1.4 Co-operative Ideology and Conceptualisation

Although there is a great deal of literature on the subject of co-operatives, which is the main focus of this research, that for social entrepreneurship remains diffuse and fragmented (Mort et al, 2002:76). However, this is not surprising since co-operative societies have been around much longer than SEs.

Co-operative ideology and conceptualisation were widely discussed particularly in the 1920s by E G Nourse and A Shapiro; in the 1940s and 50s, by O. Aresvick, I.C. Emilianoff, Phillip, and F. Robotka; in the 1960s, Helmberger, Helmer and Hoos; in the 1980s and 1990s, by E. Boettcher, J. Brazda, J.G. Craig, C. Le Vay, R. J Sexton, J.M Staatz, P. Vitaliano, Hansmann and many others. Also, co-operative principles have been reviewed in numerous co-operative congress meetings by co-operators and authors such as Laidlow (1987), MacPherson (1995), Itoken (1996), Rokholt (2000), Rockholt and Borgen (2000), Dunn (1988), Reynolds (2000), Lliopolos (1998), Nichols et al (1983) and Lambert (1963) in order to show their relevance and applicability to current social and business environments.

Co-operators argue that these principles are being applied in ‘co-operative management’ (Nakkiran, 1996), the most distinctive principle being democratic control and ownership which means that the group exercises control over all major policies (Lambert, 1963; Cook et al, 1995; Griffith, 2003). It is often the case that the rationality and ideology of co-operative management has been illustrated by some other contemporary social and economical models, such as Olson’s collective action, Jensen and Meckling’s (1976) Agent Theory, Harte’s (1997) Modern Theory of Vertical Integration and William’s (1985) Transaction Cost Theory. These models in general identify separation between ownership and leadership as the primary weakness of co-operative management structure whereas Donaldson and Davis’s stewardship theory (1991) emphasises the leaders’ intrinsic factors such as loyalty and commitment to collectivism as a strength (see further discussion in chapter 2).

However, recently there has been evidence supporting the flip side of co-operatives: that is, poor performance caused by mismanagement, financial scandals, poor management control, growing distance between members and their co-operative society (separation between leadership and ownership noted by Jensen and Meckling, 1976), the failure of democracy and the unbalanced relationship between management and elected lay directors (Siverstensen, 1996; Lees and Volkers, 1996; Bartus, 1996; Parnell, 1999,
Apart from fundamental co-operative principles, 'co-operative leaders' are one of the most essential factors in determining co-operative success or failure. It is their responsibility to reinforce and be committed to co-operative values and purposes (MacPherson, 2000; Parnell, 1999, 2000; Cook et al, 1995; Sundarajan, 1991; Griffith, 2003; Lees and Volkers, 1996; Munkner, 2000; Wilson, 1998). Wolf (1987:29) argues that the character of almost every non-profit organisation is set in large measure by its chief executive. MacPherson (2000), Parnell (1999), Cook et al (1995) and Griffith (2003) emphasise more the notion of 'transformational leadership' where leaders inspire and motivate members so that they are committed to co-operative principles and goals.

As mentioned earlier in several reviews of co-operative principles and values, the area of co-operative management and leadership which derives from these principles and values is still not clearly understood and as a result has had to borrow other social and economic theories to rationalise its operation. Thus, it is important for co-operatives to concentrate further on management and leadership in order to be able to investigate and evaluate in greater depth their weaknesses, strengths and other interesting related factors. To do so, there is a need to relive the history of co-operative one more time by examining its social construction.

1.5 Social Construction

The concept of social construction was primarily developed by Peter L. Berger and Thomas Luckmann with their 1966 book, The Social Construction of Reality. They developed a sociological theory that sees society both as an Objective Reality and as a Subjective Reality (Berger and Luckman, 1966). Berger and Luckman (1967) define social construction as a process by which concepts and subjects are talked into being. Their views are congruent with those of other writers who adopted a discursive epistemology (see for example, Fairclough, 1992; Parker, 1992; Phillips & Hardy, 1997). It has been asserted that discourse creates social ‘reality’ through the production of concepts, objects and subject positions which shape the way in which we understand the world and react to it (Hardy and Palmer, 1999:4).

Vivien Burr (1995:1) suggests social constructionism is a theoretical orientation which underpins discourse analysis, deconstruction and post-structuralism and that it is
multidisciplinary in nature. Philips and Hardy (1997, 1999) have provided an excellent illustration of how social construction works to create objects, subjects and concepts. They embraced discourse analysis in their study of the process of social construction in relation to refugee systems in Canada and the UK. They argue that discursive activity results in changes in concepts (i.e. refugeeness as a category), objects (actual refugees) and in the emergence of different subject positions such as refugees, immigration officers, lawyers and politicians who have the ability to change and alter situations and influence participants and audiences in those situations, that is, influence processes of categorisation and identification of refugees.

The primary difference between concepts and objects is that the concept of refugee exists in our minds but the refugee who appears before an immigration officer is an object, made sensible and given meaning, by the concept ‘refugee’. Concepts and objects are interrelated, for example, protections afforded to each individual object depend on the concept of what a refugee is. If the idea of what a refugee is changes, so too do the processes and practices on which it is based and, ultimately, so does the object. During this level of discursive process, subjects are being created (e.g. autonomous, dependent, demanding, genuine and bogus refugees) and so are their positions (mentioned previously). Overall, this work illustrates the ability of actors to use discourse as a resource to bring about certain outcomes. Definition and identification of the concept of refugee are shaped by the goals and interests of organisations involved in the refugee domain.

In this study, the social construction method described in the refugee example above can be applied to the co-operative movement in a similar way to explore its social construction and essential components, factors that underlie the essence of being a co-operative and that differentiate the co-operative sector from others. The co-operative movement has been continuously developed by many philanthropists and socialists since the nineteenth century. Robert Owen (1771-1855) (*A New View of Society*, 1813-16) decided to establish a self-help community providing better working and living conditions and education. He established his ideal societies at Orbiston (1825-1827), Ralahine (1831-33) and Queenwood (1839-44) (see Garnett, 1972). Many notables were attracted by Robert Owen and were interested in his views, including the Duke of Kent (father of Queen Victoria), the Archbishop of Canterbury, Lord Sidmouth and the Benthamite circle of economists and utilitarians, including Jeremy Bentham (who become his partner at
New Lannark), James Mill, David Ricardo, Thomas Malthus, John Austin and Henry Brougham (Bonner, 1970:10). In 1824, Jeremy Bentham offered Owen a free hand, establishing the London Co-operative Society (LCS) which became a propagandist body for the schemes of co-operative communities (Brown, 1928: 26-33).

1.6 History of the Co-operative

The heyday of Owenism had been from the mid-twenties of the nineteenth century to the mid-thirties, as during that time the Trade Union movement was inspired largely by co-operative and socialist ideals alongside persistent growth of co-operative societies of every kind (Cole, 1944:13). This ‘enthusiastic period’ had ended in 1834 with the collapse of the Trade Union movement, dragging down most of the co-operative experiments, although a few survived (Ibid, p.13). However, the continuation of Owen’s idea led to the founding of ‘the Rochdale Society’ (1844) led by Dr. William King and associates, which reconstructed the co-operative movement after its disaster year. Dr. King placed emphasis on the importance of education and his view on labour as ‘the basis of value’ was largely influenced by Adam Smith (1723-90) (Birchhall, 1994:25) and David Ricardo (1771-1823). His Co-operator was one of the best and most influential co-operative propaganda journals (Mercer, 1936:13).

The movement continued and consumerism expanded which further pressured productive societies to establish The Society for Promoting Working Men’s Associations in 1850, founded by Christian Socialists (Bonner, 1961: 60-7). This was immediately followed by the founding of the Co-operative Wholesale Society (CWS) in 1863. The Associations later became known as the International Co-operative Alliance (ICA), based on Owen’s idea of ‘associations of all classes and all nations’. Today it is an independent, non-governmental association which unites, represents and serves co-operatives worldwide.

Having briefly reviewed the notion of social construction and how it can be applied to explore co-operative social construction and the essential components that differentiate co-operatives from other organisations, a research focus can be generated clearly for this research study.
1.7 Research Focus

Theoretically, co-operative management and leadership is derived from history, traditions and founders' opinions that generated the cultural values and principles of the co-operatives. It should be mentioned that co-operatives (given today's dynamic global competition) need to further develop and improve their management and leadership effectiveness. However, since both aspects are derived primarily from their key founders' and leaders' visions and inspiration (which today have become the co-operative identity), it is vital to research and study the notion of the co-operative as a social construct to gain an in-depth understanding of the establishment of its management and leadership styles in order to understand existing problems that co-operatives are experiencing.

Thus, this study aims to investigate and explore the ongoing co-operative discourse and consider the implications for contemporary co-operative leadership and management. This study will focus on a sample of co-operative texts that offer insights into the sources of co-operative literature, social construction, and philosophy and examine how they directly underpin or affect co-operative concepts, ideas and theories, especially among key leaders who have prefigured and informed current leadership and management style. Here, a leader can be referred to either as an elected leader or a representative who has been elected by members, a board of directors or a manager who has been hired by a co-operative.

It is anticipated that the results of this study will not only be relevant to the objective of understanding co-operative discourse but will stimulate discussion and investigation of contemporary practices. Furthermore, this study will contribute additional empirical work to existing co-operative literature and ideologies.

1.8 Thesis Structure

This thesis is divided into eight chapters. Chapter 2: Literature Review assesses the extent of co-operative literature, its definition, values and principles, as well as management and leadership literature relating to the co-operative and other non-profit organisations (in particular, social enterprises). Chapter 3: Research Methodology outlines research purposes and questions and is followed by a review of the research philosophy, that is, social construction. The rationale for the chosen methodology using discourse analysis and multi-textual analysis (content analysis, narrative analysis and intertextuality) respectively, will be presented. Also, the procedure for data collection,
sampling, analysis and interpretation, method limitations and validity issues will be outlined.

Having explained the methodological approach analysis using each method, findings are outlined and interpreted in Chapter 4 (Content Analysis Findings), Chapter 5 (Narrative Analysis Findings) and Chapter 6 (Intertextuality Findings). Content analysis findings with an emphasis on quantification of words and word categories (citations from 23 speeches) are presented in statistical terms using two kinds of textual analysis software, General Inquirer and Diction 5. These approaches focus more on the aggregative mode of interpretation. Narrative analysis treats the texts as stories and identifies characters (such as heroes and villains) and considers the motives and emotions used to interpret meanings behind each story (i.e. speech). Intertextuality addresses relations among the chosen co-operators and reveals patterns of shared ideas, concepts and theories which vary across time and co-operators.

Chapter 7: Discussion of Findings interprets and discusses the findings from all three textual analysis methods, individually as well as in conjunction with each other. The findings from each method are discussed on the basis of their significance and contribution to the literature on co-operative management and leadership. Diagrams and tables are used to summarise the outcome and to simplify the analysis and discussion. Finally, Chapter 8: Conclusions presents the ‘substantive’ and ‘methodological’ contributions (multi-method textual analysis). It also offers suggestions for further study in the areas of management, leadership and the values and practice of co-operative organisations.
CHAPTER 2:

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

This literature review chapter is divided into two parts: co-operative management and co-operative leadership. The first part reviews co-operative management contexts: definition, distinctive factors, objectives, co-principles and values, theory, culture and adaptability and convergence with other types of companies. The purpose of the first part is to introduce the context of co-operatives in order to allow the reader to be more familiar with the area of disciplines concerning co-operatives and recognise the difference between them and other organisations. The second part begins with an introduction to co-operative leadership style, followed by illustrations of traditional and contemporary leadership approaches and their suitability and applicability to co-operative collective culture and environment. In addition, the distinction between co-operatives and other forms of leadership are discussed and the challenges and gaps in the literature are considered.

2.2 Co-operative Management

Co-operative management is defined as a complex decision-making process on three levels of the management pyramid: members, board of directors and hired professionals. This pyramid is aimed at achieving a proper balance of success of the co-operative enterprise as a business unit as well as a social institution (Watzlawick, 1978, 17). Its operative management starts with a strong board of directors, and then follows with a strong manager to carry out the board of directors' wishes (Hoagland, 2002). This is because, co-operative management is unique and, therefore, the role of the co-operative
manager is unique, that there are co-operative-specific management skills which are critical to the role, recruitment and accountability of the manager (Griffith, 2003:1).

This, of course, also depends on the values and principles of the co-operative being explicit and recognised and accepted by the co-operative's members and directors - that business decision-making and practices must reflect and reinforce co-operative values and principles (Ibid, p.1). Thus, co-operative management is different from other kinds of management because it largely involves co-operative principles and values in its practice, and its success depends critically on boards and managers, hence, co-operative leaders (discuss later).

### 2.2.1 Co-operative objectives

Broadly speaking, co-operatives are social and economic organisations with a very strong social purpose. Consequently, they often find themselves caught up in these dualistic objectives (social and commercial), being rather uncertain regarding their priorities. Some co-operators have argued that the objective of co-operatives is no longer just social responsibility but economic activities too, especially profit making. In addition, a co-operative has always been known for its common goal and interests which is rather questionable now since co-operatives involve many groups of cardinal stakeholders.

Fauquet (1951) and Munkner (1991) characterised co-operatives as having a 'double (dual) nature': an association of people (the member association) and their economic enterprises for the needs of those persons. The association of people and their economic enterprises constitute an integrated wholeness, a unity (Book, 1992). On the other hand, Rokholt (1999) and Fairbairn (2003:2-5) see such characteristics as problematic since while other businesses have 'only one clear' set of obligations (profit-maximisation), a co-operative appears to carry an extra burden.

Griffith (2003:1) argues that there is no such thing as a perfect co-operative (achieving both social and economic goals equally) as there is no such thing as a perfect economy. More important is how co-operatives deal with economic and social problems on an ongoing basis. Moreover, Cameron (1981) argues in his 'strategic constituencies model', that goal accomplishments really depend on the judgement and satisfaction of different constituencies (Cameron and Whetten, 1983:8) shareholders, management, workforce, investors, community and government. For example, management may view its performance as successful but the decisions made might not reflect members' opinions
and involvement. As a result, as many co-operators would say 'it may be successful but it is not a real co-op anymore', as members' views were neglected.

On the contrary, Fairbairn (2003:3) argues that a co-operative has to first make money before any of it can be spent on good causes. However, he still supports the idea of the 'integrated approach' in which social goals are to be accomplished through economic activities and in which the membership of a co-operative is the place where social and economic functions come together. He strongly believes that the reverse is rather doubtful. However, such a view could be opposed by many co-operators who still emphasise the social side of co-operatives, as the 'prime objective' of co-operatives is to provide services and benefits to members (Parnell, 1999:155). Another issue concerns whether the co-operative objective today is to still maintain their traditional common goal.

Based on a research paper by the British academic, Alan Fox, to the Donovan Commission on the Trade Unions and Employers' Association (Fox, 1966), traditionally, a co-operative sees itself as having a unitaristic view where employees and managers strive towards the achievement of common goals (Buchanan and Huczynski, 1999:635). This view represents the traditional co-operative where members believe that leaders/management know what is best for them and therefore rest assured that the leaders/managers make the right decisions for them as long as they, the members provide them with satisfactory results at the end of the year. In contrast, nowadays there are numerous groups of cardinal stakeholders such as producers, communities, governments and consumers whose interests largely diverge although these groups make up the co-operatives.

In pluralist analysis, interest is concentrated on the need for co-ordination and control rather than on the point of decision-making (Brooke, 1984:23). This paradox is partly resolved by the greater autonomy for social units, a fact that partly explains how decentralisation becomes a norm for democratic societies where negotiation and agreement on common goals can truly reflect community interest. For a co-operative, it is ideal for conflicts of interest to be resolved in a way that mutually benefits every party, which could be considered as a win-win situation. Sundarajan (1991:88) and Tjosvold's (1998:39) study proposed there are three management resolutions for conflict; lose-lose
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1 Interviews were conducted with executives from forty successful companies on the organisation's values and involvement practices (p.38-44).
(both parties lose), win-lose (one gains and one loses) and the win-win approach (both win).

In a co-operative, the win-win approach is ideal though that has not always necessarily been the case as leaders and management may prioritise investors' interests over members' interests. It is important for a co-operative that the value of unitarism (common goals and mutual benefit) is still being upheld as it is one original value that enables co-operators to work towards the same goal.

2.2.2 Co-operative principles and values

The concept of co-operative management signifies the application of management principles to the co-operatives that are guided by the principles of co-operation. The guiding spirit of a co-operative has always been the principles and values that, as mentioned earlier, are ideally to be translated into the co-operative management system. As a result of differences in co-operatives stemming from different occupational areas in the year 1937, the International Co-operative Alliance laid down certain principles which were applicable to all co-operatives. These principles were reviewed and outlined in Co-operative Identity of Statement (1995) (see Appendix 1).

The purpose of the Identity of Statement serves co-operatives in all economic, social and political circumstances equally well and therefore provides a general framework within which all kinds of co-operatives can function (MacPherson, 1995). Values are internalised attitudes about what is right and wrong, ethical and unethical, moral and immoral (Yulk, 1998:234). They are important because they influence a person's preferences, perception of problems and choice of behaviour. Organisation values exist when the members of an organisation share the same values (Wiener, 1988).

Co-operatives are based on the values of self-help, democracy, equality, equity and solidarity. Co-operative members believe in the ethical values of honesty, openness, social responsibility, and caring for others (Co-operative Identity of Statement, 1995). Co-operative principles are listed below (see details in Appendix 1).

1) Voluntary and Open Membership
2) Democratic Member Control
3) Member Economic Participation
4) Autonomy and Independence
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5) Education, Training and Information
6) Co-operation among Co-operatives
7) Concerns for Community

Factors that distinguish co-operatives from other private and public organisations are these values and principles and the fact that they are central to co-operative management and operations. These principles and values are further developed into specific ones that are applicable to co-operative management. Griffith (2003:3) summarises the difference between the management values and principles of investor and co-operative businesses in Table 2.1.

Table 2.1 shows the emphasis on ‘service’ rather than ‘profit’. Co-operatives ‘distribute surplus and dividend’ (profit distribution) to members equally or invest in services and ‘facilities that are publicly beneficial to members’. And finally, all members have ‘total democratic control of their societies’. However, despite such differences, one similarity between them is that both have a board of directors, acting as a link between members/shareholders and the management and in each case the owners elect the board (Stephenson, 1963).

Table 2.1 Distinction of values and principles between Co-operatives and Investment-led companies (Griffith, 2003)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Co-operative Business Management Values and Principles</th>
<th>Investor Business Management Values and Principles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maximise service to members</td>
<td>Maximise dividends to shareholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasonable profit</td>
<td>Maximise profit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited economic growth</td>
<td>Unlimited economic growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation with majority of members</td>
<td>Consultation with minority of shareholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing member education</td>
<td>No shareholder education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limit on profit distribution</td>
<td>No limit on profit distribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reinforce and reflect democracy</td>
<td>Reinforce and reflect plutocracy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Despite the fact that co-operative values and principles are essential to co-operative existence, there have been frequent discussions by many co-operators on the need for these values and principles to be applicable to daily management practices. Otherwise, they would have no role or effect within co-operatives at all and could even cause internal confusion. Similarly, Rokholt (2000:66) argues that those co-operative values and principles are not explicitly connected, argued or explained in relation to any specific strategy. There are no explicitly stated theoretical connections drawn between the values and principles and the consequences, such as member loyalty, governance efficiency, and capital supply.

MacPherson (1995) argues that democratic procedures are said to be feasible, desirable and efficient in application to economic activities but there is no explanation of ‘why’ and ‘how’ (Rokholt and Borgen, 2000:10). There has been an emphasis on setting a policy that is based on values and principles but never has there been an outlined application or implementation process. This is similar to Itoken’s (1996: 21) view that it is meaningless for the prime objectives to focus on various theoretical management systems that have come into fashion one after another rather than on their possible impact on the performance of the organisation. This is supported by a study conducted by Gundry and Rousseau (1994) where 149 recent hire recruits from 12 electronics manufacturing firms were asked to relate their experiences of formative events and the messages derived from them. The findings indicate that it is important for the newcomers to hear examples of the application of these values in order that they become committed. Dunn (1988) describes the problems regarding principles that ‘Co-operative principles should be viewed as guideposts or goals, not as absolute acid tests’.

On the other hand, business pragmatists among co-operative directors, managers, and advisors must learn to recognise the values and strengths inherent in the unique features of co-operatives. Their creative and competitive efforts may then be directed toward the refinement of the methods and mechanisms that contribute to the strong co-operative business performance without compromising the spirit of its basic principles, which would be viewed as an internal constraint related to personal morality, whereas external constraints are enforced by, for example, the national government (Reynolds,

---

2 This paper describes a set of basic co-operative principles adopted in a recent Agricultural Co-operative Service study and how these principles relate to various co-operative business practices and issues facing US co-operative organisations.
2000:4). Internal constraint is a consequence of individuals and associative groups making decisions that disregard co-operative values and principles. Consequently, the contribution and relevance of these values and principles has become questionable. Reynolds (2000:5) argues that co-operative principles are likely to have negative effects when not connected to accomplishing the goals the individual wants achieved, or if they diminish incentives for members to assume an ownership interest in co-operatives.

Lliopolos (1998) notes that in a contemporary co-operative, 'open membership' is a source of the 'internal free rider' problem while 'one man one vote' (Democratic principle, see detail in Appendix 1) on some occasions allows a faction of large producers to control the board (Nichols et al, 1983). Similarly, Gomez et al (1999) found 'open membership' to be the principle that implies the devolution of capital to a member who voluntarily decides to leave the co-operative. This leads to capital variability and instability, especially in workers' co-operatives, where the compensation of capital return to lending members using contributions from new members is extremely difficult.

This shows that co-operative principles and values to a certain degree fail to cover all aspects of co-operative management and operation, in particular where capital distribution is concerned. It is important that these values and principles are effectively applicable in the practical activities of co-operatives and not just as 'abstract aspirations'. Thus, one particular co-operative issue is how to ensure that these principles are advantageous rather than detrimental. It is possible that the absence of a connection between these values and principles to actual management practice is partly due to the co-operatives' complex structures and strategies. Another fundamental principle of co-operatives that is also the subject of debate is democratic ownership and member control.

2.2.3 Democratic ownership and member control

As Lambert (1963:64) mentioned earlier, democracy is the sharpest principle that distinguishes a co-operative business from a capitalist business (see detail in Appendix 1). Hansmann (1996) also suggests that the critical distinction between co-operatives and a corporation is 'the identity of the owner' and his/her 'role of ownership' that is considered to be the source of comparative advantages. Similarly, Barton (1989) argues that co-

---

3 Raynold's (2000) paper examines selected principles of co-operatives to demonstrate that principles can affect industry changes that benefit all producers in a commodity industry of co-operatives.
operatives differ from investor-owned firms by their ‘basic property rights’ and decision-making process (member democracy), that is, open ownership and democratic decision-making, respectively (Schrader, 1989).

Thus, ‘democratic member control’ and ‘member ownership’ are essential factors of a highly co-operative identity that make it unique. The extent of democracy within a co-operative depends on how effectively members exercise control (Hanmann, 1996; Griffith, 2003). Usually the process involves nominating the board, voting for directors, attending meetings, reading the co-operative’s newsletter and responding to surveys (Cook et al, 1995:1). Members are said to control a co-operative when they can set major policies, change them, and are able to employ and dismiss managers (Cook et al, 1995:1).

However, as a co-operative expands, the notion of democratic control becomes more complicated. Holmstrom’s (1999:407) study on US co-operative reconstruction suggests that a collective decision is difficult, especially if the interests of the parties are diverged which would increase tension among members. He further argues that in practice, it is not feasible to have a large number of people directly involved in corporate decision-making, so democratic processes are notoriously slow and costly. Consequently, the inevitable action is to give one or a few stakeholders the authority to make formal decisions through ownership. This contradicts the co-operative value of unitarism, that is, common interest.

This can explain many cases where leaders or particular stakeholders such as investors are the ones who primarily make decisions concerning co-operative activities and business strategy such as the merger between Konsum Osterreich and the Swiss Migros Group in 1978 (Schediwy, 1996:62-68). Often, the future interest of members relies on managers, leaders, CEOs and professional managers who ideally, should be committed and loyal to co-operative values and missions to satisfy all the stakeholders mutual interests and represent those who are lacking in co-operative commitment and understanding of co-operative principles and values (see section 2.10 Co-operative Challenge).

Despite persistent emphasis on democratic control, lack of participation and involvement of members has long been known as a persistent problem of co-operatives (Itoken, 1996; Lees and Volkers, 1996). It has been an ongoing challenge for co-operatives to increase employee involvement and participation, in order to continuously earn the loyalty of its members (Griffith, 2003). Employee involvement is a participative
process to utilise the entire capacity of the workers, designed to encourage employee
commitment to organisational success (Lawler, 1986).

According to Cotton’s (1996) extensive review of research on employee
involvement examining the relationship between employee involvement and job
satisfaction, there are at least three types of employee ownership: Direct ownership,
Employee Stock Ownership Plans (ESOPs) and Worker co-operatives (Toscano, 1983).
The last type directly applies to co-operatives where a group of individuals working in a
company own and personally operate the organisation (Ibid, 1996). An empirical study of
229 managers conducted by Marsh and McAllister (1981) revealed that absenteeism
decrees when a stock ownership plan is introduced.

Findings from the survey of ESOPs found that it is likely that worker co-operatives
are more effective than ESOPs since these co-operatives incorporate other forms of
employee involvement, though other comparative studies seldom distinguish between co-
operatives and ESOPs (Conte and Tannenbaum, 1978). These findings show that ESOPs
were more likely formed for financial reasons rather than as a means to increase employee
involvement. Thus, employee ownership does not necessarily lead to employee
involvement practices (Cotton, 1996). This is supported by Cable’s (1988) study of the
relationship between productivity and profit sharing from German industry that indicated
how profit sharing can be relatively unrelated to other forms of employee participation.

This further explains the co-operative situation where members do share some
ownership with their society but are lacking in initiative and incentives to participate and
become involved with the members of their society during the decision-making process.
This inevitably opens up a gap due to the absence of principled commitment and increases
the opportunities for possible financial disputes as well as dishonesty from some managers
whose interests may lie elsewhere, not with the members’ welfare. For example, in the
Regan Affair, co-operative insiders (Executive Allan Green and David Chambers)
colluded in an attempt to privatise the Co-operative Wholesale Society (CWS) with
Andrew Regan, an owner of Lanica and Galileo (Co-operative News, October 1997). This
example clearly shows that the involvement of the members of society was diminished.

Cotton (1996) suggests that merely attending annual general meetings is
ineffective and insufficient. Instead, members should focus on everyday work, not
organisational policy. Employees should make decisions, not recommendations, and they
should be involved in ongoing processes, not just a single change, and major changes in
the job, not superficial changes. This view can be directly applied to the co-operative situation where members need to be involved with co-operative activities and decisions more, not just occasionally turn up for an annual meeting. According to Barberini’s *The Supervision, Auditing and Control of Co-ops in Italy* (1996:14), there are 1,000 meetings convened annually with over 100,000 participating members and approximately 15,000 members taking the floor; over 10,000 members are active at the regional level, in the board of directors and ‘Membership Service Departments’ located in the outlets (meeting and listening points).

The above examples of different societies indicate that though members and their representatives are an indication of successful democracy within a co-operative, eventually, it is the board of directors that plans things, takes important policy decisions and ensures the implementation of the policies framed (Nakkiran, 1996:210). Thus, the reflection of democracy for the members depends crucially on the board of director’s commitment and constant close contact with members so that they can generate policies that fully reflect members’ wants and needs.

### 2.2.4 Co-operative board structure and responsibility

Generally, the formal democratic structure of co-operatives is similar in all countries and sectors, with some variations in detail. The main function of the board is to frame policies, review the results and to maintain good relationships between hired managers (professionals) and the members (Nakkiran, 1996:210). In short, Nakkiran⁴ based his analysis mainly on the functions of management and their application to co-operatives in India. He suggested that the Board must maintain a cordial relationship at all stages with executives (hired professionals), while maintaining and exercising the right to monitor and dismiss such executives, and must also maintain two-way communication with the members to ensure correct communication and information in order to set policies that reflect members’ wishes (Ibid, p.13-19).

According to Lees and Volker’s ‘structure’ (1996:40), both ‘monist’ and ‘dualist’ systems have been adopted: shareholders’ meetings⁵ (members), board of

---

⁴ He claimed that he has analysed the functions of management and applied them to the co-operatives in India.
⁵ Annual shareholders' meetings are either open to all members (in small and medium sized societies and most British consumer co-ops) or only to delegates who are elected for between two and four years terms. In general, participation in elections is low and elections are rarely contested (Lee and Volkers, 1996:41).
directors/shareholders' meetings\(^6\) (representatives), supervisory board, executive board (hired professionals)\(^7\). In the monist system, it is the board which legally exercises the ultimate power and responsibility in all matters of the society but it delegates the running of the daily operations to the chief official (CEO) and his management team who are appointed by the board. Such a system is being exercised in Sweden, France and Italy, for instance (Ibid, p.41).

On the other hand, the dualist system operates in Germany and Austria where the exact responsibilities of the supervisory board and the executive board are laid down in the co-op rules of the society. The supervisory board closely monitors the daily operation and performance of management, appoints and removes the executive boards and runs the business in its own right under given co-operative guidelines, respectively. Idealistically, the system seems to indicate more control over the executive board. In terms of the board’s ‘responsibilities’, in a recent article *Rural Co-operative* (July/August, 2002: 30-32), Baarda has summarised the co-op boards’ circle of responsibilities as set out below:

1. **Board represents co-operative members:** directors are elected by members and directors’ role is to represent those members, knowing what members need, and to meet those needs.

2. **Board establishes co-operative policies:** directors put their member representation role into effect by making policy.

3. **Board hires and supervises management:** the board hires and supervises management where supervisory responsibilities vary according to structure and circumstances.

4. **Board is responsible for acquisition and preservation of co-operative assets:** the board is to establish policies with respect to acquisition and preservation of the co-operatives’ assets.

---

\(^6\) Board of directors/supervisory board is selected for a two to four year term. In many co-operatives, elections are not often contested and candidates are often preselected by the sitting board. Re-election is possible and frequent (Ibid, p.41).

\(^7\) In large societies, the executive board consists increasingly of ‘full time salaried’ executives only (Ibid, p.41).
5. **Board preserves the co-operative character of the organisation:** Boards must maintain special character of the co-operative, meaning that they must know what that character is, how it operates in the structure of organisation, and what kinds of events and actions may undermine co-operative fundamentals.

6. **Board assesses the co-operative's performance:** co-operative’s performance is ultimately measured by the benefit it confers on those who use it, i.e., members. Also it is judged by the co-operative fundamental objectives.

7. **Board informs members:** the board has to inform members about the organisation – member’s own business since without accurate information, members cannot make decisions and therefore are unable to make judgements about management or the board’s performance.

However, there have always been issues of poor relationships between members and the supervisory board and executive board of directors, as in the case of the Board of Co-op Norway (Siversten, 1996:34). In addition, Mills and Snaith (1997) suggest that for co-operatives, problems at board level are not caused by the domination of the board by executives but rather by their ‘absence’. Recently, a number of co-operative academics have attempted to adopt social and economic models to explain co-operative models which include the relationship between the board of directors and co-operative performance. The following co-operative governance models enable a clearer review of the Board action and objectives.

### 2.3 Co-operative Models

It is important to understand the role of the board of directors, how they perform and how they should serve members. Because the co-operative structure of open-ownership and democratic decision-making mentioned above indicates differences in monitoring and control of the paid managers by the owners of the firm, co-operative theorists often try to apply contemporary theoretical perspectives to illustrate and clarify how the co-operative board of directors carry out their tasks and decision making in relation to their members’ interests.
2.3.1 Democratic model

The dominant model of the co-operative is the democratic model which is based mainly on the argument from section 2.2.3 in relation to the principle of membership control and ownership (see Appendix 1). The key ideas and practices include: open elections on the basis of one person one vote, based on the assumption that the role of board members is to represent the interests of members of the organisation (Confroth, 2004:14). The role of the board is to resolve or choose between the interests of different groups (e.g. members, employees and community) and set the overall policy of the organisation, which can then be implemented by staff. The model seems uncomplicated and most importantly able to reflect overall social interest from members and employees of co-operatives.

The popularity of this model is proven as the newly emerged form of non-profit organisations, social enterprises, have adopted the model of democratic control where their members and employees do have ‘some’ role in decision-making and/or governance (Thompson and Doherty, 2006:362), though not at the same capacity and significance as co-operatives where democratic control is central and fundamental to co-operative identity and strength. Another model similar to this is the Stakeholder theory (see later discussion).

2.3.2 Agency theory - separation of ownership and control

Agency theory has been the dominant theory of corporate governance to be applied co-operative management and operations (Harte, 1997, Fama and Jensen, 1983; Van Bekkum and Van Dijk, 1997). Its assumption is that the owners of an enterprise (the principal) and those that manage it (the agent) will have different interests, that is, managers are likely to act in their own interests rather than those of the shareholder (Fama and Jensen, 1983:9). Applied to co-operatives, members are the equivalent of owners (principal) while managers are the agent, and the main interest of co-operative owners is for the board to serve them. Van Bekkum and Van Dijk (1997) point out that co-operatives lack professional boards, are plagued by ambiguous goal structures, lack efficient decision-making procedures, possess capital without real owners, lack resource

---

8 Based on observation from large corporations such as large professional partnerships, financial mutuals and non-profits (Fama and Jensen, 1983:2).
mobility and are dominated by agents rather than principals (members). For co-operatives, the board is an essential factor where members dictate their wants and needs, though it seems that exerting influence over them is unlikely to be easy, given the number of leadership issues (Siverstsen, 1996; Lees and Volkers, 1996; Itkonen, 1996; Munkner, 2000).

2.3.3 Stewardship theory

Donaldson and Davis’s (1991) study of a sample of 337 US corporations taken from a compensation survey based upon data drawn from Standard and Poor’s Compustat Services Inc. fails to support agency theory but is favourable towards stewardship theory. Stewardship theory is therefore considered as an alternative to agency theory and offers opposing predictions about the structuring of an effective board where, it argues, the manager is more concerned about non-financial motives, including the need for achievement and recognition, the intrinsic satisfaction of successful performance, respect for authority and the work ethic (Donaldson and Davis, 1991:51-52; Muth and Donaldson, 1998:6). Managers are capable of using a high level of discretion to act for the ‘benefit of the shareholders’.

2.3.4 Stakeholder theory

Stakeholder theory is based on the premise that an organisation should be responsible to a range of groups (or stakeholders) in society rather than just the organisation’s owners or mandators (Hung, 1998:106). The theory has been developed mainly in debates over corporate governance in the private sector as an alternative to traditional shareholder models, the possible consequences of which might not prove desirable (Tricker, 2000:295). There are constraints concerning this theory in relation to co-operatives due to a lack of participation and sense of involvement (Itkonen, 1996:20). There has been an attempt to develop new multi-stakeholder co-operatives that seek to incorporate different stakeholders in the membership, for example, the new co-operatives providing social services in Italy (Mancino and Thomas, 2005: 357-69).

9 (Business Week, May 2, 1988)
Despite contradictions between 'agency theory' and 'stewardship theory' and the similarity of stakeholder theory to these two, one common factor that is shared between them seems to be the 'one-man based leadership' where managers have the ultimate power to run a business enterprise. For co-operatives, this seems problematic given existing leadership issues where an elite minority holds power and there is no guarantee that the board have the necessary skills (Silversten, 1996:34-5). It is questionable whether co-operatives need a new governance model or even their own governance model that provides a more constructive framework, and whether they can afford the risk of the wrong type leader, i.e. managers, representatives and boards.

In addition to the theories discussed above, Rokholt and Borgen (2000: 5-7) attempt to apply transaction cost economics (TCE) as discussed by Williamson (1985) to explain overall co-operative governance. The TCE model mainly confirms agency theory and was met by optimism but incomplete co-operative ideology. Frequently, co-operative governance models and other aspects of co-operatives are vulnerable to attack from outsiders. Harte's (1997) comparative study between Irish Co-op Plc and traditional Irish Co-operatives indicate that the traditional co-operative form is based on an 'outdated' business strategy (vertical integration), that co-operatives have an inefficient governance structure, and that they are kept alive by support from a third party (i.e. the state). He further claims that such weaknesses lead to a strong preference for market mechanisms over co-operative governance structure that is evidenced by his work with the Irish co-operative called Co-op PLCs: there has been a fundamental shifting away from traditional co-operatives to Co-op PLCs (vertical integration).

Evidently, there has been a convergence in terms of ownership structure of co-operation from traditional co-operatives to investment-led forms of companies (Harte, 1997; Katz and Boland, 1999; Van Bekkum and Van Dijk, 1997; Nilsson, 1997; Cross and Buccola, 2004). Despite the transition of co-operatives to PLCs, Rokholt and Bergen (2000:12) still claim that co-operative rationale and strategy is strongly supported in modern management theories and practices. This is apparent in the popularity of strategic alliances, network organisations, meta-organisations, federate co-operations, joint ventures, relationship marketing, and voluntary chains.
2.4 Co-operative Change

During the last decade or two, a growing number of agricultural co-operatives with quite different attributes have come into being, both through new establishments and through the transformation of existing traditional co-operatives. Entrepreneur Co-operatives (Nilsson, 1999:451), based on findings of Van Bekkum and Van Dijk (1997:1-7), summarises those main European-wide trends and issues from 15 single countries that affect co-operative policy making itself. In some cases, they have been transformed into a ‘Public Limited Company’ (PLC), with shareholders consisting of the farmer-members, but sometimes also of outside shareholders such as other co-operatives and co-operative federations, as well as private investors (Nilsson et al, 1997:6). This supports recent findings from Cross and Buccola (2004:1254) where members are willing capitalise on merging the co-operative’s financial structure with the IOFs’ model (invested-owned firms).

Examples of this are the Irish Dairy co-operatives Kerry, Avonmore, Waterford and Golden Vale, the Dutch meat processor Dumeco, and the Austrian dairy NOM (Nilsson et al, 1997:6) and Irish Co-op Plc (Harte, 1997), introducing tradable shares, sometimes in conjunction with ordinary shares, or closing the membership to a certain extent or inviting non-members to become shareholders (Ibid, p.6). Katz and Boland (1999:19-21) called the new PLC transition form a ‘new generation of co-operatives’ where the major focus is value-added strategy, fixed production volumes and preferential shares. Such a model expanded in North America in the 1990s and in European countries such as Denmark and Sweden (Nilsson et al 1997).

Nilsson (1999:454) argues that maintaining the co-operative ideology is important as the traditional co-operative is losing more and more significance and is converging towards new forms of co-operative, that is, entrepreneur co-operatives (having a public limited company for the business and instead of members, the patrons are share-holders). Consequently, ‘mainstream economic thinking’ becomes increasingly applicable to co-

---

11 The policy making includes both on the part of the co-operative board members and business executives, as well as their representatives in national and European umbrella organisations and government officials.
12 Their findings are illustrated using data from the internal records of Tri Valley Growers, which until its bankruptcy in 2000 was one of the nation’s leading agricultural processing co-operatives.
13 Based on empirical tests on 15 retail chemical fertiliser companies competing in the same marketplace over an eight-year period (1986-1994) (Katz and Boland, 1999:14).
operative management and operations, particularly in the case of the new form of non-profit organisation, social enterprises, where earned income ventures are used to financially support the organisation's [social] mission (Frensler, 2004:29) (See previous discussion in Chapter 1).

Edgar Parnell (1999) mentioned that a co-operative is similar to other types of businesses apart from its social goals. The private sector has shown evidence of its social obligations alongside profit maximisation, such as charity funding, employee schemes and more dedication to employee welfare. Anheier and Kendall's (2000:6) social literature review suggests that the 'for profit' sector may in fact 'not' be populated by 'pure' profit maximising firms alone but, instead, social factors can emerge to act as controlling forces that keep market opportunism in check. A case in point is that small business owners' motives go beyond profit and include other goals such as independence, 'craftsmanship', and 'professional fulfilment' (Kendall, 1999).

Furthermore, the evolution in human resource management (HRM) in the 1980s is further evidence that the private sector has been placing more emphasis on human resource welfare. Poole (1990) defined HRM as strategic; it involves all managerial personnel (and especially general managers); it regards people as the most important single asset of the organisation; it is proactive in its relationship with people; and it seeks to enhance company performance as well as employee needs and societal well-being. HRM further emphasises the 'common interest of management and the workforce' in the success of the business.

Specifically, the fundamental characteristics of co-operative management that require the stable existence of commitment - trust, loyalty, flexibility, importance of common goals (mutuality) among co-operators, fairness, member democracy, and ownership and equality - are all closely related to one particular model of HRM, that is, the SOFT model. This compiles with Walton’s (1985b:64) view that the new HRM model is composed of policies that promote mutuality - mutual goals, mutual influence, mutual respect, mutual rewards, mutual responsibility. The theory is that policies of mutuality will elicit commitment, which in turn will yield both better economic performance and greater human development.

In general, HRM is a distinctive approach to employment management which seeks to achieve competitive advantage through the strategic deployment of a highly 'committed' and 'capable' workforce, using an integrated array of cultural, structural and
personnel techniques (Storey, 1995:5). The notion of HRM has been divided into soft (illustrated above) and hard. Hard HRM focuses on the importance of ‘strategic fit’, where human resource policies and practices are closely linked to the strategic objectives of the organisation (external fit), and are coherent among themselves (internal fit) (Hendry and Pettigrew, 1986). Interestingly, Truss et al’s (1997) study\textsuperscript{14} indicates that no ‘pure’ examples of either form exist, instead, the rhetoric adopted by the companies frequently embraces the tenets of the ‘soft’, commitment model, while the reality experienced by employees is more concerned with strategic control, similar to the ‘hard’ model.

Co-operatives’ emphasis on trust and commitment is more related to the soft HRM. Soft HRM is associated with the goals of flexibility and adaptability and implies that communication plays a central role in management (Storey and Sisson, 1993). However, Wright and Snell’s (1998) study of the integration of the ‘fit’ and ‘flexibility’ model point out that it is important that organisations be good at what they are doing, or else flexibility will be of little relevance.

The close relationship between members and representatives of co-operatives is synonymous with soft HRM and its social orientated identity. However, co-operatives can only be advantageous, that is, benefit from their distinctive values and principles (See Chapter 1: Co-operative Advantage), if they are efficient, in other words have constant member participation and involvement along with an honest and committed leadership and board. However, in reality, co-operatives are required to be financially secure in order to fund their social investment. They must be concerned with strategic and marketing plans in order to yield higher revenues. These attributes tend more towards the hard model and commercial objectives of business organisations.

Thus, the boundaries between co-operatives and investment-led companies have been blurred over the extent to which co-operatives differ from other companies, and whether the identity of co-operatives has been weakened, especially as private-owned enterprises have started to place more emphasis on commitment to human welfare and interest.

\textsuperscript{14} Data presented in their paper are taken from a broad-ranging study of HRM within eight case-study organisations in the UK: BT, Chelsea & Westminster Trust, Citibank, Glaxo, Hewlett Packard, Kraft Jacob Suchard, Lloyds and WH Smith News. 4,290 questionnaires are being sent to theses companies, in addition, a focus group and semi-structured interviews are also being conducted (p.58-71).
2.5 Co-operative Culture and Adaptability

Having mentioned that the HRM objective was to seek possible competitive advantages that are essential to companies' successes, we have to bear in mind that co-operatives have always been considered unique with a strong culture as their competitive advantage. The concept of culture may generally be defined as the shared beliefs and symbols of a group of individuals (McDonald, 2000:2). Organisational culture where focus was placed on the dynamic properties of culture emerged around the same time as HRM (Hofstede, 1980; Schwartz, 1994).

Hofstede (1980) indicated that difference in work attitudes and values was ascribed to cultural difference among countries, and that there were four major dimensions for classifying cultures across the world - collectivism/individualism, masculinity/femininity, uncertainty avoidance and power distance.15 The study was based on the nation-state (not an economic sector). Schwartz's (1994) analysis of cultural-level values16 - conservatism, intellectual and affective autonomy, harmony, egalitarian commitment, mastery and hierarchy - differs from Hofstede's by being separated into two levels: the individual and the cultural level.

For a co-operative value study, Hogeland (2003:2), based on 30 interviews conducted with regional and local co-operative managements during 2001-2, identifies the fundamental, unified aspects of co-operative culture that reflect a common understanding of what co-operatives should be like and the values they encompass. These typically include:

- Emphasising service over making money;
- Being altruistic, not exploiting the business for profit;
- Attaining self-sufficiency to minimise (farmer) dependency on those perceived as outsiders;
- Emphasising a hierarchical style of leadership and dependence;
- Displaying an unwillingness to let go of relationships, things or places;
- Valuing the 'small and personal' over the 'large and impersonal';

15 It is a study of the sales subsidiaries of a major multinational corporation which operates across 39 countries worldwide.
16 Schwartz (1994) asked respondents to assess 57 values as to how important they felt these values are as 'guiding principles of one's life'. Schwartz's work is separated into an individual-level analysis and a culture-level analysis.
Preferring to subordinate individual goals to the good of the whole; and
- Valuing equality (‘treating everyone equally’).

The above co-operative values can be simply summarised as being ‘socially orientated’. Though Hartog et al (1996:80) suggest that it is hard or even impossible to operationalise and measure culture in a reliable and valid manner, it is apparent that by applying Hofstede’s cultural dimensions, it is most likely that the outcome would be that co-operatives have:

- high collectivism\(^\text{17}\) (common goals and shared values),
- high femininity (caring),\(^\text{18}\)
- high power distance (leader-member control),\(^\text{19}\) and
- high uncertainty avoidance\(^\text{20}\) (strong upholding of principles and values).

Such cultural dimensions represent the co-operatives’ uniqueness over other private firms and typify their competitive advantages (Rokholt, 1999; Rokholt and Borgen, 2000). Scholz’s (1987) study of strategic fit between corporate strategy and culture suggests that culture can generate a competitive advantage, especially when it is superior and imperfectly imitable by competitors. Moreover, Deal and Kennedy (1982)\(^\text{21}\) and Peters and Waterman (1992)\(^\text{22}\) argue that the performance of organisations is dependent on the degree to which the values of its culture are widely shared. This is because strongly held values enable management to predict employee reactions to certain strategy options, thereby minimising the scope for undesirable consequences (Ogbonna and Harris, 1998a). Co-operatives are known to widely share Hogeland’s cultural values, particularly with members’ harmonistic and democratic ownership and control.

---

\(^{17}\) Collectivists value group interests, reciprocation of favours, a sense of belonging and respect for tradition (Hofstede, 1980).

\(^{18}\) Feminine individuals are more concerned with human relationships Collectivists value group interests, reciprocation of favours, a sense of belonging and respect for tradition (Ibid, 1980).

\(^{19}\) Individuals with high power distance perceive that superiors are entitled to special privileges (Ibid, 1980)

\(^{20}\) Individuals with high uncertainty avoidance feel a need for written rules and procedures and are intolerant of deviations from these rules (Ibid, 1980).

\(^{21}\) Their work specified five elements of culture: organisational environment, values, heroes (individuals who personify the culture and serve as role models), rites and rituals, and the cultural network (the informal means of communications within the culture).
Nevertheless, given these cultural values, Hogeland (2003:3) states that the current concerns of members and their co-operatives are very different – getting access to information, finding a place within a value-added system, negotiating an equitable ownership role within that system, and addressing food safety and other product specification issues which are integral to the success of those systems. These changes of preference strongly suggest that a co-operative needs to consider carefully how to translate these values into daily practice according to members’ changing needs due to dynamic external changes, technological advances, intense competition, globalisation and changes in governmental and social policies. Thus, it seems that there is a need for existing values and principles of co-operatives to be again reviewed and modernised (though they already were in 1995) so that they are compatible with the co-operative’s current practice and economic situation.

Nilsson (1999:449) suggests that a successful firm is one that adjusts its product offerings to changing demand and has the ability to adapt to a variety of demand changes, both large ones and rapid ones. Ogbonna and Harris (2000:781-3) argue that strongly held values are appropriate ‘only if’ the culture is geared towards the external environment. Similarly, Barney (1991) argues that for organisational culture to provide a source of ‘sustainable competitive advantage’, the culture must be ‘adaptable’ to external contingencies. Under the co-operative scope, Holmstorm (1999:416) agrees with them when he suggests that co-operatives will continue to have distinct competitive advantages ‘if’ they are ‘alert to changes’ in the economic environment. Alexandra Laidlow (1980) emphasises the need for co-operative ideas and theory to be flexible when he says:

In order to fit into the great many situations in which co-operatives are being and will in the future be used, our interpretation of co-operative ideology must be broad and flexible rather than narrow and stringent. But still there must be general agreement on essentials and inexpendable elements. In other words, what are the features without which an organisation cannot be considered a co-operative? We would assume, for example, that ‘democracy in ownership and control’ would be one such essential feature, although there may not be agreement on how to interpret and apply it. (Laidlow, 1980)

---

22 Based on a study of forty-three of America's best-run companies from a diverse array of business sectors, In Search of Excellence describes eight basic principles of management - action-stimulating, people-oriented, profit-maximising practices - that made these organisations successful.

23 Based on quantitative research on a multi industry sample of 1000 units, drawn from the FAME database of registered United Kingdom firms (p.772-83).

24 Theoretical study based on summary and extension of some of the book’s leading ideas, paying special attention to the intergenerational tensions that arise from termination of membership (1999:405).
The passage shows that Laidlow stresses the need for ideological flexibility, the ability to explore and apply new efficient strategies and structures that are beneficial to co-operative performance. On the other hand, he recognises the importance of maintaining certain features of co-operatives that should be kept inexpendable: co-operative identity; democratic ownership and control, and service and member orientation. This corresponds with Peters and Waterman’s (1992:13-5) notion of Loose-Tight properties where high-performing companies are both centralised and decentralised. Theoretically, co-operatives have powerful advantages because of their integrated, flexible, and dynamic relationship with their members. They can integrate members’ economic activity, their purchases, or their production, in ways which other businesses can only dream of, to obtain efficiency or quality premiums no other form of business can match (Fairbrain, 2003:26).

In reality, however, there is evidence indicating otherwise. For example, in Hungary, state-owned companies and socialist type co-operatives are facing difficulties adapting to the market economy (Bartus, 1996:16). However, there has been a transitioning of some co-operatives (discussed earlier) from the traditional co-operative towards a form of public limited company, which could be considered as being adaptable to external economic requirements as long as the fundamental values and purposes of the co-operative are still being upheld. However, when a co-operative has become or is established as a co-operative public limited company, it is questionable to what extent they are still committed to co-operative values and purposes.

Having mentioned the extent that co-operative values and principles should be committed to and upheld, I can state that there are interesting findings from Ogbonna and Harris (2000:781-3) that ‘bureaucratic and community’ cultures are ‘not’ directly related to organisational performance but ‘innovative’ and ‘competitive’ cultures are. Bureaucratic and community culture is concerned with integration, internal cohesiveness and establishment of uniformity (that is creating a strong culture), while the innovative and competitive culture emphasises competitive external positioning and responsiveness. This is closely related to Van Bekkum and Van Dijk’s (1997) argument: they propose that all ideological, historical and other non-economic and non-business considerations should be entirely disregarded and instead a co-operative should be more active in propagating efficient business methods and introducing restrictions on those co-operative practices that inhibit efficiency and effectiveness.
This however would divide co-operators into two groups: those who favour such ideas and those who would say that, 'it might be successful but it's not a co-operative anymore'. It seems that co-operatives have found it impossible to separate business and social concerns. One reason for this could be largely due to the fundamental principle of democratic ownership and control. For example, a decision that would certainly yield large profits might not be democratically agreed upon but at the same time members would be satisfied with greater dividends regardless of how the decision was made, not to mention a greater chance of survival in the market. Again, this brings us back to the earlier discussion of co-operative objectives.

There is a need for the co-operative to be responsive to external changes and also to be innovative, as Ogbonna and Harris suggested. Their findings are further supported by Holmstorm’s (1999:415) observation that ‘those (co-operators) who don’t innovate, don’t survive’. He also illustrates that a co-operative is at a disadvantage in its innovation race due to the fact that younger members do not stay long, resulting in fewer opportunities for management to experiment and explore. This could be regarded as another challenge for co-operatives to overcome. Hong (2002:31-2) supports the view that it is crucial to the survival of co-operatives that youth inclusion efforts are made at the earliest possible date. He believes that new generations can offer new thinking, ideas and skills. Last but not least, one other important factor in the future co-operative performance and effectiveness is co-operative leadership which can work effectively with member democratic control and ownership, and co-operative principles and values.

2.6 Co-operative Leadership

Strong leadership with weak management can prove a worse combination than the reverse (Kotter, 1999:102). This is even more pertinent to a co-operative where management decisions and operations depend largely on leaders. It is questionable whether the success or failure of co-operatives lies primarily in the hands of leaders, however. The argument that it does is supported by a number of co-operators. Laidlow (1980:68) believes that it is not too much to say that the quality of co-operatives will depend on whether first class leaders are leading them, not necessarily super-humans but democratic leaders who share responsibility with others in groups and teams.

Similarly, Wolf (1987:29) argues that the character of almost every non-profit organisation is set in large measure by its chief executive. Finally, MacPherson (2000:2)
supports the co-operative leadership's importance, stating that 'if leadership is not effective, trained and committed, then member views will not be well defined, except at the most basic level and in times of crisis; more importantly, they will not be continuously responded to and the co-operative ultimately will fail to reach its full potential'.

Given the recent revolution of globalisation and the rapid progress of technology, competition has become even more intense. As a result, co-operatives are in greater need than ever of effective leadership to guide them through. This involves reinforcing the necessary cultural and structural changes and strategies, particularly where there are persistant and overdue problems of poor management control and communication, and bureaucratic control by a few minorities such as managers and elected lay directors. Here, Barker, Johnson and Lavellete (2001: 22-3) state the importance of leadership for any kind of movement:

Leadership is fateful for (co-operative) movement development at every stage and turning point. Movement successes and failures – their growth and decline, their heritages for the future and their mark on history – are all intimately tied up with their forms of leadership, the quality of ideas offered and accepted, the selections from repertories of contention, organisation, strategy and ideology they make.

Despite the importance of leadership within co-operatives, there is far less literature in this field than there are studies of co-operative's management. Co-operative leadership work has been undertaken by a few co-operators such as Alexandra Laidlow, Edgar Parnell and MacPherson. MacPherson (2000:1-2) believes that the reason for co-operators’ reluctance to talk about co-operative leaders is two-fold. First, given a 'strong tradition' of recognising the 'importance of democracy of members', emphasising leadership could be construed as undervaluing the importance of members.

Second, the issue is publicly avoided because it clearly intrudes on the almost invariably delicate balance between the leadership roles of elected (representatives) and employed leaders (managers). Before further discussing the area of co-operative leadership, I will first review the mainstream approach towards leadership and eventually follow this by examining charismatic and transformational leadership, which are closely related to the co-operative leadership style.

2.6.1 Co-operative leadership model

Leadership approaches have been established, revised and researched by many theorists in contemporary management. Being aware of the lack of literature pertaining
specifically to leadership in co-operatives, a well known co-operator, Alexandra Laidlow (1980) has outlined three main types of co-operative leadership: membership leadership, management leadership, and educational leadership (MacPherson, 2000:3-4). In traditional co-operative theory, membership leadership stands for leaders who are elected by members to act on their behalf. As the organisation expands, these elected leaders take a greater interest in management and staff.

This is where many elected leaders are likely to lose contact with members, resulting in slowly weakening democratic ownership and control which further leads to insufficient participation and involvement. Eventually, members lose interest in the co-operative. However, if elected leaders manage to retain and exercise the right of employing and evaluating management and making necessary managerial changes, then it can be said that members are in control of the organisation (Cook et al, 1995:1).

‘Managerial leadership’ is primarily the responsibility of employed leaders within co-operatives. This kind of leadership has been increasing due to globalisation and liberalisation of trade in recent years. Finally, ‘educational leadership’ is when new members have to be educated, directors and employees have to be trained, and public officials have to be informed. However, it is often the case that co-operatives adopt a kind of training programme that has no direct use or applicability to co-operative operations and management. Finally yet importantly, one additional kind of leadership is ‘state leadership’ (Sundarajan, 1991:90). Such leadership finds expression, for example, through the State Government and Co-operative Department headed by the Registrar of Co-operative Societies (in India). This position has been granted by the co-operative society’s act and rules. Sometimes this is referred to as ‘political leadership’.

It seems that all kinds of leadership are faced with their own problems; however, the controversial ones are member and managerial leadership as far as the issues of democratic ownership and control and commitment of leaders are concerned. Managers who do not have the necessary co-operative commitment and skills will introduce a risk that could eventuate in co-operative failure – as a co-operative if not as a business (Griffiths, 2003; Lees and Volkers, 1996). There are always potential dangers in replacing leaders (who are strongly co-operative minded) with new ‘corporate managers’, thinking and acting ‘primarily’ in ‘commercial’ categories (Munker, 2000:81), resulting in a shifting emphasis from member promotion to growth, merger and acquisition instead. MacPherson (2000) defines the above leadership style only in terms of its responsibilities
and functions, but there is no in-depth indication of factors such as focus, capabilities and external and internal constituencies such as members’ motivations and co-operation, for example.

Bear in mind that there has been an increase in studies of co-operatives’ management and leadership. Consequently, the co-operative model of leadership and its effect on the social and economic side is still considerably limited in comparison to studies which have been carried out for contemporary leadership approaches. Therefore, in the following section, I will discuss traditional and contemporary leadership approaches for further consideration of their suitability and applicability under the co-operative context in addition to the existing MacPherson’s leadership model.

### 2.7 Traditional and Contemporary Leadership Approaches

The first approach is the ‘great man approach’ (trait approach). Here, the assumption is that some individuals were ‘born to be’ leaders and would excel by virtue of their ‘personality’ alone. An extensive study by Stodghill (1948) revealed that there are a number of other traits frequently found with some consistency among successful leaders in a variety of groups and situations such as persistence, consistence, self-confidence, sociability, need for achievement, and dependability (Stodghill, 1974). Although the trait theory has a century of research to back it up, it disappointingly fails to define specific leadership traits, not to mention its failure to take situation into account (Northhouse, 2004:22-3).

An alternative to the ‘trait approach’ is, the ‘behaviour (attitudinal) approach’ which stresses that leaders can be trained to exhibit certain behaviour so that they can become better leaders (Bryman, 1992:4). This approach arose from McGregor’s (1960) Theory of X and Y which was influenced by the persons’ assumptions on human nature. An additional study was by Blake and Mouton (1964) where they develop a model that conceptualises management styles and relations. Their ‘Managerial Grid’ focuses on task (production) and employees (people). It was proposed that a high concern for both employees and production is the most effective type of leadership behaviour. The notion that just two dimensions can describe managerial behaviour has the attraction of simplicity. This approach has broadened the trait approach but provides little guidance as to what constitutes effective leadership behaviours in different situations (Bolden, 2004:10).
The situational leadership approach is explained by Fiedler (1967) who proposed that there is no single best way to lead; instead, the leaders’ style should be adapted to the situation. Hersey and Blanchard (1988) had similar views but proposed that it is possible for a leader to ‘adapt’ his/her style to the situation where the maturity of the followers was the crucial situational factor. A similar model was proposed by Tannenbaum and Schmidt (1958) who presented a continuum of leadership styles from autocratic to democratic. An additional influential model was proposed by John Adair (1973) who argued that the leader must balance or vary his/her attention to the needs of task, team and individual according to the situation. Despite extensive research on this approach, theoretical and empirical support is lacking and therefore there is still room for further research (Arvonen and Ekvall, 1999:243).

In addition to the traditional approaches mentioned above, in the 1980s, management researchers suddenly became very interested in charismatic leadership (e.g. Weber, 1947; House, 1977) and the transformation and revitalisation of organisations (Burns, 1978). Charismatic leadership refers to the perception that a leader possesses a divinely inspired gift and is somehow unique and larger than life (Weber, 1947). The followers of a charismatic leader perceive that the leaders’ beliefs are correct, accept the leader without question, obey the leader willingly, feel affection towards the leader, are emotionally involved in the mission of the group/organisation, believe that they can contribute to the success of the mission and have high performance goals (House, 1977).

This approach combines notions of the transformational leader as well as the earlier ‘trait’/‘great man’ theory. Four major characteristics of charismatic leaders can be identified: (1) a dominant personality, desire to influence others and self-confidence; (2) strong role model behaviour and competence; (3) articulation of ideological goals and moral overtones; and (4) high expectation of followers and confidence that they will meet these expectations (Northhouse, 2004:171). The approach, however, has been criticised as it has been associated with a number of high profile corporate scandals where a leader is manipulative and persuasive but is lacking in genuine concern for the welfare of his followers (Conger, 1989).

---

25 Based on a study of 2,109 employees in total from industrial companies, supermarkets, private and public service organisations in Sweden and the USA who rated their immediate manager’s leadership styles and competence as well as the operation requirements and the leadership style with regard to the goals, strategies and tasks (p.214).
Similarly, Bass (1985:3) believes that ‘charisma’ is a necessary ingredient for transformational leadership but insufficient to account for the whole transformational process. James MacGregor (1978) was the first to put forward the concept of ‘transforming leadership’ while Bass and Avolio (1990) further developed Burn’s idea and proposed the formal concept of transformational leadership. At the heart of this approach is an emphasis on the leaders’ ability to motivate and empower his/her followers and also the moral dimension of leadership (Bolden, 2004:11).

A transformational leader transforms the personal values of followers to support the vision and goals of the organisation by fostering an environment where relationships can be formed and by establishing a climate of trust in which visions can be shared (Bass, 1985a). Conger and Kanungo (1998) differentiate between charismatic leadership, which focuses on the followers’ perceptions of leaders’ behaviour, and transformational leadership, which is more concerned with follower outcomes. The approach is criticised for its vagueness, which allows for an ‘almost anything’ interpretation (Yulk, 2002), and shares the same potential for abusing power as charismatic leadership (Northhouse, 2001).

Another type of leadership that shares Burn’s emphasis on the moral and ethical dimension of leadership is ‘servant leadership’. The premise of servant leadership is that the leader is one who ‘seeks to serve’ and that this serving is a natural component of the leader (Greenleaf; 2002; Keichel, 1992; Daft; 2000; Patterson, 2003). Servant leadership takes stewardship assumptions where leaders are deeply accountable to others as well as to the organisation one-step further (Daft, 2000:374). ‘Servant Leadership’ transcends self-interest to serve the needs of others, help others grow and develop, and provide opportunities for others to gain materially and emotionally (Ibid, p.374). Keichel (1992:121-2) proposed that leaders can operate to form the basic precepts of servant leadership: to put service before self-interest, listen to others’ opinions, inspire trust by being trustworthy and nourish others and help them become whole.

In addition, Patterson (2003:2-7) encompasses seven virtuous constructs which work in a processional pattern; a) agape love; b) humility; c) altruism; d) vision; e) trust; f) empowerment; and g) service. Despite, an increasing popularity of servant leadership, it is still systematically undefined and not yet supported by empirical research and therefore there is still room for further development of the model (Russell and Stone, 2002:145).

The previous three leadership styles to a large extent put forward the idea of a great /heroic leader. A new school of thought holds that no individual can be ideal as a
leader. It proposes that individuals at all levels in the organisation and in all roles can exert leadership influence over their colleagues and thus influence the overall direction of the organisation (Bolden, 2004:13). This less formalised model is being referred to as the ‘distributed leadership approach’. The key to this approach is a distinction between the notions of ‘leader’ and ‘leadership’.

It is a more ‘collective’ concept, and would argue for a move from analysis and development of individual leader qualities to an identification of what constitutes an effective (or more appropriate) leadership process within an organisation: a move in focus from the individuals to the ‘relationships’ between them; from managers to ‘everyone’ within the organisation (Ibid, p.13). The fundamental aim of this approach is to produce an ambience and culture that encourages high levels of integrity, creativity, imagination, care and collective ambition for ‘excellence’ (Ibid, p. 13). This latest model of leadership seems to be the closest match with the co-operative model. Although the model has only newly emerged and there is still further room for empirical and theoretical research, its collective style and emphasis on ‘no one individual is the ideal leader’ is already highly desirable in any organisation, particularly co-operative societies.

2.8 Applicability of Leadership Approaches to Co-operative Culture and Environment

Schein (1992) and Bass and Avolio (1993) argue that organisational culture and leadership are intertwined. Schein (1985) even suggests that ‘often culture manages management more than management manages culture’. Traditionally and ideally, a co-operative is known for its strongly upheld ‘collectivist culture’ where people tend to view their groups and organisation as an essential part of their lives more so than those in more individualistic societies (Hofstede, 2000). Thus, co-operative leaders should fit Thorne and Saunders's (2002: 1-14) and Hofstede's (2000) definition of collectivist managers as more likely to consider the broader needs of society in the formulation of prescriptive judgement instead of only considering the needs of shareholders and themselves. The definition matches the supportive, participative and transformational styles of leadership.

26 The study aims to illustrate how culture may affect the various components of individuals’ ethical reasoning by integrating findings from the cross-cultural management literature with cognitive development perspective.
The leadership approaches that come closest to the culture of co-operatives are the ‘charismatic’, ‘transformational’, ‘servant’ and ‘distributed’ leadership approaches. The first two are related to the ‘great man’ approach. Krishnan’s (2002:24) findings\(^{27}\) indicate that charismatic/transformational leadership approaches relate to the mission of strongly held values that are part of the firms’ culture. Charismatic (often referred to as heroic) leadership seems to have been part of the co-operative approach since its early establishment, strongly confirmed by its history of founders’ and leaders’ heroic deeds and contributions to the working class. However, power-abuse has always been a risk and there have often been incidents to support this (e.g. CEO scandals). Waldman et al, (2001:17)\(^{28}\) suggest that this style of leadership may be most appropriate under conditions of environmental uncertainty.

On the other hand, Jung, Sosik, and Bass (1995) suggest that it may be easier for transformational leadership to emerge in a collective society than in an individualistic one (Hartog et al, 1996:74). Hartog et al’s (1996:68081) study\(^{29}\) suggests similar findings: Transformational leadership is fostered in organic environments where warmth and ‘trust’ are present and where members are expected to be creative. Their findings also indicate that an innovative, supportive environment could enhance the effectiveness of transformational leadership, while a strong bureaucratically oriented culture could diminish its effectiveness. It is most likely that a co-operative would provide a supportive environment that would potentially foster such a style of leadership.

A study of 24 participants by Pasa (2000:417), indicates that the ‘participative style’ of leadership (which is closely related to transformational leadership) can work well everywhere except in those societies with a combination of relatively high power distance, strong collectivism, and high uncertainty avoidance, a description that fits co-operatives. Another approach which would be appropriate for co-operatives is ‘servant leadership’. Russell and Stone’s (2002:145-57) review\(^{30}\) on servant leadership has proven to be very popular within the church and non-profit sector due to the greater purpose of its leaders to

\(^{27}\) From a Value Survey of a sample of 100 leaders drawn from nurse managers of Bloods Services (p.25-31).
\(^{28}\) A study based on a sample of 210 executives was generated by Fortune; 5000 firms were surveyed in the middle of 1990 (p.10-20).
\(^{29}\) Hartog’s aim to show how the research into this relation could be conducted, the transactional and transformational leadership paradigm is combined with a measurement-oriented perspective on organisational culture in order to derive and test hypotheses. Transformational and transactional leadership are linked to the culture model used by the Focus research group, which is based on the competing values model (p.68).
\(^{30}\) Reviews the servant leadership literature with the intent to develop a preliminary theoretical framework.
serve and meet the needs of others. Thus, for this type of leadership, self-interest is not a motivational factor. The difference between ‘servant’ and ‘transformational’ leadership is in the focus of the leader: a servant leader focuses on service to followers whereas a transformational leader focuses on attracting followers’ engagement and support to achieve organisational objectives (Stone et al, 2003: 5).

Unfortunately, no type of leadership is risk-free. Charismatic and transformational leadership can rapidly degenerate into a form of manipulation that can be more subtly coercive than overtly exploitative (Stone et al, 2003: 7). The co-operative sector has had its fair share of suffering from leaders who abuse their position, power and trust, creating a number of scandals which have a detrimental effect on co-operative performance and member morale (Siverstsen, 1996; Lees and Volkers, 1996; Munkner, 2000; Itkonen, 1996).

Lees and Volkers (1996:20) suggest that there have been too many occasions where power and decision making are all concentrated at the top in the hands of a few. Sometimes the board members do not have the background and ability to lead and monitor a large complex business co-operation. Thus they fail to recognise wrong developments, mismanagement and heavy financial losses. Munkner (2000:81) further focuses on leaders who only have commercial interests at heart such as the Regan Affair (Co-operative News, October 1997). This case confirms that the heroic approach, which is based on the perception of the leader as a saviour, is far too risky and that co-operatives cannot afford to experience this in the face of today’s global dynamics and competition.

As a result, we are left with the only suitable approach - ‘distributed leadership’ - where individuals at all levels can exert leadership on the management’s operations and decisions. This is well suited to the co-operative’s fundamental values and its culture of member democratic control and ownership. All members should be able to express their opinions and exert influence democratically on the co-operative’s operations, not just the CEO or board of directors. Throughout co-operative history, there has always been a leading figure who leads and assures members of his interest and worthiness. Therefore, the distributive model would be totally new to co-operatives (in terms of practice). It is questionable whether members would prefer such a model or would rather put their trust in particular individuals/leaders as they have done in the past. It is more or less a question of habit and familiarity with a particular kind of leadership.
This brings us to the issues of member incentive, involvement and participation. Distributive leadership is ideal since it would guarantee the purpose of the co-operative, namely member democracy. For co-operatives, there has always been a vicious circle where a lack of participation creates a distance between the board and the members thus opening the door to leadership dishonesty and eventually causing poor performance of co-operatives, if not bankruptcy. Therefore, distributive leadership would have a greater effect on co-operative performance where members are active, while the heroic leadership style would have more effect where members are inactive/lacking in participation.

An ideal situation for co-operatives is that normally members are active and leaders are charismatic, transformational and service-minded. This has always been the ideal attitude for co-operatives as their original purpose was to assist the weak who were being exploited under the free market system to maintain and sustain a reasonable standing of living and working. Thus, there has always been this mindset of heroic leaders who would guide and serve the members. However, at present, it is inevitable for co-operatives and their leaders to take a greater account of financial and commercial interests in order to survive. Since co-operative leaders are now obliged to focus on two sets of objectives, it is questionable whether any differences exist between co-operative and non-co-operative leaders.

2.9 Co-operative and Non-Co-operative Leaders

Having discussed the ideal leadership model for co-operatives, that is, distributive leadership, it would seem that there is no such individual ‘leader’. However, at the present or for the time being, realistically, there still exist those such as directors, representatives or recruitment managers who to some extent make decisions on the members’ behalf. In this section, it is important to differentiate between these co-operative individual leaders and other non-co-operative leaders.

Following Baarda’s (2002) seven responsibilities of the co-op board (section 2.2.4) that is, to represent members, hire and supervise management, oversee acquisition and preservation of co-operative assets, assess the co-operative’s performance and inform members, he further includes in his later article Rural Co-operative (Sept/Oct, 2002: 15-17) that co-operative directors have three other duties. First, under duty of obedience, directors must perform their roles in conformity with the statutes and terms of the co-operatives’ documented requirements. Second, duty of care includes good faith, prudence
and judgement. Directors must act in good faith, making decisions that are in the best interests of the co-operative. Finally, their duty of loyalty requires the highest degree of honesty and fair dealing with the co-operative and on the co-operative’s behalf; this has always proved to be a troublesome area.

It is questionable to what extent Baarda’s board responsibilities and additional director’s duty differ between co-operative leaders and non-co-operative leaders. One of the sharpest distinctions between co-operative leaders and business leaders is ‘focus’. The former have to fulfil members’ needs and wants as a priority while business is simply profit maximisation to satisfy investors and shareholders; a further point where co-operative leaders’ success is measured by member satisfaction while non-co-operative leaders’ success is measured by profitability.

With regard to duty of obedience, care and loyalty, both types of leaders are certainly required to perform as expected in terms of their duties and responsibilities. However, the latter two duties, care and loyalty, seem to bear more heavily on co-operative leaders due to the co-operative’s social orientated purposes. Although both types of leaders are expected to have integrity and be ethical, straightforward and honest, as the co-operative preaches unselfishness, loyalty, all for one and one for all (self-help though mutuality), it is therefore even more imperative for a co-operative leader to have impeccable commitment, loyalty and honesty. A case of corrupt leaders would be twice as embarrassing in the co-operative sector since it would be seen as an apparent irony. Moreover, a co-operative leader has two additional tasks: that is, to ensure that members do have democratic control and that their views are being properly represented to preserve the co-operative’s unique character without compromising the co-operative’s principles and values.

The emergence of social enterprises (see detail in Chapter 1), whose interests are both socially and financially orientated seems an interesting combination between co-operative leaders and business leaders. According to Dees (1998:56-57), ‘non-profit leaders’ are scrambling to find ‘commercial opportunities’ for three reasons. First, non-profit leaders want to make ‘for-profit’ initiatives more acceptable. Second, they are looking to deliver social goods and services in ways that do not create dependency on their constituencies. Third, they are seeking financial sustainability since earned income-generating activities are a more reliable source of funding than donations and grants.
However, in relation to this new breed of co-operatives that incorporate many characteristics of PLCs, it is also possible that their leaders are both socially and commercially focused, just like the leaders of SEs. The distinction between traditional co-operative leaders and other non-profit leaders, in particular business leaders, is apparent and clear, although in the case of Co-op PLC, its leaders’ focus is similar to that of SEs.

It seems that co-operative leaders are faced with a more demanding and complicated role than other leaders despite little reward. This is supported by the USDA study\(^3\) as it reveals a wide range of co-operative pay plans where many directors received limited compensation despite their commitment to time and mental energy. Such a situation would not occur in non-co-operative business (Reynolds, 2004:38). Strong leadership is important to all forms of organisations, but for a co-operative it is absolutely vital. It has always been a challenge for a co-operative to develop and foster an effective, committed and competent kind of leadership that can prioritise objectives ethically and competently according to external changes and requirements at the time. It may be possible for co-operative leadership and leaders to learn from those with a similar agenda, that is, SEs.

### 2.10 Co-operative Leadership Challenge

There has been an ongoing debate on how to improve governance in organisations throughout society which impacts on the co-operative sector. Inevitably, great attention has been focused on issues such as ‘how a co-operative develops effective leaders’ (Wilson, 1998:1), a fundamental principle concerning education and training of co-operatives (see *Education, Training and Information Principle* in Appendix 1). Wilson suggests that the position is complex since a co-operative has very distinct forms of business. Therefore, this requires a ‘particular blend of skills and competencies that equip elected non-executive directors to strategically direct large businesses operating in a highly competitive environment, while at the same time helping them to assess their distinct co-operative identity which differentiates them in the market-place.

Baarda (2002) later proposes that ‘[co-operative] director training is key to effective directorship and effective training programs must go far beyond indoctrination'\(^3\)

\(^3\) 419 survey of co-operatives have been carried out regarding travel expenses of the co-operative board of directors.
by management about the co-operative’s business from management’s view point’. Similarly, Wadsworth, Co-op Education and Member Relations (2004:27) argue that directors should attend leadership institutes enable them to understand the big picture issues which allow for face-to-face networking and learning from others. However, the effectiveness and relevance of co-operative education has always been an issue. Bob Yuill, a senior project manager for Scottish Agricultural Organisation Society once mentioned that most of the co-op education courses he had discovered seemed to be the basic MBA with a co-op module attached at the end and that does not work (Livingston, 2006:23).

In addition to education, the alternative is to avoid or if possible get rid of bad leaders, as Parnell (1999:117-9) suggested, for example, the ‘nest-featherers’ who use the co-operative for their own advantages, and the opportunists who want to get their hands on the accumulated assets by converting the co-operation into an investment-led company. It is always easy to define undesirable co-operative leaders, however, what is difficult or even impossible is how to identify one. Thus, investing in education tends to have more potential as a long-term goal, creating new forces of co-operators who are co-operatively committed as well as competent and effective.

2.11 Summary

Co-operative management and leadership literature covers a broad range of co-operative activities and fieldwork. Each has made key contributions to the co-operative framework, but unfortunately there are still some limitations. There have been insufficient attempts to generate co-operatives’ own models, adopting other contemporary business governance models to explain the co-operative context instead. Though the co-operative business has been studied from several perspectives by co-operator theorists, there still lacks a solid and constructive management and leadership conceptual framework.

However, this problem does not only apply to co-operatives as although the literature on social entrepreneurship has also grown in significance over the last two decades, it still remains diffuse and fragmented (Mort et al, 2002:77). This is likely to be due to the fact that the co-operative in itself is ‘complex’, as supported by Laidlow’s (1980) statement: ‘a co-operative as a social and economic system, it is not based on one specific concept or social theory but on a collection of many ideas and concepts such as mutuality, the weak combination in solidarity for greater strength, equitable sharing of
gains and loss, self-help, a union of people with common problems, the priority of man over money, the non-exploitative society; even the search for Utopia'. It is difficult to capture all co-operative values and principles and generate them into one single concept.

Thus, this raises the question: how can we overcome this complex difficulty in order to generate constructive co-operative framework and concepts? Why is this the case? Why do co-operatives lack their own management and leadership models, strategy and solutions? Does the co-operative management structure become too complex or are co-operatives' objectives too vague to possibly generate a single solution? Why don't co-operative researchers concentrate more on innovating their own model and framework instead of adopting others?

Second, despite the existing awareness of the failure to connect related co-operative principles and values to co-operative practice, such as business strategy and planning (Rokholt, 1999, 2000; MacPherson, 1995), co-operatives are still unable to solve such matters. Additionally, a number of studies (Dunn, 1988; Reynolds, 2000; Lliopolos, 1998) claim that the co-operative’s principles and values have acted as constraints rather than benefits, but no substantial solutions have been generated by them. This leads to the third criticism that although there are discussions of some co-operative topics, there does not appear to be any genuine intention to implement and apply these suggestions to solve particular problems. In brief, the existing literature still does not provide anything new but only identifies problems or suggestions for solutions.

As an example, many recent publications state the importance of co-operative flexibility and adaptability (Rural Co-operatives, May/June, 2004; Zueli, 2005; Wadsworth, 2002). However, there is still no evidence of longitudinal studies of co-operative flexibility as a response to Laidlow’s suggestion, but instead there exists evidence of poor management control, mismanagement and ineffectual leadership (Lees and Volkers, 1996; Itoken, 1996; Siverstsen, 1996; Bartus, 1996 and Munkner, 2000), mostly likely caused by the co-operative’s own rigid structure and strategy. In addition, existing literature provides a review of the co-operative system (democratic ownership and control) and its historical establishment that could hardly be related or relevant to co-operative practical strategy or operation anyway. This is because they primarily act as a spiritual guide for co-operatives, explaining the original purposes of, and belief in, the co-operative’s establishment, but no effective illustration of their application to co-operative strategy and operation.
It seems that co-operatives operate under trust and commitment values and therefore are more risky than systems that are based on structure and plan since human personalities are difficult to predict and prone to changes of opinion. It is therefore questionable whether a co-operative can afford to trust a manager’s motivations and intentions while at the same time there seems to be a reluctance to consider ‘trust’ and ‘commitment’ as weaknesses of co-operatives.

It seems that co-operative researchers tend to ‘generalise’ their findings and assumptions as it is apparent that co-operatives comprise different occupations, nationalities and cultures that have different objectives from each other. Thus, every idea that has not been clearly stated under a particular sector or country will tend to produce findings that are too generalised within the co-operative context. This could be one of the reasons why co-operative theories, models and concepts are difficult to derive and generate, as there exist several different social, economic and cultural contingents.

Finally, despite a number of claims that some co-operative frameworks and concepts are outdated, there is still no substantial piece of work to suggest how the co-operative should be modernised to attain greater efficiency and competency. Instead, there is more evidence of co-operatives transforming themselves entirely into public limited companies rather than adapting their existing structure and strategy to be responsive to external changes. This to some degree indicates that it is easier for a co-operative to change totally rather than to adjust and continuously improve its existing style. It is interesting to investigate how a co-operative is doomed to underperform in comparison to other investment-led firms. Existing literature and research so far have been focused on the description of components of co-operative management such as values, principles, objectives, leadership tasks, culture but are still lacking in the description of co-operative strategic management. The literature neglects and rarely integrates the co-operative’s social construction into its review and analysis (see more detail in chapter 3).

Therefore, it is important to go back to the roots of co-operative history to exercise the social construction, discourse and philosophy that underlie the co-operative’s existence. Co-operative principles and values can possibly be reconstructed if we understand its fundamental purposes better through social construction studies and discourse analysis. Many co-operators have attempted to analyse and identify factors that obstruct co-operative efficiency and effectiveness but neglect the philosophy behind co-
operative management and leadership which goes back hundreds of years. Thus, social
creation and discourse of co-operatives is the area that this study will focus on to
close the gaps in the existing literature.
CHAPTER 3:

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

The objective of this chapter is to explain how the overall research strategy of this study will be conducted. This chapter will establish clear research purposes, generate research questions, and discuss a suitable methodology and methods. The discussion of methodology will be based on research philosophy using both quantitative approaches and qualitative approaches. Suitability and appropriateness of different methodologies and methods will be discussed and decisions will be made based on the discussion. The chosen methods will be further illustrated (including its analytical underpinnings, limitations, etc). Furthermore, other factors will be outlined including sample selection, available software and validity issues.

3.2 Research Purposes

A review of the literature and theory of co-operatives in the previous chapter indicated an existing gap in the co-operative literature as well as existing problematic management operations and strategies which result in mismanagement and unclear objectives. Therefore, my research purpose is to explore primarily the discursive formulation of co-operative leadership and secondarily co-operative management. The broad research purposes of this thesis are to explore the discursive construction and representation of the concepts of co-operative leadership and management.
3.3 Research Questions

Flick (2002:46) argues that it is important for the researcher to develop a clear idea of his or her research questions, but remain open to new and perhaps surprising results. Questions to be explored in this research study are outlined below:

Q1. What philosophies underpin co-operative ideology, concepts, culture and values (including the implications for leadership and management style)?

Q2. What contemporary leadership discourse has been disseminated to the co-operative sector?

Q3. How does the discourse of co-operative management differ from that of mainstream organisations (non-co-operative organisations)?

Q4. What is the relationship between the contemporary co-operative practices and traditional co-operative discourse?

The questions are divided into four parts relating to co-operative leadership, co-operative values as well as principles and co-operative management. Given the purpose and questions outlined above, it is essential to adopt a suitable approach and methods to provide reliable and valid findings. Given, the explorative purposes of this research, it has been decided that a qualitative approach is most suitable in so far as it provides scope to develop accurate and reliable answers to the above-mentioned research questions.

3.4 Research Philosophy

The purpose and questions for this research study are derived from the literature gap mentioned in Chapter 2. It strongly suggests that there is a need for research into the social construction of co-operatives to underpin the philosophy of co-operative management and leadership. Therefore, the central issue for this research study lies in clarifying the question of the extent to which the everyday reality of co-operatives is a form of social construction. In this section, research philosophy will be discussed as a guide to suitable methodology and methods for this research. The term 'methodology' in a broad sense refers to the process, principles, and procedures by which we approach
problems and seek answers (Bogdan and Taylor, 1975:1) whereas a method is a procedure, tool, or technique used by the inquirer to generate data, analyse data, or both (Silverman, 1997:91).

Much attention has been drawn to methodological debates between ‘positivists’ (quantitative approaches) and ‘interpretativists’ (qualitative approaches) (Cassell and Symon, 1994:2). Positivists seek ‘facts’ and ‘causes’ of social phenomena apart from the subjective states of individuals (Comte, 1896:2). This however leads to criticism that it ignores the differences between the natural and social world by failing to understand the ‘meanings’ that are brought to social life (Silverman, 1999:4). Phenomenologists such as Max Weber (1973) were primarily concerned with ‘understanding human behaviour’ from the actor’s own frame of reference (Bogdan and Taylor, 1975:5). The idea is encapsulated in Weber’s famous definition of ‘social action’: an action is social when a social actor assigns a certain meaning to his or her conduct and, by this meaning, is related to the behaviour of other persons (Hughes, 1990:95).

3.4.1 Social constructionism

Social construction is attention to the fact that human experience, including perception, is mediated historically, culturally and linguistically (Willig, 2001:7). Weber was one of the great exponents of the social scientific methodology of the 1980s called social constructionism (SC can be referred to as constructionism or constructivism) (Knorr-Cetina, 1993; Sismondo, 1993). The central research methodology used in this study resulted from the ‘linguistic turn’, which is the idea that language is much more than a simple reflection of reality - in fact, it is ‘constitutive’ of social reality (Wittegenstein, 1976; Winch, 1958; Berger and Luckman: 1967; Geertz, 1973).

Mannheim (1993 [1928]) argued that knowledge was always produced from a specific social and historical standpoint, reflecting the interests and culture of the groups in question. His knowledge of sociology was best associated with Mead and the sociology of knowledge. Moreover, Berger and Luckman’s (1967) The Social Construction of Reality argues that human beings together create and then sustain all social phenomena through social practices (Burr, 1995: 9-10).

Two works in science studies have played key roles in the growth of social constructionism: Thomas Khun’s The Structure of Scientific Revolutions (Khun, 1970 [1962]) and Bruno Latour and Steve Woolgar’s Laboratory Life: The [Social]

Social Construction was criticised by positivists (Burman, 1990; Gill, 1995; Parker, 1992; Potter: 1996a). They reject the notion that 'social change' is a matter of discovering and altering the underlying structures of social life through the application of a meta-narrative (Ibid, p.14). However, these criticisms started to decline in the 1980s as SC began to be applied to several disciplines such as science, social movements (Touraine’s The Self-Production of Society (1977), The Voice and the Eye (1981), Return of the Actor (1988), 1995; Alberto Meluci, 1989), feminism (Harding 1983, 1986, 1987; McCarthy, 1996), religious study (Desplan, 1999; Segovia, 1995; Leming, 1989), sociology (Ulrich Beck’s The Risk of Society, 1992[1986]), and is particularly influential in psychology today (Schmidt, 1987, 1992; Nuse et al, 1991).

Social construction has also been applied to the construction of identity where Philips and Hardy (1997) adopted discourse analysis to investigate post-war refugee identity construction. It was found that different organisations - the Refugee Legal Centre, British Refugee Council and the Refugee Forum struggled to define and identify 'refugee' and to influence the associated practices of the refugee determination process (Philips and Hardy, 1997:161). Different organisations construct different identities for refugees (e.g. dependent, demanding, autonomous refugee) and in turn, these different refugee identities construct different organisational identities which further complicate the connection between refugee identity, organisational identity and organisational practice (Phillips and Hardy, 1997:181). Their later work, Discursive Struggle in the Canadian Refugee System (1999:1-24) reveals similar findings indicating that at societal level, discourse provides resources that actors may use in strategies to construct identity.

Hacking (2000:48) defined SC as various sociological, historical and philosophical projects that aim at displaying or analysing actual, historically situated social interactions or casual routes that led to, or were involved in, the coming into being or establishing of some present entity or fact. Constructionism (SC) can be characterised in two ways: internally, in terms of its defining characteristics, and externally, in terms of the views that

---

1 The word 'social' was dropped from the title of the second edition of Latour and Woolgar because of its perceived redundancy.
it generally opposes (Engler, 2004:294). Internally, constructionist perspectives generally take at least some of the following forms: anti-essentialism, anti-realism, an emphasis on historical and cultural specificity of knowledge; an emphasis on language as a pre-condition of thought, an emphasis on language as a form of social action; a focus on interaction and social practices, as well as a focus on processes, not simply products (see Burr, 1995).

On the other hand, externally, constructionist perspectives generally stand sharply opposed to the realist, essentialist, naturalist and physicalist perspectives. The clearest and most influential example is in the field of science studies, where radical constructionist claims stand opposed to the realist view that the scientific method generates objectively true knowledge about the world (Engler, 2004:294). Moreover, Raskin (2000, 2001:9) suggests that in SC, all knowledge is considered local and fleeting. What constitutes personhood one day may change the next, based on shifts in social surroundings and currently accepted interpersonal boundaries. Thus, SC is about ‘relationships’ where the focus is on ‘joint action’ – the co-operative development and implementation of shared functional meanings that arise when two or more people interact (Shotter, 1993).

In short, the SC focus is on social practices engaged in by people and their interactions with each other which further lead to consideration of ‘how’ certain phenomena, or forms of knowledge are achieved by people in interaction (Burr, 1995:8). Under the weak form of SC, the socially constructed nature of knowledge and institutions and the way in which the knowledge often bears the marks of its social origins is put in the forefront (Sayer, 2000:90). In its strong form, it also claims that objects or referents of knowledge are nothing more than social constructions (Berger and Luckman, 1967; Gergen: 1999) (Ibid, p.90). Discourse analysis (DA) is categorised to be under the latter as it goes one step further (Luckman, 1967; Gergen, 1999).

3.5 Rationale for Research Approach

To be able to draw and derive inferences about co-operative concepts and framework, this research will focus on meanings and social constructions. The nature of this social construction approach is qualitative-based. Documentary sources and text will be analysed and studied to reveal answers to research questions. In addition to such an approach being able to accurately provide promising answers to the questions, the
methodology can also provide other more interesting and unexpected findings and further create room for future study within this field.

Both the co-operative establishment and the context are deeply rooted in social and political history for which information and data has been recorded mainly in documentary sources: journals, documents, literary works, reports, diaries, etc. Thus, the scrutiny of text is the main focus of research analysis as a data source. Discourse analysis would be a suitable methodology, simply because it focuses on language (text) both spoken and written and also it focuses more on social and sociological aspects of text rather than linguistic. As a result, it effectively enables this research to draw inferences and answers about the representation of co-operative management and leadership that have not yet been explained.

It was decided to use DA as a research method, which will be adopted under the DA approach as a text analysis-based method. I have further decided to use a ‘multi-textual’ analysis - content analysis, narrative analysis and intertextual analysis instead of a single one. This is because I believe that multiple methods can bring about a wider scope of exploration, analysis and interpretation, and provide a wider angle for answers to this research than if only one method had been adopted. In addition, in terms of validity, multiple methods satisfy Denzin’s (1978:291) notion of triangulation, whereby the combination of methodologies in the study of the same phenomenon when using many methods in conjunction with each other eliminates bias (Jick, 1979) (see further section 3.13.1). A justification for each textual analysis will be illustrated later in this chapter after its meanings and characteristics have been outlined.

3.6 Discourse Analysis

Discourse analysis focuses attention on processes whereby the social world is constructed and maintained, not just a mere understanding of the social world and the meaning it has for the people living in it as provided by many other qualitative methods (Philips and Hardy, 2002:2). Basically, it focuses on language as used in social contexts, both written and spoken (Marshall, 1994:91). Potter (1997:146) defined another longer version of DA as an analytic commitment to studying discourse as texts and talk in social practices. The focus is not on language as an abstract entity such as a lexicon and set of grammatical rules (in linguistics), a system of differences (in structuralism), a set of rules
for transforming statements (in Foucauldian genealogies). Instead, it is the ‘medium for interaction’; the analysis of discourse becomes, then, the analysis of ‘what people do’.

Discourse studies have been involved in several fields in the humanities and the social sciences such as ethnography, discourse grammar sociolinguistics and pragmatics, enthomethodology, cognitive psychology, special psychology and discursive psychology, communication studies and many other disciplines (Van Dijk, 1997:25-7). Most of them have been developed in social psychology such as deconstruct emotions (E.g. Harrel, 1986; Stenner, 1993), prejudice e.g. Potter and Wetherell, 1987; Wetherell and Potter, 1992), psychopathology (Parker et al, 1995), trust (Willig, 1997) and the psychological subject itself (E.g. Heriques et al, 1984; Holloway et al, 1989).


Furthermore, it has been used to investigate more specific aspects of business practice such as Total Quality Management (TQM) (De Cock, 1998; Zbaracki, 1998) and accounting conventions (Hoskins & Morgan, 1991), in addition to broader discourse around strategy (Knights & Morgan, 1991) and organisational change (Morgan & Sturdy, 2000). It also looks at the production of individual and collective identities within organisational settings (du Gay, 1996), social identity (e.g. Philips & Hardy, 1997; 1999), occupational identity (e.g. Watson & Bargiela-Chiappini, 1998), corporate identity (e.g. Salzer-Morling, 1998) and individual identity (e.g. Holmer-Nadeson, 1996).

Moreover, many studies have focused on discourses of ‘difference’ (Wodak, 1996) to explore particular social identities such as gender (Garney & Rees, 1996; Maile, 1995; Fletcher, 1998; Gill; 1993a, 1993b; Stokoe, 1998), age (Ainsworth, 2001) and ethnicity (Potter and Wetherell, 1987; Van Dijk, 1993) as well as ‘environmental studies’ (Spicer, 2000; Dirlik, 1999; Macnaghten, 1993; Welcomer, Gioia and Kilduff; 2000).

Despite its contribution to a number of disciplines, DA requires substantial investment of time and energy to master (Philip and Hardy, 2002:11). Also, the theory has been strongly contested and has provoked considerable debate (Dallmayr: 1989,
Mouzelis: 1990; Osbourne, 1991; Aronowitz, 1992; Sim, 1998; Wood, 1998). Realists, Marxists and positivists argue that the theory neglects material conditions, institutions and natural constraints on the production and transformation of social meanings (Howarth, 2000:13). Howarth (Ibid, p.13), nevertheless, argues back that DA does not merely reduce the social world to language. DA instead makes a useful connection between linguistic and social systems, thus providing a powerful means to conduct social and political analysis. In addition, Philips and Hardy (2000:13) believe strongly that DA's benefits outweigh the above-mentioned limitations by far.

3.6.1 Discourse analytic approaches

The two most well known approaches of DA are Conversational Analysis and Critical Discourse Analysis. ‘Conversational Analysis’ (CA) is an approach and a systematic method for examining ‘social interaction’ (Samra-Fredericks, 1998). Its founder, Harvey Sacks (1984:2), asserted that it was because social organisation must be apparent at the level of mundane face-to-face interactions that he turned to conversation (also Schegloff, 1987). The approach is based on naturally occurring talk and social phenomena to discover the form, structure, machinery and methodological procedures (Psathos, 1995) of social actions. It involves studies such as ethnomethodology logical speaking (Garfinkel, 1967; Heritage, 1984) and management literature (Samra-Fredericks, 1994, 1996a, 1996b).

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) provides theories and methods for the empirical study of the relations between discourse and social and cultural developments in different social domains (Phillips and Jorgensen, 2002:60). CDA is used in two different ways: Norman Fairclough (1995a and 1995b) uses it both to describe the approach that he has developed and as the label for a broader movement within DA of which several approaches including his own, are integral parts (Fairclough and Wodak, 1997). He further constructed a ‘three-dimensional’ framework for CDA where the aim is to map three separate forms of analysis onto one another: the analysis of (spoken and written) language texts, the analysis of discourse practice (processes of text production, distribution and consumption) and the analysis of discursive events as instances of socio-cultural practice (Fairclough, 1995:2).

Research in CDA has covered numerous areas such as organisational analysis (e.g. Mumby and Clair, 1997), pedagogy (Chouliaraki, 1998), mass communication and
racism, nationalism and identity (e.g. Van Dijk, 1991; Wodak et al, 1999), mass communication and economy (Richardson, 1998), the spread of market practices (Fairclough, 1993) and mass communication, democracy and politics (Fairclough, 1998; 2000). Furthermore, within the social control area, it has been proposed as a way to analyse the practices and techniques that produce and reproduce power relationships within organisations (e.g. Clegg, 1975; Townley, 1993; Covaleski et al, 1998) on the basis that discursive construction of identities and relations can offer a valuable alternative to traditional approaches to the analysis of power and control in organisations (Philips and Hardy, 2002: 29).

3.6.2 Discourse analysis characteristics and theoretical principles

Despite the diversity of disciplines that discourse studies have been involved with, some academics point to some fundamental common features and principles. Jupp (1996:305) identifies three features of DA as used by Foucault. First, discourse is ‘social’, which indicates that words and their meanings depend on where they are used, by whom and to whom. Particularly, their meanings vary according to social and institutional settings and therefore there is no such thing as ‘universal discourse’. But according to Gill (1996:155), any generalisation is possible when it is constructed from particular interpretative resources and designed for specific interpretative contexts.

Thus, DA is occasioned: there are no trans-historical, trans-cultural, universal accounts, except those that might be ‘produced’ by the artificiality of the research context. Second, there can be different discourses which may be in conflict with one another. Third, as well as being in conflict, discourses may be viewed as being arranged in a hierarchy. The notion of conflict and hierarchy is linked closely with ‘exercise of power’ which is a vital concept of DA. Potter and Wetherell (1994) suggest three main features that make the sort of DA they describe especially pertinent to qualitative research, as illustrated below:

First, it is concerned with talk and texts as social practices; and as such it pays close attention to features which would traditionally be classed as linguistic ‘content’ – meanings and topics – as well as attending to features of linguistic form such as grammar and cohesion. However, DA in general is after answers to social or sociological questions rather than to linguistic ones.

Second, DA has a triple concern with ‘action’, ‘construction’, and ‘variability’ (Potter and Wetherell, 1987). People perform actions of different kinds through their talk and their writing, and they accomplish the nature of these actions partly through constructing their discourse out of a range of styles, linguistic resources and rhetorical devices.
A third feature of DA is its concern with the rhetorical or argumentative organization of talk and texts. Rhetorical analysis has been particularly helpful in highlighting the way discursive versions are designed to counter real or potential alternatives (Billig, 1991). Put another way, it takes the focus of analysis away from questions of how a version relates to some putative reality and asks instead how this version is designed successfully to compete with an alternative.

Later in 1995 (p.80-3), Potter and Wetherell added three more features: practices and resources (see Sacks: 1992a, 1992b; Billig, 1987), stake and accountability and cognition in action (Edwards and Potter, 1995a, 1997b; Coutler, 1989; Harre and Gillet, 1994). Not all of these themes are likely to appear in any particular discourse study and the list is certainly not meant to be comprehensive, though generally or at least in this research, the first three features mentioned above place a central emphasis on the methodological application of DA. It is important to note that DA has not been developed to answer questions formulated in a traditional psychological language of factors and effects and it is certainly not a theoretically neutral approach.

3.7 Content Analysis

The content analysis of language is a method of assessing what people say or write about in speech or texts and how strongly they may feel about their subject matter (Gottchalk and Gleser, 1969). Speech always implies, as Saussure (1966) tells us, an established system, though this system is also continually evolving. Potentially, content analysis (CA) is one of the most important research techniques in the social sciences. It seeks to understand data not as a collection of physical events but as symbolic phenomena and to approach their analysis unobtrusively (Krippendorff, 1980:7). Though CA in general has been classified as a quantitative method, the theoretical orientation is more concerned with the processes through which texts depict ‘reality’ rather than with whether texts contain true or false statements (Silverman, 2000:128). This clearly fits the purpose of this research.

Barelson described content analysis as ‘a research technique for the objective, systematic and quantitative description of the manifest content of communication’ (Berelson, 1952:147), while Holsti (1969) described it as any research technique for making inferences by systematically and objectively identifying specified characteristics within text and a research method that uses a set of procedures to make valid inferences from text (Weber, 1990:9). The definition was further reduced by Shapiro and Markoff
(1997:14) to 'any methodological measurement applied to text (or other symbolic material) for social science purposes'.

For its applications, content analysis was widely used by the US during World War II for code breaking (Lasswell, Leites and Associates, 1949; Shils & Janowitz, 1948) and in the study of the replies of Berlin and Rome radios to a Churchill speech early in the war (Berelson and Grazia, 1947). Its application was further developed by the media, which used it to analyse photos of African-Americans in Life, Newsweek, Time (Lester and Smith, 1990), study characters on TV (Riffe, Goldson, Saxton and Yu, 1989) and analyse public images (Simmons, 1990).

In psychology, CA found three primary applications: 1) the analysis of verbal records to discover motivational, psychological/personality characteristics such as the need-achievement framework (McClelland, 1953); 2) the use of personal documents (e.g. letters, diaries, open-end responses on questionnaires (Allport's, 1942, 1965); and 3) Baldwin's (1942) application of 'Personal Structure analysis' to cognitive structure, and White's (1947) Value Study.

In its organisational application, CA has been used in the analysis of open-ended responses to employee surveys (DiSanza and Bullis, 1999) in the 'word network' analysis of voice-mail (Rice and Danowski, 1991) and in the application of interpersonal interaction coding to manager-subordinate control patterns (Fairhurst et al, 1987). Developing a novel-coding scheme, Larey and Paulus (1999) analysed the transcripts of brainstorming discussion groups of four individuals, looking for unique ideas.

In the fields of linguistics, history and literature, some attempts were made at analysing individual authors or other sources. Elliot and Valenza's (1996) 'Shakespeare Clinic' developed computer tests for Shakespeare authorship, and Martindale and McKenzie (1995) used computer text analysis to confirm James Madison's authorship of 'The Federalist'. In history, CA is concerned with changes in attitudes recorded in archives of written data (Merton, 1957; Cochran, 1953; Shapiro, 1965) and in building psychological profiles (McGee, 1981).

The main strengths of CA as summarised by Riffe et al (1998) and Krippendorff (1969) are that: 1) content analysis is 'unobtrusive', and seldom has any effect on the subject under study; 2) CA 'permits longitudinal studies' - one can study processes occurring over long periods; 3) the analysis is 'able to deal with unstructured material' (also, Krippendorff, 1969); 4) it 'can handle large volumes of data', and it is easy to repeat
part or all of the coding to make sure the information is coded in a consistent manner; 5) it has virtually unlimited applicability to a variety of questions in many disciplines; and 6) documents that are not scientifically prepared can still be meaningfully analysed for patterns and relationships. However, one criticism of CA is that too much quantification can overlook some crucial single element in a message and often some meanings within a message can only be obtained qualitatively, that is, by observing latent meaning (see Holsti, 1969).

3.7.1 Content analysis characteristics

Berelson (1952:18-20) and Berelson and Janowitz (1966:264-5) stated three general assumptions which apply to all studies of content analysis. First, content analysis assumes that inferences about the relationship between intent and content or between content and effect can validly be made, or the actual relationships established. Second, content analysis assumes that the study of the manifest content is meaningful. This assumption requires that the content be accepted as a ‘common meeting ground’ for the communicator and/or is fully understood by the audience. Third, content analysis assumes that the quantitative description of communication content is meaningful. This implies that the frequency of occurrence of various characteristics of the content is itself an important factor in the communication process, under specific conditions. Whenever ‘one word’ or ‘one phrase’ is as ‘important’ as the rest of the content taken together, quantitative analysis would not apply.

In addition to previous assumptions, one additional set of fundamental aspects of the content analysis process includes measurement, indication, representation and interpretation (Namenwirth and Weber, 1987: Chapter 2 and 8). First, in CA, ‘measurement’ refers to counting the occurrences of meaning units such as specific words, phrases, content categories, and themes. Two standard practices are, using the percentage (or proportion) transformation to control for document length, and counting each occurrence of a word or meaningful unit equally. Second, ‘indication’ refers to ‘inferences’ made by the investigator of some unmeasured or latent characteristics of text using numbers that represent some manifest aspect of the text. Third, ‘representation’ refers to the fact that words, phrases, or other textual units are represented through classification into a set of categories. ‘Interpretation’, on the other hand, consists of translating one set of linguistic or linguistically expressed elements into another.
3.7.2 Thematic content analysis

Themes have been used since the 1960s as a loose, general way for analysing patterns in text. A theme in its most compact form is a ‘simple sentence’. That means, subject and predicate (Waples et al, 1940). In other words, a theme is an assertion about ‘subject matter’ (Berelson, 1952). Thematic content analysis is the scoring of messages for content, style, or both for the purpose of assessing the characteristics or experiences of persons, groups or historical periods (Smith, 1992:1). Often a thematic analysis of text is quite informal and involves ‘more or less’ judgements rather than precise numerical measurements such as when people who regularly read about a political campaign can easily note changes in Senator X’s speeches. One of its first applications was to distinguish themes of Axis radio propaganda (Lasswell et al, 1949) and in the study of the replies by Berlin and Rome radios to a Churchill speech early in the war (Berelson and Grazia, 1947).

Thematic analysis has been conducted on non-political materials as well, where a set of themes describing ‘social optimism’ (i.e. emphasis on social rather than individual responsibility) and ‘social pessimism’ (i.e. affirmation of man’s need for mysticism) was analysed in Protestant sermons (Hamilton, 1942). The latest evidence that thematic analysis can be used in the field of occupations is the case of the Gallup organisation, which has proven its ability, based on over half a million job interviews, to use thematic indexes to identify those who will be outstanding performers in a particular job (Stone, 1997). Thematic approach of content analysis is well suited to research purposes where the thematic-focus analysis would enable one to draw common themes that underlie the concept of co-operative management and leadership.

By using content analysis software, thematic categories have already been built in as part of a dictionary arrangement. For this research, I have decided to adopt two kinds of content analysis software which are General Inquirer (GI) and Diction 5. Both are textual analysis software which shares some similarities as well as differences in terms of functionality and dictionary arrangement. The aim is to use both programs as a cross-check content analysis tool to increase the reliability and validity of the findings.

3.7.3 General Inquirer (GI)

The GI program can be used to content analyse written messages from linguistic, psychological, sociological, anthropological, and communication standpoints (Stone et al,
The main dictionary used in the program is the Harvard Third Psychological Dictionary with a further additional 16 dictionary systems that have been developed for use with the GI Program including, ‘Stanford political dictionary’, two need affiliation dictionaries and Lasswell Value dictionary. The latest is an extension of the Harvard III, Harvard IV (Stone et al, 1965:140-1). The General Inquirer is a set of computer programs to:

- Identify systematically, within texts, instances of words and phrases that belong to categories specified by the investigator;
- Count occurrences and specified co-occurrences of these categories;
- Print and graph tabulation;
- Perform statistical tests; and
- Sort and regroup sentences according to whether they contain instances of a particular category or combination of categories (Ibid, p.68).

There are a total of ‘182’ word categories\(^2\) in GI software. However, I have chosen to use 23 categories which I consider appropriate in terms of relevance to this research: Positiv, Negativ, Strong, Weak, Active, Passive, Econ@, Polit@, COLL, Means, Complet, Fail, IAV, SV, PowCoop, PowAupt, PowPt, PowTot, ReEthic, WlbPhys, WlbPsyc, SureLw and If (see further details in Appendix 2). The latest version of GI used in this research offers technical facilities of ‘disambiguation rules’ that are especially designed to solve problems of homographs (words that have more than one meaning) and text analysis that arises from phrases or idioms that constitute a single unit of meaning (Weber, 1984). Furthermore, concerning reliability, dictionaries seem to have the advantage of high reliability because computers categorise only on the basis of their programs without human bias.

The reason I have chosen these categories is because they are all related to the cooperative disciplines that have been outlined in Chapter 2. Categories of Positiv, Neg, Strong, Weak, Active and Passive represent positive and negative outlook, extent of strength and weaknesses, being active or passive, that can be related to co-operators’ characteristics including values and sentiments which can be applied directly to leadership

---

\(^2\) See full category in www.wjh.harvard.edu/~inquirer/homecat.htm.
questions (2) and (4) - to what extent does co-operative leadership discourse affect the co-operative sector both in management and morale? The remainder are related to power, participation in decision-making, human well-being, economics, politics, confidence and ethics, which are vital and accurately enable and explain the social construction and philosophy of the discourse co-operative which can further explain its management and leadership, and the cultures and values that are exercised by management and leadership. Therefore, this can provide promising answers, particularly to questions (1), (2), (3) and (4).

3.7.4 Diction 5

Diction 5 was developed by Professor Roderick P Hart (1999) and is a dictionary-based language analysis program that searches a passage for five semantic features - Activity, Optimism, Certainty, Realism and Commonality - as well as thirty-five sub-features. Diction conducts its searches via a 10,000-word corpus, although the user can also create Custom Dictionaries adapted to particular research needs. Output includes raw totals, percentages, and standardised scores and, for small input files, extrapolations to a 500-word norm. Diction also reports normative data for each of its forty scores based on a 20,000-item comparison sample of contemporary discourse.

Thirty-one dictionaries (word-lists) lie at the heart of the Diction program. In addition, five Master Variables are built by concatenating these dictionaries. The dictionaries have the following properties (Hart, 2000):

- They vary considerably in size, ranging from as few as 10 words to as many as 745 words.
- The dictionaries contain individual words only (vs. phrases).
- No words are duplicated across the thirty-one dictionaries.
- Homographs, words that are spelled alike but that have different meanings, are treated via statistical weighting procedures (thereby partially correcting for context).
- Diction 5 produces both raw scores and standardised scores for each of the standard dictionaries.
A standard dictionary consists of 'variable',³ 'calculated variables'⁴ and 'master variables'. The first two produce thirty-five individual language scores (via standardisation procedures) that it then sums into five master variables; 'activity', 'optimism', 'certainty', 'realism' and 'commonality'. The program assumes that these five variables best capture the major tonal features of a text. The program also presents normative data for these five variables, which lets the user 'locate' a given passage in the universe of discourse (Hart, 2000). A definition of each master variable is shown below (see further detail of variables in Appendix 3):

- **Certainty** - Language indicating resoluteness, inflexibility, and completeness and a tendency to speak ex cathedra.

- **Optimism** - Language endorsing a person, group, concept or event or highlighting their positive entailments.

- **Realism** - Language describing tangible, immediate, recognisable matters that affect people's everyday lives.

- **Activity** - Language featuring movement, change, the implementation of ideas and the avoidance of inertia.

- **Commonality** - Language that highlights the agreed-upon values of a group and that rejects idiosyncratic modes of engagement.

The 'certainty' feature obviously relates to the flexibility and adaptability of co-operative management, leadership and culture (questions (1), (2) and (3)) while 'optimism' and 'activity' could be related to co-operators' characteristics, attitude and personality and thus relevant to leadership questions, especially question (2).

---

³ Variables consist of numerical terms, ambivalence, self-reference, tenacity, levelling terms, collectives, praise, satisfaction, inspiration, blame, hardship, aggression, accomplishment, communication, cognition, passivity, spatial terms, familiarity, temporal terms, present concerns, human interest, concreteness, past concerns, centrality, rapport, co-operation, diversity, exclusion, liberation, denial and motion.

⁴ Insistence, embellishment, variety and complexity
### Table 3.1 A Comparison of Functionality between GI and Diction 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>GI</th>
<th>Diction 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Function</strong></td>
<td>Dictionary-provided ‘word category’</td>
<td>Dictionary-provided ‘word variable’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Platform Support</strong></td>
<td>Any hardware such as PC, Mac, Unix or Linux that has Java Virtual Machine system, web-based application</td>
<td>Available for PC/Windows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Input</strong></td>
<td>Text or ASCII format, can be processed as a single or group of files</td>
<td>MSDOS-TEXT or ASCII-TEXT can be processed as a single or group of files</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Output</strong></td>
<td>Raw score and percentage</td>
<td>Raw score, percentage, standardised score (Z scores)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. Output format compatibility</strong></td>
<td>Files can be read into SPSS and Excel.</td>
<td>Files can be read into SPSS and Excel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6. Customisation</strong></td>
<td>No limit, providing each has a unique name</td>
<td>Permits up to 10 custom dictionaries for specific purposes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7. Speed</strong></td>
<td>1 million / hour</td>
<td>30,000/minute(^5) (1.8m /hour).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3.2 A Comparison of Dictionary between GI and Diction 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>GI</th>
<th>Diction 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Size of Categories</strong></td>
<td>The largest has 2,291 words, the smallest 4 words and many more contain more than 100 words(^6).</td>
<td>5 main categories with 35 sub-features of which the largest has 745 words, the smallest 10 words.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Norm</strong></td>
<td>Not provided</td>
<td>Compare given text’s features to a database of 12,000 previously analysed texts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Default categories</strong></td>
<td>182 categories in conjunction of psychological, sociological and political research</td>
<td>Thirty-six normative values types divided into seven individual classes(^7) and one general class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Word Exclusion and Inclusion</strong></td>
<td>Leftovers for non-match dictionary</td>
<td>Inconsistent Scoring; exempt and eligible words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. Homographs (word that has more than one meaning)</strong></td>
<td>Over 6,500 disambiguation routines on 1,650 words</td>
<td>Treated via statistical weighting procedures (thereby partially correcting for context).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6. Word Classification</strong></td>
<td>Overlap between categories</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7. Key Features</strong></td>
<td>One that has large dictionary size; positiv and negative</td>
<td>5 key features are provided</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^5\) On Pentium-based system.

\(^6\) Within this research, 157 word categories were removed, leaving 25 that precisely matched the to research objective.

\(^7\) Business, Literature, Politics, Daily Life, Scholarship, Entertainment and Journalism.
Commonality can largely provide a collective-based view, concepts or values that can explain further the co-operative’s underlying values and cultures and how they have been constructed and finally translated into management and leadership rules, principles and goals (questions (1), (2), (3), and (4)). Finally, realism indicates emotions and feelings that involve the everyday routine of co-operators which can provide the characteristics of speakers and factors that arouse such feelings and emotions (questions (1) and (2)).

Diction 5 allows a user to compare a text to the entire set of norms (n=20,027) that consists of seven individual classes (business, literature, politics, daily life, scholarship, entertainment and journalism) or to select sub categories (e.g. newspaper editorials) for more precise comparisons. I have chosen ‘political’ class and ‘social movement speech’ sub-category as both are closest in relation to this research area. Co-operatives are largely involved with political activities and the documents that will be used as documentary source data would be the social movement kind of speech. Although, GI and Diction 5 are totally different software, there are still similarities between their functionality and the dictionaries’ organisation which is interpreted by using the tabulation reprobation in Tables 3.1 and 3.2 (see above).

Table 3.1 shows that GI and Diction 5 share most basic functionalities, especially for function and output format compatibility. These are slight limitations to the Diction 5 software as it is available only for PC/Windows and allows for 10 customised dictionaries, though it has a faster speed, analysing a larger amount of input. On the other hand, table 3.2 shows that an apparent advantage of Diction 5 is its ‘norm values’. Another clear distinction is that there is no overlap of Diction 5’s word classification, whereas one word can be classified under several categories under GI. Furthermore, words that do not match existing GI dictionaries will be excluded and classified under ‘left over’ for reselection purposes while Diction 5 has an ‘inconsistent’ scoring that may exempt eligible words at some times and include them at others.

Overall, there are no clear-cut differences or similarities between GI and Diction 5 functionality and dictionary arrangement. It is most likely that both will produce different outcomes caused by some of their differences. Nevertheless, using two methods certainly provides more reliable data due to the cross-checking process between them.
3.8 Narrative Analysis

The word 'story' is used interchangeably with 'narrative' through narrative analysis (Richmond, 2002:3). Boje (2000: 2) defines 'story' as an account of incidents and events, but 'narrative' comes after that and adds 'plot' and 'coherence' to the story line. Narrative studies draw on theories of mythology (like those of Levi-Strauss, 1963; 1976; 1978 and Campbell, 1986; 1988) and folklore (like Propp, 1984). Another way of studying narratives/stories is by analysing their narrative structure and seeking to classify their plots, characters, dramatic and thematic qualities (Martin et al, 1983; Mahler, 1988). In Narrative Analysis (NA), form and content can be studied together, and a concern with narrative can illuminate how informants use language to convey particular 'meanings' and 'experiences' (Punch, 1998:223). It attempts to reduce the story to a set of elements that may reveal a particular case in a certain time or place (Richmond, 2002:1).

The use of narrative research has grown immensely since the 1990s in the fields of psychology, gender studies, education, anthropology, sociology, linguistics, law and history (Harven, 1997). Citing a rising percentage in the usage of narrative studies, the statistics show an increase from an average of 0.058% during 1960-1964 to 1.49% since the 1980’s, a comparative growth of 2569% (the PsycINFO Database cited in Harven, 2004). In psychology, education and medicine, narratives are used for diagnosing psychological and medical problems/learning disabilities (Capp & Ochs, 1995; Herman, 1992; Wigren, 1994).

In many studies on sociology and anthropology, NA is used to represent the character or lifestyle of specific subgroups in society, defined by their gender, race and religion that are often subjected to discrimination, for example on women’s issues (see Gluck & Patai, 1991; Josselson, 1987; Gorkin & Othman, 1996) and on gay life (see Curtis, 1988; Plummer, 1995).

In cognitive sciences, the narrative method is employed to study memory, development of language, and information processing (Hartley & Jensen, 1991; Neisser & Fivush, 1994). In the last two decades, NA has been gaining considerable merit in the fields of socio-historical inquiries (Griffin, 1992; Aminzade, 1992; Kiser and Hechter, 1991; Goldthorpe, 1991; McMichael, 1992; Hall, 1990) and urban development and change/urban sociology (Hutchison, 1993; Feagin and Parker, 1990; Gottdiener and Feagin, 1988).
Within the organisational scope, Gabriel (1998:135) explained in detail the study of organisational storytelling that had recently gone beyond the analysis of folklore. By listening and comparing different accounts, by investigating how narratives are constructed around specific events, by examining which events in an organisation's history generate stories and which ones fail to do so, we gain access to deeper organisational realities, closely linked to their members' experiences. In this way, stories enable us to study organisational politics, culture and changes in uniquely illuminating ways, revealing how wider organisational issues are viewed, commented upon and worked upon by their members (Ibid, p.136).

Organisation theorists adopt the culture paradigm in their discipline. Attention is turning to organisational stories, jokes and myths (Allaire and Firsirotu, 1984; Mahler, 1988; Mitroff and Kilman, 1976; Pondy, 1983; Martin et al, 1983; Meek, 1988; Bowles, 1989; Hansen and Kahnweiler, 1993). Narrative research has been applied to other organisational areas such as organisational communication and learning (Wilkins and Martin, 1979; Martin, 1982; Barnett, 1988; Boje, 1991; 1994), political systems of organisations (Wilkins, 1983; Deal and Kennedy, 1982; Martin and Powers, 1983) and management power (Rosen, 1985a; 1985b; Meek, 1988; Collinson, 1988; 1994; Trice and Beyer, 1984; Gabriel; 1995).

Narrative studies contribute to many fields of study, particularly to organisational theory, as they enable a researcher to synergise and bring together a number of key elements when approaching or analysing organisational problems (Eastoe et al, 1999). In addition, they value the signs, symbols, and expression of feelings in language, validating how the narrator constructs meaning which is useful, such as feminist and critical theory (Eisner, 1988; Grumet, 1990). Nevertheless, narrative analysis cannot totally reveal what someone really thinks or feels because any truth is simply a construction, and narratives are skilfully woven to bring into being versions of the self that serve specific purposes (Redwood, 1999:674).

3.8.1 Types and frameworks of narrative analyses

Regardless of the fields in which narrative studies have been adopted, there are three main types of narrative analysis that are most often explored: linguistic, psychological and biographic (Baumgartner, 2000). An example of the 'linguistic approach' is Labov and Waletzsky's (1967) structuralist technique which slices stories
into ‘clauses’. These clauses are identified by the functions they serve and together they form a core narrative. For example, a separate group of clauses orient the reader to the narrative, describe the actor and resolve the action.

Second, the psychological method of analysis concentrates more on the meaning people create through words rather than the particulars of language. Finally, Denzin’s (1989) biographical method of analysis takes into account the influence of society on the individual’s narratives such as family values, gender, class and so on. The first type of narrative analysis, the linguistic approach is closest to the nature of this research.

Labov and Waletzsky (1967:1) argued that it would not be possible to make much progress in the analysis and understanding of these complex narratives until the simplest and most fundamental narrative structures are analysed in direct connection with their originating functions. They suggested that a ‘fully formed narrative’ includes six common elements: an abstract (summary of the substance of the narrative); orientation (time, place, situation, participants); complicating action (sequence of events); evaluation (significance and meaning of the action, attitude of the narrator); resolution (what finally happened); and coda (returns the perspective to the present) (Ibid, p. 24-38).

Within these structures, a teller constructs a story from a primary experience and interprets the significance of events in clauses and embedded evaluation. The framework is being developed for oral narratives of personal experience which is useful in approaching a wide variety of narrative situations and types, including oral memoirs, traditional folk tales, avant garde novels, therapeutic interviews and most importantly, the banal narratives of everyday life (Labov, 1997:1).

Using a similar structural approach, but on a much larger scale, Prop in his famous work on Morphology of Folktales (1968) argued that in each fairy tale, there are thirty-one well-defined parts of the plot. For example, abstention, interdiction, violation and delivery. He argued that the sequence of functions is constant. Mishler (1986:241) noted that this type of analysis is quite formal and structured and its ‘power lies in its generalisability’. Gabriel (2000:36-42), using a similar approach but in a much smaller framework, argued that for a story to be interpreted effectively, a mechanism which can generate an underlying set of meanings is essential.

---

8 One member of family absents himself or herself
9 An interdiction is addressed to the hero - a command, request, suggestion, etc.
10 The interdiction is violated. At this point a new personage, the villain, enters the story.
I have decided to adopt Gabriel’s framework as a narrative analytical tool. This framework is called Gabriel’s Poetic Tropes indicating eight ways of making sense of specific parts or making connections between them in the narrative: motive, casual connection, responsibility, agency, unity, providential significance and emotion. These will be explained in more detail as follows:

- **Motive** is one of the most powerful ‘sensemaking devices’ and features prominently in a story. It is central to any story interpretation, determining whether events are accidental, incidental, intentional or unintentional. It is vital in the sense that it helps to justify whether the predicament facing the protagonist is one that he/she deserves or not, and therefore affecting the construction of the protagonist as hero, victim, villain, survivor and so forth. A story must have motivated characters to make it comprehensible to hearers or readers.

- **Causal connection** is related to motive, whereby two or more incidents in the narrative are linked as ‘cause’ and ‘effect’. Goffman (1974:503) noted that causal connections between actions and events are subjected to necessity rather than being accidental or conditional, especially when two events can be presented as ‘simultaneous’ or as being in close temporal proximity (Polkinghorne, 1998; Weick, 1995).

- **Blame and credit** (responsibility) determines who will be cast either as a villain (the one who causes disaster), a victim (who suffers from it) or a hero (who resolves the whole situation heroically). In organisational stories, attribution is often associated with ‘lack of recognition’ (claiming credit for others’ work), ‘scapegoat’ (finding someone to blame), and ‘heroic achievement’ (as one who single-handedly saves the day). Overall, attribution allows storytellers to determine what’s right and wrong, therefore assigning them to appropriate agents.

- **Agency** refers to someone or something who turns something passive or even inanimate into something active, purposeful and conscious, capable of being an

---

11 The villain receives information about his or her victim.
agent. Agency turns an object into subject, governing its entire range of cognitions and actions. In other words, it is when a decision is encouraged to be carried out or dismissed. For example, management is an agent, knowingly causing explosions to eliminate particular employees.

- **Providential significance** represents an incident which has been engineered by a key high profile figure in order to achieve a particular end, such as a radical conversion in the hero, a test of character, or an intervention that restores justice and brings about the punishment of villains.

- **Emotional attribution** is important as it distinguishes the emotions with which the characters are invested and the emotions aroused by the story itself in order to evaluate the emotional tone of the story.

The next two tropes are both subjected to the quality of sameness and come together in collective representations – labelling, generalisation (Robinson, 1981) and stereotyping. They are ‘attribution of unity’ and ‘attribution of fixed quality’.

- **Unity** is where a class of people are being treated as one similar group as a whole which shares the same responsibility.

- **Fixed Quality** refers to a situation where a liar is treated as one on every subsequent occasion and a hero is always treated as a hero. Thus, once a liar, always a liar and the same applies to a hero.

Different tropes tend to have different significance in different types of stories; for example, motive and blame as well as credit are important for criminal cases and tragedy, respectively. Furthermore, they are related and associated to each other in some ways. Even if one attribute is missing, others can still be used to make a reasonable and comprehensible interpretation of a story. These tropes can provide answers to the questions raised by this research. For example, attributed blame or credit can identify heroes and villains and can explain the construction of co-operative ideology (question 1).
Motive and emotion tropes are closely related to values, principles and objectives that can explain co-operative management, values and leadership (questions (2), (3) and (4)).

In this research, the main concern regarding this type of analysis is whether selected sampling texts can be treated as a complete narrative since they are being selected from multiple sources and are therefore fragmented. However, selected sampling texts here consist of the ‘beginning’ stage where introduction and objectives are outlined; the ‘middle’ stage where concerns and problems are identified and eventually the ‘end’ where ideal solutions and actions are derived or suggested. Therefore, they can be considered as narratives as they possess a coherent sequence of beginning, middle, and end (Czarniawska, 1997, 1998; Gabriel, 2000; Martin et al 1982, 1983; Weick, 1995) that can be further analysed under narrative analysis, and any prevalence of fragmented and polyphonic storytelling can be dealt with through intertextual analysis (Boje, 2000).

3.9 Intertextual Analysis

One can find theories of ‘intertextuality’ wherever there has been ‘discourse’ about texts because thinkers are aware of intertextual relations and because our knowledge of theory makes us, as readers, keen to re-read our source texts in that light (Worton and Still, 1990:3). Intertextuality, like modern literary and cultural theory itself, can be said to have its origins in twentieth-century linguistics. It was not until the 1960s that ‘intertextuality’ became widely known and used. The semiotician Julia Kristeva (1980a, b:36) introduced the notion of intertextuality which was associated primarily with Ferdinand de Saussure and M.M. Bakhtin’s theory of language and literature. Her work was also based on other post-structuralists, Derrida (1976) and Foucault (1972:82).

Barthes (1957, 1977) and Fairclough (1992:101-36)) have also added considerably to ‘intertextual analysis’. Kristeva (1980:3) noted that ‘a text is a permutation of texts, an intertextuality in the space of a given text in which several utterances, taken from other texts, intersect and neutralise one another’. Similarly to Barthes (1977:146), Foucault (1974:23) suggests that all texts are made out of other texts in one way or another and therefore none of them are original but are ongoing adaptations or mixing of writings.

The concept of intertextuality reminds us that each text exists in relation to others (Chandler, 2001). Therefore, there is a need to look beyond separate texts and ask how they are related (Atkinson and Coffey, 1997:56). This includes other texts of the same genre, or other kinds of textual products (e.g. journalism, biography and movies).
Intertextuality refers to those characteristics known to the reader because she/he has come across them in other texts before, while a more recent definition suggests that 'intertextuality' is a web of complex interrelationships ensnaring each story's historicity and situational context between other stories (Boje, 2000:91).

Intertextuality is being applied to many disciplines such as literature, media, management and particularly, art. It can be seen as connected to a developing trend within twentieth century art to incorporate 'real objects' into painting. The use of bits of wallpaper, string, postage stamps, within, for example, a cubist design, incorporates segments of the physical world into the pictorial image only, paradoxically, to unsettle the notion of the painting's realistic representation of the world (Allen, 2000:179). Intertextuality became a controversial issue as a result of its use in the Da Vinci Code. In the story, Da Vinci supposedly used several of his paintings including the Mona Lisa and The Last Supper as a form of secret code communication.

Intertextuality has been popular within the media discipline; T. Jefferson Kline's (1992) 'Screening the Text: Intertextuality and the New Wave French Cinema', James Goodwin's (1994:9) study of the film of Akira Kurosawa, shows that there is an intertextual chain which demonstrates the hybridity, the crossing of Japanese and US cultures. Television critic John Fiske (1987:108) uses intertextuality to study interpretations across culture. Another example is one of Fox's most popular TV series O.C (Orange County) which frequently refers to comic books and movie characters such as Spiderman or the Star Wars protagonist Luke Skywalker.

In organisational study, Keenoy and Oswick (2003:136) argue that exploring the relationship within and between the various forms of discursive media which populate management and organisations is equally valuable for 'organisational analysis'. Norman Fairclough's 'Discourse and Social Change' (1992) also provides a contribution towards organisational analysis. He develops an original framework for discourse analysis which firmly situates discourse in a broader context of social relations. This framework brings together text analysis, the analysis of processes of text production and interpretation, as well as the social analysis of discourse events. Thus, in the organisational analysis prospect, intertextuality has been applied as a textual analysis tool.

Significantly, intertextuality has become a major focus in 'postmodern literacy' criticism which is closely related to postmodernists such as Derida's (1976) concept of difference and Foucault's (1976; 1979) concept of discontinuity. Derrida's concept of
'difference' argues that it is unavoidable once one enters into a language or other symbolic mode of representation in which signifiers (words and signs) refer 'not' to referents (the 'underlying reality') but only to other signifiers (Fox: 1995:2-3). Thus, while a writer is trying to represent the real meaning, one finds that the meaning which one is trying to communicate slips from one's grasp.

Foucault's writing (1976; 1979; 1984) discloses 'discontinuity' and the 'continual writing' and 'rewriting' of the world in discourse. For genealogy, 'rationality' is no longer the force behind the evolution of knowledge but rather knowledge is fabricated through the never-ending struggles for power to describe the social aspect (Fox, 1995:3). Genealogy does not provide the truth of how one discourse supersedes another and indeed, it admits itself to be incapable of discerning the reasoning (or its absence) whereby it became possible to speak about the world in particular ways at particular points in time and space. 'Medicine' and 'Psychiatry' therapy and other caring disciplines construct human subjects in ways which supersede earlier versions, not for reasons of rationality, but for strategic objectives concerned with 'power' and 'control'.

Furthermore, it was argued by Agger (1992) that perhaps problems of intertextuality are due to the fact that the concept appears to be infinitely expandable. The problem is aggravated in the case of literature on account of certain aesthetic issues and contexts (see Derrida and Foucault previously). As a result Culler (1998) suggests some ways of limiting the scope of the term 'intertextuality', one of which is to apply the linguistic concept of presupposition to the way a text produces a 'pre-text' - or draws attention to its own conventions. Emphasising the suggestive aspects of intertextuality while simultaneously calling attention to the many problems involved in its application seems to be a recurrent pattern in the short history of the concept.

3.9.1 Characteristics and features of intertextuality

Boje (2000:75) summarises four intertextuality points derived from the narrative analysis of novels that are being applied to organisational narrative as shown below:

- **Textual productivity** – Kristeva observes that a novel's 'productivity' is 'redistributive' (destructive-constructive). She notes 'it is a permutation of texts, an intertextuality: in the space of a given text, several utterances, taken from other texts, intersect and neutralise one another' (1980a, 36-8).
• **Social and historical intertextual networks** – Besides the juxtaposition of various voices, quotes, and narrative interpretations in novels, intertextuality is also the social and historical network that interlaces a novel with other texts. Novels are produced to be distributed and to be consumed, to link past texts with present and anticipated texts.

• **Intertextual distribution and consumption** – Novels are intertextual in terms of covert struggles for power that is dialogically embedded in its production, distribution and consumption.

• **Intertextuality and carnival** – There is one final element of the novel that has relevance to organisational narratives: carnivalesque spectacles (Boje, 2000:75). It is useful to consider the ‘degree of intertextuality’.

For example, would the ‘most intertextual’ text be an indistinguishable copy of other text, or would that have gone beyond what it means to be intertextual? (Chandler, 1994:11). Here are some defining factors which help to indicate the degree of intertextuality (Ibid, 1994:11):

- **Reflexivity**: how reflexive (or self-conscious) the use of intertextuality seems to be (If reflexivity is important to what it means to be intertextual, then presumably an indistinguishable copy goes beyond being intertextual);

- **Alteration**: the alteration of sources (more noticeable alteration presumably making it more reflexively intertextual);

- **Explicitness**: the specificity and explicitness of reference(s) to other text(s) (e.g. direct quotations, attributed quotations);

- **Critical comprehension**: how important it would be for the reader to recognise the intertextuality involved;
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- **Structural unboundedness**: to what extent the text is presented (or understood) as part of or tied to a larger structure (e.g. as part of a genre, of a series, of a serial, of a magazine, of an exhibition, etc); factors which are often not under the control of the author of the text.

All the above-mentioned factors are indicators of intertextuality; however, since the dominant mode of producing texts seems to involve masking their debts, 'reflexivity' seems to be an important issue and is more often referred to by many authors. Chandler (1994) noted that intertextuality is not a feature of text alone but of the contract which reading it forges between its authors and readers and this is why 'reflexivity' is also a condition that can be found in non-narrative as well as narrative texts (Abbott, 2002:195).

Alvesson (2002:171) uses the term 'reflexivity' in a way that it stands for conscious and systematic efforts to view the subject matter from different angles, and to avoid strongly privileging a favoured one. It aims to realise more fully the linguistic implications of preferred positions, and to invite the expression of alternative voices or perspectives into one's activities (Gergen, 1991:79). An example of 'reflexivity' in 'Absolute Vodka' advertisements in Figure 3.1 is shown below (Chandler, 1994:5).

**Figure 3.1 Absolut Vodka Advertisement (in Chandler, 1994)**

From the picture, in order to be able to make sense of the advertisement, one needs to know what to look for. Such expectations are established by reference to one's previous experience in looking at related advertisements in an extended series. Once a customer
knows what they are looking for (the ‘shape of the bottle’), it is easier to perceive it. If one observes carefully, the advertisement shows no direct reference to the product at all. Thus, how intertextual the advertisement is depends on the previous knowledge and awareness of the consumers, hence, reflexivity. The advertisement also shows that modern visual advertisements make extensive use of intertextuality in this way, which is beyond textual account usage.

Rorty (1989), on the other hand, implies that there are always other vocabularies for addressing the line taken. One approach is to move between different lines of interpretation, varying and confronting an earlier-used vocabulary with a line of interpretation that offers a different angle and a different vocabulary (Alvesson and Skoldberg, 2000). This means challenging the chosen interpretation and the researcher confronting him/herself and possibly the reader with alternative views, which may facilitate the process of arriving at the ‘strongest’ or most interesting interpretation and / or offering alternative ones. Thus, the study may offer ‘more than one type of result’. For example, after a researcher gathers data and produces a preliminary text, he may then critically go through it from a postmodernist (or other challenging, e.g. feminist) angle which can lead to further revisions of texts, comments and reinterpretation.

3.9.2 Gerard Genette’s intertextuality

For this research, I have decided to adopt Genette’s transtextuality framework as an intertextual analytical tool. Gerard Genette (1992, 1997a, 1997b), in an attempt to reclaim the ground lost to Kristeva’s (1980) definition of intertextuality and Barthes’ (1977) ‘Death of the Author’, sought to re-discipline literary discourse analysis by reconstituting it through what he now calls ‘transtextuality’ (Allen, 2000:101 cited in Keenoy and Oswick, 2003:136). For Genette, intertextuality is subsumed as one of a subset of five forms of transtextual relationship (Ibid. p. 137) which are:

- **Intertextuality.** Genette sought to confine the meaning of intertextuality to refer only to the direct co-presence between two or more texts and ‘the actual presence of one text within another’ (Genette, 1997a: 1-2). This connects aspects of the text to another through explicit interpretation (for example, direct quotation, plagiarism, and referencing). The intertextuality is visible on the ‘surface’ of the text.
• **Paratextuality.** This refers to elements outside the main body of a text and is subdivided into the ‘peritext’ (consisting of elements such as titles, chapter headings, and footnotes) and the ‘epitext’ (for example, reviews by critics and responses, editorial discussions, and publicity). The paratextual is visible on the ‘margins’ of the text.

• **Metatextuality.** This occurs when a text takes up a relation of ‘commentary’ to another text (Allen 2000:12). This appears to be the most flexible of his five transtextual forms as it includes instances where the text is being commented upon (or alluded to) but not directly cited or even named (for example, works of the same genre). The metatextual is not directly visible, but appears to be prefigured in the weave of the text.

• **Hypertextuality.** Genette (1997a) uses this term to refer to a more specific form of metatextuality. It refers to those works which self-consciously incorporate elements of an earlier text (referred to as the ‘hypotext’) into the text under scrutiny (the ‘hypertext’). This category explicitly excludes aspects of commentary, but includes pastiche, parody, caricature and travesty. The hypertextual is a visible ‘bowdlerization’ of an earlier text.

• **Architextuality.** Genette (1992) argues that the basic building blocks which underpin the entire literary system can be categorised as an interrelated set of ‘architexts’. Hence, architextuality refers to ‘the entire set of general or transcendent categories’ – types of discourse, modes of enunciation, literary genres – from which emerges each singular text (Genette 1997a:1). The architextual is visible ‘everywhere’ about and around the text.

Genette’s transtextuality would enable an identification of connection and relation with each other (intertextuality). Also, it can identify interest and sentiments, concepts (Metatextuality), supports and criticism (Hypertextuality) across co-operators either to each other or towards some topics. These concepts and ideas surely are key to the understanding of co-operative construction, and underlie and affect its existing management and leadership, principles and values. Common themes of written and
spoken sources will also be identified to indicate certain topics and issues that are central to co-operative philosophy and ideology. Broadly, Genette’s definition of intertextuality can relate to all four research questions here.

3.10 Rationale for using a Multi-Textual Method

In the three previous sections; 3.7, 3.8 and 3.9, I have outlined the analytical framework that will be adopted in this research. Each framework focuses on a different level of text analysis as shown in Table 3.3 (see below). This enables the researcher to obtain a wider scope of focus to this research that allows greater exploration of these findings and their analyses than if only one single text analysis method had been used.

Content analysis focuses on fragments of text, that is, words. It quantifies the number of citations for each word and eventually classifies them into different categories through the use of two kinds of content analysis software, GI and Diction 5. Many possible themes can be derived from these existing categories, but due to its emphasis on word quantification, the interpretation of the meaning of the words requires further qualitative supplement from other methods such as narrative analysis and intertextual analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Analytical Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Content Analysis</td>
<td>Fragments of text (i.e. words and thematic meanings)</td>
<td>Micro – i.e. sentences</td>
<td>General Inquirer and Diction 5 Software:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Quantification of Word Counts and Word Category classification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Narrative Analysis</td>
<td>Complete text (as stories)</td>
<td>Meso – i.e. whole (unitary) speeches</td>
<td>Gabriel’s (2000) Attribution: Interpret meanings underlying stories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Intertextual Analysis</td>
<td>Across text (i.e. patterns)</td>
<td>Macro – i.e. many (pluralist) speeches</td>
<td>Genette’s Transtextuality (1992): Explore connection and linkage between concepts, sentiments and topics that share across co-operators.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
On the other hand, narrative analysis can look at speeches as one complete unit, treating them as stories and identifying characters, motives, heroes, villains and so on. By using Gabriel's tropes as the analytical framework, it is possible to focus on each story as a whole picture and generate meanings underlying that particular story, which content analysis fails to provide. However, intertextuality takes the analysis a step further, enabling the researcher to focus across speeches to identify possible connections and relations among co-operators in order to generate a pattern of concepts, sentiments and theories across different co-operators and time. This again is what content and narrative analysis fail to provide.

Overall, each method processes speeches at different levels, with content analysis examining speeches in 'sentences' (micro), narrative analysis looking at the 'one whole speech' (meso) as a story, and intertextual analysis looking at 'all 23 speeches' (macro) to identify patterns among co-operators. As each method focuses on different angles of speech analysis, each therefore reveals a different aspect of the findings that produce a synergetic effect on this research (see Chapter 8).

3.11 Multi-Textual Analysis Method Limitations

An overall limitation of the research methodology employed (i.e. the three textual analysis methods) is that they deal with 'espoused' views rather than actual practice. The strategy of analysing speeches can only indicate the verbal expression of ideas, values and concepts from selected co-operators while in reality, these ideas and concepts could have been executed or reinforced differently. However, this is because the intention of this thesis is to study the contribution from leading co-operative figures whose ideas and opinions influence the management, commitment and operation of co-operatives.

Also, methods such as interviews and questionnaires do not necessarily provide accurate findings that correspond to current co-operative practice. For example, it is not often the case that interviewees will provide answers that correlate questions or correspond to actual situations. Co-operatives have a strong culture and high level of optimism towards their values, principles and traditions, and co-operators are likely to possess a strong sense of obligation to defend and uphold these traditions and therefore be inclined to provide positive answers that might not correspond to the actual situation of the co-operatives.
In addition to the overall limitations and despite the justification of the suitability of the three selected textual analysis methods, namely, content analysis (CA), narrative analysis (NA) and intertextual analysis (IA) outlined previously, they differ in their level of focus on findings analysis and interpretation. It is also inevitable that each method has its own limitations, particularly in relation to other methods and research questions. Thus, it is important to be aware of and understand these limitations, and to be able to overcome them within this research study.

3.11.1 Limitations of content analysis

Despite the main strength of content analysis being its ability to deal with fragmented material and large quantities of data, it is important to outline some possible limitations that might occur during this research process. One apparent limitation is the difficulty in detecting any form of emotion during the speech-making of co-operators and also in identifying the sense of purpose and objectives of selected speeches. For example, it is unable to detect sarcasm or certain linguistic expression. Thus, a further complementary qualitative research method is required, as outlined below.

- **Lacking category relevance**

  Word counts can merely measure the number of words cited and later list them under specified categories. From the 182 word categories of General Inquirer software, I have tried to select the most relevant ones, and have already specified five word categories from Diction 5. Since these categories had already been specified by the chosen computer software, their relevance to the research questions is automatically limited. There is no specific word category to provide a thorough answer to for example, question (2) where the question concerns the differences between the contemporary leadership discourses of co-operative and mainstream organisations. For example, I have chosen the Power Domain word category because its main category and its sub-categories relate to the areas of empowerment, democracy, participation and decision-making that are in turn directly related to leadership ideology.

- **Lacking in explanation from findings**

  Having chosen the most relevant word categories, CA can still only provide findings in thematic form with no proper explanation, illustration and meaning as to how
and why the findings have been derived. There still needs further interpretation by a researcher to relate the word count and word categories findings in order to make them meaningful, easier to understand and most importantly relevant to the research questions of this study, although not to extent that NA and IA do. Furthermore, the overall time consumed using CA is only slightly less than for the other two methods.

- **Neglect relationships within and between different texts**

  Content analysis is the study of the text itself, not of its relation to its context, to the intentions of the producer of the text, nor of the reaction of the intended audience (Hardy et al, 2004:20). It only tackles ‘word’ as its unit of analysis which as a result provides a rather limited scope for meaning analysis and interpretation. Therefore, it is unlikely to be able to answer question (4) since the question concerns the ‘relationship’ between contemporary co-operative practices and traditional co-operative discourse. This is where intertextual analysis can be used as a complementary method as it analyses the meanings of findings across the text.

- **Limitations to insights into the context of word usage**

  Content analysis offers limited insights into the context of word usage through content analysis software: General Inquirer and Diction 5 merely count the number of word citations. However, a significant number of citations does not necessarily represent an actual meaning obtained from that particular word. For example, ‘co-operation’ would be cited often in sentences, paragraphs or whole speech since speeches are mainly made during a co-operative congress. However, this does not necessarily suggest that the notion of co-operation is being truly emphasised nor does it contribute any significant meanings within that particular paragraph or speech.

  This is where narrative analysis can establish causes and outcomes that further reveal the meanings of sampled texts, that is, the relationships within those selected texts. In addition, unlike CA, it can indicate emotions and feelings accurately.

3.11.2 **Limitations of narrative analysis**

Having outlined the NA benefits of treating the text as a story and interpreting its meaning by identifying characters, motives, causes and outcomes, nevertheless, it is
uncertain whether a 2000-word sample selected from each speech is sufficient. Such a limited amount of sampling provides only narrow scope for exploration and analysis of the sampled text. However, given that NA is manually analysed, interpreting such an amount seems reasonable and should produce adequate findings for this research. There are also some other limitations for NA which will be outlined below.

- **A single speech cannot represent a co-operator entirely**
  
  A choice of 23 co-operators allows for some comparison between sampled texts (stories) in order to understand how each chosen co-operator’s values and principles affect current co-operative management and leadership ideology. However, according to Marshall and Rossman (1995:88), no single story provides a full understanding of the journey towards literacy, but each provides pieces for a ‘mosaic’ or total picture of a concept. This can be applied here where one single speech cannot entirely represent what the co-operator thinks, believes or feels, particularly given the limited sampling quotas of 2000 words. Thus, to obtain solid findings that would allow accurate analysis and interpretation, there might be a need for a greater amount of sampling, or, alternatively more attention could be paid to any ‘repeating storylines’ in order to understand the total concept or meaning lying behind the sampled texts.

- **Difficulty in comparing qualitative data**
  
  Since a narrative analysis method provides findings that are qualitative-based, it is difficult to compare such data. This particularly applies to question (3) where a comparison between the discourse of co-operative management and that of mainstream organisations is required.

- **Limitation of sampled quotas (i.e. key co-operators)**
  
  In this study, 23 key co-operators were chosen, which might be considered limited. However, the objective of this research is to study co-operative management, leadership and values by studying speeches from key founders and leaders impose certain values and principles on co-operative concepts and practice. Unfortunately, these key figures are historically limited and selecting more would lessen the resolution of the purpose of the sampled selection.
• **Fragmented sampled texts**

Some sampled texts are being selected from multiple sources and are therefore fragmented. This questions whether they can be treated as stories since some parts of the texts are not connected to others. It is argued by Richmond (2002:2) that ‘narrative provides an organisation borrowed from literature (the plot), from language and thought (cognitive reflection and understanding) and from life events (actions and outcomes)’. The selected samplings are mostly from speeches made during a co-operative congress, and mostly outlines of co-operator’s account of objectives, actions, problems, solutions, outcomes and future plans and improvements. Thus, selected sampled texts can, to a considerable extent, be considered as narratives.

Furthermore, these speeches consist of a ‘beginning’ where the objectives are outlined, a ‘middle’ where concerns and problems are identified, and finally an ‘end’ where ideal solutions and actions are derived or suggested. Therefore, these selected texts can be considered as narratives as they possess a coherent sequence of beginning, middle, and end (Czarniawska, 1997, 1998; Gabriel, 2000; Martin et al. 1982, 1983; Weick, 1995), and can be further analysed under narrative analysis as chosen within this research study, and any prevalence of fragmented and polyphonic storytelling findings can be dealt with by intertextual analysis (Boje, 2000).

3.11.3 Limitations of intertextual analysis

Intertextual analysis (IA) can offset NA’s limitations by dealing with fragmented text and establishing a pattern of criticisms, opinions and sentiments shared by the selected co-operators which indicate common themes. Unfortunately, IA also has its own limitations that this research must be aware of.

• **Infinitely expandable**

A particularly important problem has to do with the fact that the concept of intertextuality appears to be ‘infinitely expandable’ (Agger, 1992:2; Marlow, 1997: 131) where every time the concept of intertextuality is used, an ongoing regression will entail a loss of perspective, possibly to the point where the origin, context and purpose fade and the results become uncertain unless subdivisions and typologies are developed in order to ensure a rigorous application of the concept in practice (Agger, 1992:2). Given this explanation of limitation, this leads to the question of where do we draw a line in relation
to text inclusion since sampled texts are being either directly or indirectly related to ideas, opinions, reference and quotations from other texts. Fortunately, as suggested, these drawbacks of IA can be overcome by adopting Genette’s transtextual framework. The framework consists of five different categories: intertextuality, paratextuality, metatextuality, hypertextuality and architextuality that can categorise types of findings in order to preserve their originality and uniqueness.

• **Arbitrary nature of textual linkages**

  One concern about the intertextual category of Genette’s transtextual framework is that intertextuality identifies the linkage or relationship between texts through quotations and references and these linkages can be arbitrary. For example, Harris (2005) might merely mention Stone (2004) as an example but might not illustrate Stone’s work in further detail, indicating a weak linkage between the texts (i.e. the two authors). Also, it is difficult to measure how strong or weak the linkages between the two authors are, since the method only takes into account quotations and references and neglects the depth of illustration and exploration among the authors. However, this is where the other categories under Genette’s framework become useful and able to provide more solid conclusions to strengthen linkages across texts.

• **Limitation of framework chosen for intertextual analysis**

  Although Genette’s (2000) transtextual relationship can ideally outweigh the drawbacks of infinitely expandable and arbitrary linkages, there are still further inevitable drawbacks. First, the categories of metatextuality and hypertextuality overlap since there is only a slight difference between indirect (comments) and direct (criticism and support).

  Furthermore, the purpose of using IA is to qualitatively analyse and establish a transtextual relationship between selected texts; however, according to Liestol (1994) there is an ascending level of abstraction in the types of transtextual relationships. Metatextuality and hypertextuality refer to the less concrete instances of relationship between primary texts, and architextuality, even more abstract, refers not to the relationship between individual texts but to the themes and style of a text, and thus is relevant to the larger body of the text (Dalgaard, 2001). A possible way to solve this is to acknowledge the intertextuality category while at the same time being aware of the potential for there being metatextual and hypertextual relationships to other texts.
3.11.4 Limitations in relation to the three methods

Each method has its own drawbacks, however, there is one common limitation for qualitative analysis method: interpretation relies and depends heavily on the interpreter’s skill, and is therefore largely prone to ‘human bias’. It is likely that a researcher, either consciously or unconsciously will distort his/her interpretations of key issues (Eastoe et al, 1999:1-2).

- Potential bias

Having completed Chapter 2: Literature Review (based mainly on the co-operative context), I have gained an understanding of the co-operative ethic that suggests that they act in the interest of society while opposing profit-seeking activity. Thus, it is essential to prevent these assumptions from blurring the judgement of the interpreter during qualitative analysis and interpretation of the findings. For example, profit is not always considered unacceptable by co-operators, in fact, some findings could suggest the contrary.

- Difficulty in comparing findings from three textual analysis methods

Furthermore, the three textual methods focus on different units of analysis as mentioned previously: content analysis focuses on the word, narrative analysis focuses on a complete text while intertextual analysis focuses across texts. Therefore, obtaining findings from these three textual analysis methods would provide different types of findings, which would be difficult to compare. Findings from content analysis would be by word category and word most cited, for example, using the Certainty category variable (Diction 5) which is difficult to compare to the findings of narrative analysis, identified as heroes, villains and motives and also to the shared opinions and criticisms of co-operators from intertextual analysis. Thus, a substantial degree of interpretation of the findings is required in order to relate these findings to each other.

- Overlapping of Garbriel Trope and Genette’s transtextual framework

Although, narrative analysis and intertextual analysis are totally different qualitative methods, their frameworks chosen for this study can to some extent overlap each other. It is likely that Gabriel Trope’s (2000) narrative analysis consisting of motive, emotion, causal connection, unity, blame and credit, agency and providential significance
can provide similar findings to Genette’s (1992) framework under IA that consists of categories as outlined in the previous discussion.

Hypertextuality indicates direct support and criticism, however, similar finding can be also obtained from the blame and credit attribution (hero and villain) of Gabriel Trope. Also, such heroes and villains are usually associated with certain types of activities relating to specific ideas, goals, sentiments and purposes that can be identified through intertextuality, metatextuality and hypertextuality. Under hypertextuality, criticism and support of individuals or concepts and ideas are identified.

As a further example, similar findings could be obtained from both causal connection attribution and metatextuality where many common themes and concepts that are shared among co-operators are likely to be those that bring about the success of co-operatives and vice versa for any concepts that are opposed by them. Similar findings from different methods can reduce the chance of obtaining any unique answers. However, using three different methods which focus on different angles of findings analysis certainly outweighs the few possible overlapping categories that might provide similar answers. In addition, potential similar answers would in fact simplify qualitative data comparison among the three textual analysis methods. Also, some repetitive findings under qualitative research can only strengthen the reliability of findings analysis and interpretation.

3.11.5 Limitations in relation to research questions

So far, each method is subject to certain limitations which to some extent increases the complication of the meaning of the findings, particularly in relation to the research questions. Certain limitations from each textual method in relation to the ‘specific’ questions from section 3.3 have already been outlined. Here, I will focus on the limitations of the methods in relation to ‘overall’ research questions.

- **Absence of real time participation**

There is a common general limitation which the three methods share, that is an absence of real time participation within the actual co-operative environment, for example, interviewing, observation and participation of co-operative members and employees. This indicates a high potential for inaccurate and inadequate understanding of actual values and principles as practised among co-operators and members. However, the
methodology that I have chosen substantially provides the insights into the espoused value, belief and stature of selected co-operators which strongly affect and influence co-operative practice and structure. Therefore, it is most likely these values and beliefs are being reinforced and applied to daily co-operative practice at the present time. This is because given the history of the co-operative as a social and political movement, its purpose, goals, principles, values and ideas have unsurprisingly been reinforced and influenced by its paternalistic and heroic leading figures. It is almost possible to say that they were 'the movement' themselves during that time. Therefore, it is almost certain that these values and principles are still being strongly adhered to since they are what distinguishes these organisations and societies from others (See Identity of Statement in Appendix 1 that illustrates the current co-operative values and principles).

- **None of the three methods provide precise replication to the research questions**

  Having mentioned earlier that thematic data from CA does not provide precise replication to the research questions, unfortunately, such limitation also applies to both NA and IA. NA findings are being identified in terms of characters, motivations, causes and effects while IA findings are being identified in terms of direct and indirect inferences among co-operators, for example. These findings still to some extent require further interpretation in relation to research questions. However, under the discourse approach, NA and IA provide a rich source of contextual data, providing a big picture as a whole story and pattern across co-operators, while CA can only provide data that is rather broad and generalised. Fortunately, the three methods being adopted in conjunction with each other fit well with the triangulation concept (discussed below) and therefore, balance out each other's weaknesses, thereby strengthening the validity and reliability of the data.

  Overall, the limitation of CA is mainly due to the difficulty of dealing with the latent meanings of texts and identifying emotions either from the speaker or within the speech itself. Also, the specified word category can provide data that are unsuitable and irrelevant to the specified research questions. This is where the two other qualitative methods namely NA and IA offset CA's limitation. However, NA is subject to its own limitations - the uncertainty of using one single speech to entirely represent what the selected co-operators think or believe, and whether fragmented text can be considered as
narrative; and for IA, the difficulty of text inclusion and overlapping categories can lessen the originality and uniqueness of findings.

A common limitation for each method is therefore that they always require other complementary methods to ensure their weaknesses and limitations in terms of data. It is also difficult to compare and merge findings from the three methods since their styles and forms are totally different. Furthermore, NA and IA share a common risk of high potentiality to bias and subject manipulation since the method depends heavily on the individual analyst. In addition, a further limitation of these two methods is the possible overlapping between Gabriel’s and Genette’s frameworks, providing similar findings, thus lessening the uniqueness of the findings.

In relation to the research questions, the absence of real time involvement and participation within the co-operative environment, that is, no direct contact with co-operative employees and members, indicates a high potential for inaccurate and inadequate understanding of the actual co-operative values and principles. However, given the history of the co-operative being a social movement where values and principles were reinforced by past leaders, it is most likely that at the present time, these values and principles are still being upheld and reinforced by current co-operatives and their members. Furthermore, the three methods do not provide a precise replication to the research questions and CA offers a limited amount of insights in comparison to NA and IA. Fortunately, the three methods satisfy the triangulation concept, balancing out each other’s weaknesses, strengthening validity, and the reliability of the level of findings. For instance, the limitations of content analysis regarding contextual meanings can be offset by intertextual analysis which emphasises such meanings across texts. Thus, it is important to reassert that the limitations of each individual method are being outweighed by far by the benefits of the multi-method approach usage.

3.12 Sampling Selection

The purpose of sampling is usually to study a representative subsection of a precisely defined population in order to make inferences about the whole population (Silverman, 1993:38). This research involves two sampling selection processes which are co-operators and speech selection. Appropriate co-operators were chosen based on criteria that will be explained below, and the chosen co-operators’ speeches were selected with a fixed number of 2000 words.
3.12.1 Selection of co-operators

The 23 co-operators selected are individuals who in the past and present have contributed considerably to co-operatives. They are outstanding leaders with strong commitment to co-operative values, principles and purposes. Selection criteria therefore included contributions, types of societies (organisations), strategies and approaches and nationalities, the reason being to gather data across different individual, cultural, societal and management approaches. This increases the reliability and validity of the data (see section 3.13). Details are as follows:

- **Contributions** - Robert Owen is the founder of the Co-operative Movement and Raffeisien is the Founder of the Credit Union in Germany.

- **Types of organisations** - Co-operative Wholesale Societies, Producer Cooperatives, Co-operative Unions, for example.

- **Co-operative status** - These leaders are founders, CEOs or directors responsible for different kinds of strategy from shaping co-operative culture and values to innovating new strategies and campaigns.

- **Across cultures** - Different nationalities such as Irish, German and American.

The time period ranges from Robert Owen in the nineteenth century to the twenty-first century. It was difficult to find present co-operators’ speeches due to lack of availability and accessibility. Therefore, this list includes mainly past leaders who suit the purposes of this research as they are core figures who have contributed and significantly shaped the overall culture and values of the co-operatives that we aim to explore and understand in this research. Following is the list of selected co-operative leaders:

Webb (1858-1943), (17) Margaret L. Davies (1862-1944), (18) Dr James P. Warbasse (1866-1957), (19) Ernest Poisson (1882-1942), (20) Toyohiko Kagawa (1888-1960), (21) Isao Takamura (born in 1897), (22) A.F. Laidlaw (1908-1980), (23) Terry Thomas (born in 1937). A summary of co-operative text sampling will be outlined in Table 3.4 shown below:

Table 3.4 Co-operative Text Sampling Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Medium (Texts)</th>
<th>Context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Robert Owen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Written Speech</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The New Moral World, No.10, 1935 - for publication</td>
<td>Man’s Nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The New Moral World, No.12, 1935 – for publication</td>
<td>Human conditions: degradation and harmony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Oral Speech</td>
<td>Society and Government Involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech at the Second Co-operative Congress in Birmingham, 1831, composed by John and James Powell</td>
<td>Co-operative Disciplines and Principles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Congress of delegates from Co-operative Societies of GB and Ireland</td>
<td>Opposition to Business orientated attitude based on Christian Values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report of the Meetings of the Congress of the Advanced Minds of the World by R Owen (himself), 1857, Sevenoaks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Charles Fourier</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Written Speech</td>
<td>Emancipation of women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection of Fourier’s work by Charles Gide, translated by J Franklin – publication</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Dr. W King</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Written Speech</td>
<td>Importance of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainly from his publication ‘The Co-operator’</td>
<td>Worker Possession</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The Co-operator, April 1st, 1830 – publication</td>
<td>Spirit of Co-operation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The Co-operator, July, Brighton, 1828</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The Co-operator, November, 1828</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The Co-operator, December, 1828</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The Co-operator, July, 1830</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labour, Capital and Knowledge Christianity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. William Pare</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Oral Speech</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Co-operative Congress, Liverpool, 1832</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-operative Congress, London, 1869, reprinted by The Co-operator and edited by J W Ludlow. Preparation of speech by William Pare and read it out during the congress.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-operative Unity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-operative Organisation and Propaganda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. E.V. Neal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1 Written Speech</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As prepared speech by E.V. Neal and J. Woodcock, issued as a publication of the Central Co-operative Board, Manchester, 1885</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copy Tenure and Copy Hold Enfranchisement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2 Oral Speech</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivered at the 20th Annual Co-operative Congress by him, Manchester, 1888</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inheritance imbalances fair distribution process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Sense of Co-operation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. G.J. Holyoake</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1 Written Speech</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written for publication, London and Manchester, 1873</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written as publication, London, 1891 and being reprinted five times.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy of Commercial Co-operation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-operative Movement Today</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2 Oral Speech</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech delivered at 31st Co-operative Congress and being edited and reported by J.C. Gray, Manchester, 1899</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A quote – Co-operative Principles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equality and Equity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech delivered at 20th Co-operative Congress and being edited and reported by J.C. Gray, Manchester, 1888 being edited by E.V. Neal and issued by the Co-operative Board, Manchester, 1888</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech delivered for the 14th Annual Co-operative Congress, Oxford, 1882</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech delivered for the 22nd annual Co-operative Congress, 1890 and being edited by E.V. Neal as reports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with Production department performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World with just Co-operators</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7. F.W. Raffeisien</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7.1 Written Speech</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quotes and Passages of Raffeisien from Dusedau. Arno and Dr. Joachim Kleinhan, in 'F.W. Raffeisien The Credit Unions', published in Germany, 1970</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7.2 Oral Speech</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech as later being written as quote in International Raffeisien Union’s Leaflet, Bonn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mainly concerning credit union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mainly refers to topic of Unity, Principles and Self-help</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8. William Cooper</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8.1 Written Speech</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written work, ‘History of The Rochdale District, London, 1861</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reports on Co-operative Mill’s performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9. Thomas Hughes</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9.1 Written Speech</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Publication in International Co-operative Banking Association, 1995</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Publication in International Co-operative Banking Association, 1995</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inclusive Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Building Business through Co-operative Values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Capital Formation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10. J.W.T Mitchell</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10.1 Oral Speech</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivered at the 24th Annual Co-operative Congress, 1892, Bristol and being edited by J.C. Gray and published, Manchester</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivered at 25th Annual Co-operative Congress, 1893, Rochdale and being edited by J.C. Gray and published, Manchester</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Importance of Federation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Co-operative Movement, performances, Social justice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>11. E O Greening</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>11.1 Oral Speech</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The 31st Annual Co-operative Congress 1899, Liverpool, edited by J C Gray</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How to make co-operation succeed in large centers of population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 3: Research Methodology: Page 102</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The 13th Annual Co-operative Congress, 1881, Leeds, edited by E.V. Neal, reported by Henry Pitman, Manchester</td>
<td>N/A (only brief sentences from the speech)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The 14th Annual Co-operative Congress, 1882, Oxford</td>
<td>Success factors to promote Co-operative Production</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Sir W. Maxwell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.1 Oral Speech</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The 1st Annual Co-operative Congress 1899, 'Public Meeting and Concert', Liverpool, edited by J.C. Gray, Manchester</td>
<td>Prosperity and success of co-operative as supporters of working class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecture being delivered by request in Leeds, 1888,</td>
<td>Wholesale Co-operation A Necessity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Charles Gide</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.1 Written Speech</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The People's Year Book and Annual of the English and Scottish Wholesale Society 1921, Prepared by The Co-operative Press Agency, 4th Year of Publication, Glasgow</td>
<td>The Relations of the Co-operative Movement in France to Political Parties and Trade Unionism',</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Principles of Political Economy, translated by Ernest F. Row BSc (Econ) LCP, London and Sydney, 1922</td>
<td>Principles of Political Economy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The People's Year Book and of Annual of the English and Scottish Wholesale Societies 1925, Glasgow</td>
<td>The Commercial Policy of France’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. J.C. Gray</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.1 Oral Speech</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The 31st Annual Co-operative Congress 1899, Liverpool, edited by himself</td>
<td>Development in Co-operative Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The 30th Annual Co-operative 1898, Peterborough, edited himself and published, Manchester 1898</td>
<td>Problems and proposed solution in bringing the practice of agriculture into line with co-operative ideals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Sir H Plunkett</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>15.1 Oral Speech</strong></td>
<td>'The Progress of Economic Thought and Work in Ireland' (1900-3), Four Address to the First Council of Agriculture (1900-3), Dublin and later being published by him for his Majesty's Stationary Office by Alex Thom &amp; Co, 1903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'Co-operation for Ireland' (delegate to the Annual Congress of the Co-operative Union of GB and Ireland', Manchester, 1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>15.2 Written Speech</strong></td>
<td>'Plain Talks to Irish Farmers: An Examine of the changes which must be made by Irish Farmers in the management of their private and public affairs if the land settlement is to be bring prosperity to Ireland', Massers Eason &amp; Son Ltd, Dublin, 1910</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>16. Beatrice Webb</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>16.2 Written Speech</strong></td>
<td>'My Apprenticeship', LSE, 1968, published, again in 1971 by Penguin</td>
<td>Admiration of her Father's contribution to Co-operative Movement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'The Co-operative Movement in Great Britain', Sonnenschien &amp; Son, London, 1891</td>
<td>Desire for equality in society</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>17. M.L. Davies</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>17.1 Oral Speech</strong></td>
<td>Delivered at 31st Annual Co-operative Congress 1899, Liverpool, edited by J.C. Gray</td>
<td>Urges for Concern on Co-operative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Delivered at 30th Annual Co-operative Congress 1989, Peterborough, being published in 1989, Manchester</td>
<td>Housing Problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Delivered at 22nd Annual Congress, Glasgow, 1980</td>
<td>Financial Support to Educational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>17.2 Written Speech</strong></td>
<td>The Women's Co-operative Guild 1883-1904, 1904</td>
<td>Co-operative Store as essence of Labour Movement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Message from M.L. Davies to the delegates Assembled at the Opening Ceremony of the Rochdale Pioneers Memorial, 1931</td>
<td>Suggestion for establishment of Consumer's Policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. P.J. Warbasse</td>
<td>18.1 Written Speech</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Co-operative Way: A Method of World Reconstruction', The Co-operative League of USA, Chicago, NY and Washington, arrangement with Barnes and Noble, INC, April, 1945</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Co-operative Consumer's movement in the US', The People's Year Book and Annual of the English and Scottish Wholesale Societies 1922</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>US Co-operative failing factors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Co-operative as a way to promote social needs, satisfaction and happiness.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expansion of Co-operative Movement in US</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>19. Ernest Poisson</th>
<th>19.1 Written Speech</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Co-operative Republic', translated from the French by Watkins, WP and May H.J., Manchester, 1925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Benefits of Co-operation and Associationism , e.g. solidarity and unity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mainly concern Co-operative Republic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>20. Kagawa Toyohiko</th>
<th>20.1 Oral Speech</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Several quotes form web sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.2 Written Speech</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'Life in Blood' from Medications on the Cross by T. Kagawa, 1935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Co-operative as foundations of peace and freedom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Christianity Faith</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>21. A F Laidlow</th>
<th>21.1 Oral and Written Speech</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A Co-operative in the Year 2000, Studies and Reports , 15th in series, ICA , 1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(the same) as paper prepared for the 27th Congress of the Moscow, October, 1980 (Oral)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indicate future trends suggesting necessary changes if such trends continue into the next two decades.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 22. Terry Thomas

#### 22.1 Written Speech

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speech Title</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'Inclusive Partnerships'</td>
<td>in Journal of Co-operative Studies, No 89, 1997</td>
<td>Importance of partnership in cooperation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Capital Formation'</td>
<td>in International Co-operative Banking Association, Omnibus, 1995</td>
<td>Co-operative Banking being distinctive from others private banks.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 23. Isao Takamura

#### 23.1 Written Speech

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speech Title</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'Principle of Co-operative Management'</td>
<td>Co-operative Publishing Ltd, translated by Cruddas, 1993</td>
<td>Japanese Co-operative after WWII and emphasis on effective and competent Co-operative managers as success factors for the movement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is shown in Table 3.4 that one selected co-operator's sampling text is drawn from multiple sources. It also shows that each textual source is delivered either in spoken or written form and that each source is related to different themes.

### 3.13 Validity Issues

According to Maxwell (1996:87), validity refers to the correctness or credibility of a description, conclusion, explanation, interpretation, or other kind of account. When undertaking research, there is always a possibility of bias, clumsiness and/or mistakes introduced by the researcher unconsciously. However, it is important for any research to prepare for these eventualities and adopt a strategy to reduce or ideally eliminate them. Here, I have chosen to conduct three textual analyses and pay careful attention to the selection in the sampling of speeches, thereby increasing the level of both general reliability and validity.

#### 3.13.1 Triangulation

Triangulation has been discussed above to some extent regarding methodology, methods and strategy. However, in this section its usage is also related to validity issues. According to Jick (1979), it is based on the assumption that any bias inherent in particular data sources, investigators and methods would be neutralised when used in conjunction with other data sources, investigators and methods (Creswell, 1994:174). He also suggests
that 'using two or more approaches in selection is likely to produce better results than using either one alone as no one single method was sufficient...’ (Van Maanen, 1983).

Jick further argues that ‘within method’ essentially involves cross-checking for internal consistency or ‘reliability’ while ‘between methods’ tests the degree of external validity. The multi-textual methods of content analysis, narrative analysis and intertextual analysis can fit into both ‘within’ and ‘between’ methods. This is because they are all similar insofar as they are ‘textual analysis tools’, but yet they are very different in the way they analyse the data which makes it possible to consider them as totally different methods. Consequently, there is a considerable level of prospective validity and reliability from using this multi-textual method for this research study.

3.13.2 Co-operator and speech selection validity

The second concern is the reliability and validity of the selection of co-operators and their speeches. As was mentioned previously, they were selected across cultures, nationalities, time, co-operative status and societies; this method of selection should also provide obtained data with a certain degree of validity. Regarding speech selection, not all documents are reliable (North et al, 1963:19). The reader should also consider external factors such as the motive of the publication, the editor’s reputation and access to archival materials and the period of publication (Ibid, p.20).

In this research, most data sources such as congressional reports and the co-operators' written work or diaries mostly reflect the co-operators' thoughts, opinions and ideas on the social justice system and co-operative values, principles and concepts. The motive was purely self-expression related to co-operative and social aspects. In addition, co-operative reports in general contain accurate statistical data or performance reports where the motive was to simply update members on ongoing activities and performance. Another issue related to sampling validity was where speeches are lengthy (see Weber, 1990:43). Some speeches needed to be processed entirely.

However, for this research, the limit was 2000 words which is considered to be reasonable, with each sample consisting of one or more entire paragraphs, preserving some degree of 'semantic coherence' (Ibid, p.43). It is important to note that the availability of, and accessibility to, the speeches of certain co-operators are rather limited. Thus, it is often the case that one speech consists of many paragraphs and quotations that belong to one particular co-operator but come from different sources.
3.14 Conclusion

It is clear that the research philosophy which is central to this research is social construction, as it will allow exploration of the construction of co-operative philosophy and ideology which gradually forms co-operative management, leadership and values as well as the existing strong culture of co-operatives. A suitable methodology and method to explore and investigate the social construction of co-operatives that this research has adopted are the discourse analysis approach, and the multi-textual analysis methods, respectively. The use of multi-methods enables this research to explore future findings from existing documentary sources in a wider focus, particularly where appropriate analytical frameworks have been chosen. The next three chapters (4, 5 and 6) will discuss the findings that were obtained using each textual method.
CHAPTER 4: CONTENT ANALYSIS FINDINGS

4.1 Introduction

This chapter is divided into two main parts, namely 'word count' and 'word category' findings. In the 'word count' section, there will be an illustration of the word selection, how some words are eliminated, others chosen, and what their definition is within the co-operative context that has been cited by selected co-operators. In the second part, (word category), the three most cited word categories from both General Inquirer and Diction 5 are identified in addition to others. There will be a further comparison between the two sets of findings from word categories for the purpose of data reliability.

4.2 Word Count Results

The overall outcome of the number of words cited from speeches is 44,949 words. To be able to make logical sense, analyse and interpret any meanings and patterns of all of these, it is necessary to reduce the scale in order to minimise possible difficulties and time constraints since some words (such as a, the and to) bear no proper meanings at all. Thus, it is necessary to include only words that are relevant and meaningful in relation to this research topic and objectives and exclude those that are irrelevant. It is easier to start with excluding words that are classified under the following categories as shown below; (adapted from 'Computer Recognition of English Word Sense' (Kelly and Stone: 17-21).

1. Articles (a, an, the)
2. Demonstratives (those, this, that, these)
3. Genitives (my, our, your, his, her, their, its, whose)
4. Numbers (one, two, three, 35, 1968, first, second, 3rd ... next, last)
5. Pre-article
- Count (both, each, either, another, few, fewer, many, several, neither, every) and Mixed (all, any, some, enough, half, no)

6. Prepositions
(in, at, over, around, about, through, to, from, with, out, toward, down, up...)

7. Pronouns
- Nominative (he, she, we, you, I, they, who), Objectives (him, her, us, you, them, whom), Reflexives (myself, herself, themselves, itself), Other (one, someone anyone, somebody, everybody, etc.) and Impersonal/indefinite (it, everyone, anything, something nothing, none, all)

8. Conjunction
- Sentential (and, but) and Clausal (then, that, because, if, when, since, as, so, etc.)

9. Interrogatives
(wh-words -when, why, who, what, where, how)

10. Be
(be, being, is, was, -re...)

11. Have
(have, has, had, having)

12. Do
(do, did, does)

13. To
("to" as an infinitive)

After removing the above 13 categories, we are left with 381 words that have a solid meaning in terms of values, personality type, characteristics, emotions, society, economics, politics, ethics and so on. It is interesting to evaluate which areas these words are related to and I have chosen to use five main descriptors as shown below:

1. Economic descriptors
2. Social descriptors
3. Political descriptors
4. Moral/ethics and values descriptors, and
5. Other descriptors

After words were classified under the above descriptors, those that were cited fewer than 20 times were further removed and that left a total of 83 words. These words are shown below while at the same time being classified in the above categories in Table 4.1 (see overleaf).
Table 4.1 Word Descriptors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOCIETY</td>
<td>BUSINESS 95</td>
<td>PRINCIPLE 72</td>
<td>POWER 55</td>
<td>MOVEMENT 85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL</td>
<td>CAPITAL 52</td>
<td>INTEREST 47</td>
<td>POLITICAL 30</td>
<td>SYSTEM 52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORK 129 (ECON)¹</td>
<td>ECONOMIC 45</td>
<td>VALUE 39</td>
<td>LAW 28</td>
<td>CHANGE 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COOPERATION 104</td>
<td>PRODUCTION 40</td>
<td>WISH 28</td>
<td>GOVERNMENT 25</td>
<td>TRUE 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LABOUR</td>
<td>CONSUMER 37</td>
<td>THOUGHT 28</td>
<td>RULE 24</td>
<td>IDEA 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEMBER</td>
<td>TRADE 28</td>
<td>MORALE 28</td>
<td>PUBLIC 23</td>
<td>FUTURE 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLASS</td>
<td>ORGANIZATION 25</td>
<td>GOD 27</td>
<td>CONTROL 21</td>
<td>PRACTICE 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSOCIATION 55</td>
<td>PAY 24</td>
<td>MORAL 26</td>
<td>NATIONAL 20 (ECON)³</td>
<td>SUCCESSFUL 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDIVIDUAL 54</td>
<td>ECONOMY 24</td>
<td>HELP 26</td>
<td>PIONEER 27</td>
<td>POSSESS 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATION 31</td>
<td>AGRICULTURAL 23</td>
<td>CREATE 25</td>
<td>ACTION 26</td>
<td>EXPERIENCE 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO-OPERATIVE 28</td>
<td>MARKET 22</td>
<td>LOVE 23</td>
<td>ESTABLISH 25</td>
<td>STUDY 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNITE</td>
<td>MANAGEMENT 22 (SOC)³</td>
<td>SHARE 23</td>
<td>ADVANTAGE 24</td>
<td>WOMEN 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SERVICE 25</td>
<td>WEALTH 21</td>
<td>CONCERN 21</td>
<td>PRACTICAL 21</td>
<td>PRACTICAL 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUMAN 25</td>
<td>INDUSTRIAL 21</td>
<td>SUPPORT 20</td>
<td>KNOWLEDGE 21</td>
<td>ATTEMPT 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORKER 24</td>
<td>EMPLOY 21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAMILY 23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMITTEE 22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMUNITY 20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong> 1,235²</td>
<td><strong>Total</strong> 649⁴</td>
<td><strong>Total</strong> 433</td>
<td><strong>Total</strong> 226</td>
<td><strong>Total</strong> 600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ 'WORK' can also be classified under economic descriptors.
² Including 'MANAGEMENT' (20)
³ Management can also be classified under social descriptors.
⁴ Including 'WORK' (129) and 'INTERNATIONAL' (20)
⁵ 'NATIONAL' can also be classified under economic descriptors.
The total number of citations for social, economic, political, moral/ethical and other descriptors are 1,235, 649, 226, 433 and 600, respectively. We can assume that ‘other descriptors’ is irrelevant due to the fact that those descriptors do not belong to one solid kind of theme or topic. Overall, the most cited words were classified under ‘social descriptors’ (1,235). It is most likely that co-operatives’ primary objectives are socially orientated; therefore, topics or issues would mostly be related to social interests with further emphasis on the co-operative’s fundamental principles and values which again are socially orientated.

The second most cited type of descriptor is ‘economic’ (649) followed by ‘moral’ (433) and ‘political’ (226). Although co-operatives are socially driven, they are still a form of economic enterprise with economic issues on a par with social objectives. This is especially the case as many co-operators begin to see the importance of economic-based activities and objectives. Also, the co-operative movement places itself highly on moral ground, valuing equality and self-help which result in a high morality and in some aspects consisting of politically related issues.

For example, the Labour Union could be considered a political movement as well as a social one. Thus, the significant ranking for these concepts in order is social, economic, moral and political. Finally, since 54 words under the first 4 descriptors were too broad to be analysed and interpreted, I will further eliminate words that have been cited fewer than 40 times. The final selection of words is in Table 4.2.

Table 4.2    Selected 16 words

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>SOCIETY</td>
<td>269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>SOCIAL</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>WORK</td>
<td>129 (ECON)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>COOPERATION</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>BUSINESS</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>LABOUR</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>MEMBER</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>PRINCIPLE</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>CLASS</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>ASSOCIATION</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>POWER</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>INDIVIDUAL</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>CAPITAL</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>INTEREST</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>ECONOMIC</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>PRODUCTION</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This leaves 16 words, with the least having 40 citations. Furthermore, concerning the word descriptors classification above, a one-person classification on its own can be seen as questionable in terms of its reliability and validity by other readers. Thus, cross-checking of the classification was carried out with another independent rater.

4.2.1 Cross-checking the classification of descriptors

To cross check that these words are validly classified, an independent rater was asked to go through the same classification, listing the type of descriptor where each word belongs under its own justification. This independent rater should have a research background in economics, politics and social sciences and, ideally, be a PhD student from the Management Centre. Miss Nil Gunsel was chosen as she fulfilled all the criteria. The cross-checking results are shown below in Table 4.3.

Table 4.3 Cross-checking Word Descriptor Classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Rater 1</th>
<th>Rater 2</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Society</td>
<td>Social</td>
<td>Social</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Social</td>
<td>Social</td>
<td>Social</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Work</td>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>Social and Economic Work is a social obligation for one to make a living and the rewards come as wages that can affect the economic state of a country as a whole</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Co-operation</td>
<td>Social</td>
<td>Social</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Business</td>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>Economic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Labour</td>
<td>Social</td>
<td>Social</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Member</td>
<td>Political</td>
<td>Social</td>
<td>Member indicates the status of an individual of belonging to a group, society or club.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Principle</td>
<td>Moral/ethical</td>
<td>Moral/ethical</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Class</td>
<td>Social</td>
<td>Social</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Association</td>
<td>Social</td>
<td>Social</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Power</td>
<td>Political</td>
<td>Political</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Individual</td>
<td>Moral/ethical</td>
<td>Social</td>
<td>'Each individual' often being referred to for their view points as community citizens in order to show in terms of statistics the community's wants and needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Capital</td>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>Economic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Interest</td>
<td>Social</td>
<td>Moral/ethical</td>
<td>Interest can be a good measurement of one's values, attitudes and beliefs. Thus, it can be seen closest under the moral and ethical concept. For example, one's interest is charity work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Economic</td>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>Economic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Production</td>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>Economic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The results can be further calculated in terms of percentage of agreement and disagreement between myself and the independent rater (Miss Nil Gunsel). Rater 1 is Miss Gunsel while Rater 2 is myself. There was agreement on 12 words which represents 70.59% agreement between rater 1 (Nil Gunsel) and rater 2 (myself) and therefore, only 29.41% of disagreement. The rationale is stated by rater 2 to explain the reason for classifying words differently from rater 1 in Table 4.3. Following this word classification, the meanings that are cited among selected speeches will be outlined in the next section.

4.2.2 Word count result definition

The selected 16 words were analysed and cross-checked for their meanings and relationship to the different topics, principles and ideas that are relevant and significant to the co-operative movement, both quantitatively (number of citations in which the word has been used under different meanings) and qualitatively (in terms of content and theme). As a reminder, these words are ‘Society’, ‘Social’, ‘Work’, ‘Co-operation’, ‘Business’, ‘Labour’, ‘Member’, ‘Principle’, ‘Class’, ‘Association’, ‘Power’, ‘Individual’, ‘Capital’, ‘Interest’, ‘Economic’ and ‘Production’. In this section, the meanings of these words will be illustrated using documentary sources.

Approximately 41% of ‘society’ words are cited under the meaning of an organisation of people formed for a particular purpose - a club or association. Some examples are Rochdale Society, Co-operative Mill Society and English Wholesale Society. The rest of them are used with the meaning of ‘system whereby people live together in communities’, ‘social way of living’ and ‘particular grouping of humanity with shared customs, laws etc’.

‘Social’ words are cited under the meaning of ‘relationship between people’ such as social-well being and social problems. The word ‘social’ has also been used as an adjective in idioms (e.g. social genius). In addition, it has been used in the context of ‘social system’ (social market and social system), ‘social field of studies’ and ‘living in groups’ (social movement).

‘Work’ here is cited as work in a general sense, as a use of physical/mental power in order to produce something relating mostly to co-operative benefits. Work is also used to refer to a specific kind of work, but the main focus is placed upon ‘educational work’. The value of work has also been greatly emphasised by Dr. William King.
‘Co-operation’ is mainly used in the context of ‘people co-operating’ and ‘co-operation as institutions, societies, etc’.

The majority of ‘business’ falls under the meaning of ‘selling and buying (especially as a profession); commerce; trade (for example, we do not do much business with foreign companies)’.

‘Labour’ words are used equally in three meanings; ‘physical/mental work: manual work’, ‘labour as workers in groups/class’ and ‘in a general sense’.

‘Member’ is used under one meaning as ‘a person who belongs to a group, society, etc’. Members are often referred to as members of committees and societies of co-operation (Cooper, Gide, Mitchell, Warbasse and Webb), Boards management, or in conjunction with solidarity and unity of members.

‘Principle’ is used mostly to mean ‘basic general truth that underlies something such as a subject/a system of morality’. Sometimes, it is referred to as ‘co-operative principle’. A few have used it to refer to the principle of association.

‘Class’ is mainly used under the meaning of ‘group of people at the same social or economic level or system that divides people into such groups (class differences)’.

‘Association’ is cited under the meaning of ‘group of people joined together for a common purpose; organisation’.

‘Power’ has been used with several meanings: strength or energy behind or contained in something, control over others; the power of the law, have somebody in one’s power. Most power words are used in relation to the idea of power of unity and loyalty.

‘Individual’ is mainly cited under the meaning of ‘single or separate: each individual person is responsible for his own arrangements’.

‘Capital’ is used under two major meanings; ‘wealth or property that may be used to produce more wealth’ and ‘accumulated material wealth owned by a person or a business (capital assets)’. Moreover, M.L. Davies and Maxwell particularly emphasise ‘capital contribution’ to members.

‘Interest’ is used under the meanings of ‘advantage or benefit’, ‘money charged for borrowing money, or paid to somebody who invests money’ and ‘in somebody’s interest’ (for or to somebody’s advantage). The usage relates to the interest of the co-operative society as a whole in terms of capital gain (Greening) and how collective and individual interest can benefit all concerned.
'Economic' is cited under the meaning of 'economics of an economy and something connected with trade and industry'. Emphasis has been on ideas for self-help, democracy and freedom from co-operative economic systems and activities in order for members to obtain mutuality and equitable sharing; hence, benefits to society as a whole.

'Production' is used as the action of manufacturing, extracting, etc, especially in large quantities. The word is mainly associated with labour earnings, the essence of work, the idea of inequality and the importance of a self-help attitude.

4.2.3 Number of citations and their contribution correspondence

The 16 words are useful for interpreting whether the number of citations of each word corresponds to its contribution within the overall speeches of the 23 co-operators. From 23 speeches, 16 words were used in their general and typical meanings. Only a few words are related to a specific area such as 'social' with social problems and social reform; 'power' with power of unity, loyalty and solidarity of co-operators; class as working class; and 'education' (educational work) as the essential factor in co-operative expansion and development. These characteristics significantly correspond to the principles and values stated in the Identity of Statement that is currently being used as morale and management guidance for co-operative organisations (see more detail in Appendix 1).

All selected co-operators place emphasis on 'self-help', 'mutual interest', 'unity', 'solidarity' and 'democracy' (corresponding to values in the Identity Statement, see Appendix 1): Nevertheless, these words have a low number of citations, not more than 20. 'Moral' (26 citations) is cited mostly by Robert Owen and others such as E.V. Neal, F.W. Raffisien, and W. Pare. However, it is important to point out that several words share the same meaning. For example, the idea of self-help is closely related to idea of 'unity' and 'solidarity' as they are all based on co-operative power and teamwork among members of a group for the benefit of the association as a whole. A further example is between 'participation' and 'democracy' which are related to other words such as delegate (16), democratic (6), elect (6), equality (8) and establishment and vote (9) while 'community' is closely related to 'association' and 'society'. Furthermore, unite is cited as unity. It is a question of similar meanings among words and the ways in which they are used, for example, noun, adjective or verb.
To sum up, there seems to be an analytical gap here where some words that share similar meanings with others could affect the accuracy of data interpretation. On the other hand, some words have been used in their broad meanings and hardly provide any outstanding meanings to the whole passage or sentence. Thus, it is important to look at word categories and qualitatively interpreted meanings as well as themes that co-operators try to get across to congress participants and readers.

### 4.3 Word Category Findings

The data obtained from sources under content analysis were processed by the General Inquirer software, producing word counts (illustrated earlier) and word category counts. The results of General Inquirer's analysis process will be illustrated in this section. I have chosen to use 23 categories (from 182 categories) which I consider suitable in terms of relevance to this research (see Chapter 3 and Appendix 2). I have chosen to represent these results mainly in three rankings according to the number of word category citations from 23 co-operators. The fourth and fifth ranks are interesting for their relevance to this study. Table 4.4 (see below) shows the results' summary from 23 speeches after being processed by the General Inquirer software.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.4</th>
<th>Findings from GI's Word Categorisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) William Cooper</td>
<td>13) Edward V. Neal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WC¹</td>
<td>Frequency²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Active</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. SV</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Strong</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Econ@</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. IAV</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Margaret Llywlyn Davies</td>
<td>14) Robert Owen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WC¹</td>
<td>Frequency²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Strong</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Active</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Positiv</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. SV</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. PowTot</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Word Category
² Number of word occurrences in that particular category
³ Percentage of words within that particular category occurring out of all categories
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#### 3) Charles Fourier

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Strong</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>10.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Active</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>8.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Positiv</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>6.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. PowTot</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. SV</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>5.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Negativ</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>5.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 4) Charles Gide

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Strong</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>10.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Active</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>8.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. PowTot</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. SV</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>6.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Positiv</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>5.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 5) John C Gray

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Strong</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Active</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>8.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. SV</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Positiv</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. PowTot</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>5.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 6) E O Greening

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Strong</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>9.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Active</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Positiv</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>6.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. SV</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>5.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. PowTot</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 7) J C Holyoake

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Strong</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>9.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Active</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. SV</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Positiv</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>7.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. IAV</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>5.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 8) Thomas Hughes

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Strong</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>8.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Active</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>8.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. SV</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>8.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Positiv</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>5.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. PowTot</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>5.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 15) William Pare

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Strong</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Active</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>9.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. SV</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>7.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Positiv</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>6.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. PowTot</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>5.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 16) Sir Horace Plunkett

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Strong</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>12.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Active</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>10.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Positiv</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>8.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. PowTot</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>8.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. IAV</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 17) Earnest Poisson

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Strong</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>8.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Active</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>6.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. SV</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Positiv</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>5.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. PowTot</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>5.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. IAV</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>5.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 18) Frederick W Raffesien

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Strong</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>14.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Active</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>8.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Positiv</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>7.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. PowTot</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>6.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. SV</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 19) Isao Takamura

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Strong</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>12.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Active</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>10.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. SV</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>6.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Positiv</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>6.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. IAV</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>5.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 20) Terry Thomas

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Strong</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Active</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>9.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Positiv</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. SV</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>6.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. IAV</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>6.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. PowTot</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>6.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The above table shows the five most frequently cited categories from 23 co-operators' speeches. Findings from the table can be summarised and shown more clearly in graphical representation in Figure 4.1 (see overleaf).

- The most cited word category (rank 1) is STRONG used by 82.60% (19 co-operators); M.L. Davies (244), Charles Fourier (206), Charles Gide (228), J C Gray (210), E.O. Greening (263), J.C. Holyoke (226), Thomas Hughes (190), Dr. King (225), A.W. Laidlow (207), Robert Owen (237), William Pare (216), Sir Plunkett (258), Ernest Poisson (209), F.W. Raffesien (311), Takamura (254), Terry Thomas (278), J.P. Warbasse (265) and Beatrice Webb (209). This is possibly due to the charisma and strength of the leaders along with their ambition, determination and commitment to their beliefs and principles.
The second most cited category (rank 2) is ACTIVE by 73.91% (17 co-operators); Margaret L. Davies (204), Charles Fourier (175), Charles Gide (175), John C. Gray (209), E.O. Greening (207), J.C. Holyoake (223), Thomas Hughes (184), Dr. W. King (181), A.W. Laidlow (203) William Pare (211), Sir Plunkett (222), Ernest Poisson (169), F.W. Rafféisien (190), Isao Takamura (213), Terry Thomas (196) and Dr. J.P. Warbassee (212). It is most likely that co-operators or leaders are constantly up for new challenges that are subjected to the co-operative’s further development and missions, particularly as the majority of these elected leaders are founders, pioneers, and rule and system innovators.

The third most cited category (rank 3) is SV by 47.83% (11 co-operators); John C. Gray (182), J.C. Holyoake (204), Thomas Hughes (181), Dr. W. King (161), A.W. Laidlow (148), Sir W. Maxwell (197), J.W.T Mitchell (202), William Pare (168), Ernest Poisson (145), Isao Takamura (140) and J.P. Warbassee (177). This is so because the speakers in these selected speeches often express their emotions relating to
co-operative values and principles which are based largely on 'trust', 'love' and 'commitment' as mental/emotional states.

- The fourth most cited category (rank 4) is Positiv by 52.17% (12 Co-operators) and the fifth most cited category (rank 5) is IAV by 39.13% (9 co-operators). PowTot has occasionally been cited among the top five, too. Econ@ came up only once as fourth cited by William Cooper. These categories may not have a substantial number of citations like the first three categories but they indicate some relevance to findings where there is apparently a lot of optimism among speakers of the co-operatives' higher moral ground (Positiv); including selflessness, unity, democracy (PowTot) and the relationship of some of its activities to economics (Econ@). Here are the definitions for these categories (see more detail in Appendix 2):

1. **Strong** - implying strength
2. **Active** - implying an active orientation
3. **SV** - verbs describing mental or emotional states. Usually detached from specific observable events, such as "love, trust, abhor".
4. **Positiv** - words of positive outlook.
5. **PowTot** - (whole power domain PowCoop, PowAuPt, PowPt).
   PowCoop = Power of co-operation
   PowAuPt = Power authoritative participants; individual and collective actors in the power process
   PowPt = Power Ordinary participants; non-authoritative actors (such as followers) in the power process
6. **IAV** - verbs giving an interpretative explanation of an action, such as "encourage, mislead, flatter".
7. **Econ@** - words of an economic, commercial, industrial, or business orientation, including roles, collectivities, acts, abstract ideas, and symbols, and references to money. Includes names of common commodities in business.
4.4 Word Category Data Analysis

These 7 categories will be interpreted with the additional use of quotations from the original speeches. The first three are primary findings, though others with less significance will be discussed to some extent, too.

4.4.1 Strong word category

The ‘strong’ category, as observed in selected speeches, represents the charisma, self-confidence, mental and physical strength, commitment and devotion that co-operators possess. It also indicates a certain degree of competitiveness and challenge as well as of being achievement-orientated since it includes words such as ‘accomplish’, ‘acquire’, ‘active’, ‘achieve’, ‘accelerate’, ‘additional’, ‘challenge’, ‘combat’ and ‘development’. Co-operators who used the most words under this category are Raffeisien (311), followed by Terry Thomas (278), J.P. Warbasse (265) and E.O. Greening (263). Here are samples of speeches from the three co-operators Raffeisien, Thomas and Greening, respectively:

In order, however, to accelerate the necessary improvement of life conditions as much as possible, it seems to be highly desirable that the better-off classes participate in the movement in the future as they have hitherto. It represents a legitimate self-help action. For this reason, it is urgently recommended that impeding hindrances to the movement be eliminated by legislation and with the help of governmental agencies. After nearly four decades of extraordinary success, the institution needs legal sanction and governmental protection, so that no steps will be made which, in any way, could impair its liberal development.  
(F W Raffeisien, 1987)

And can they be used as a means of building a modern and appealing brand? At the Co-operative Bank we believe so, and have set about proving that co-operative values are capable of forming a powerful means of creating sustainable differentiation and, ultimately, of providing substantial new sources of business.

(T Thomas, 1995)

To some philosophic observers, the movements of populations towards the great hives of humanity may be only interesting phenomena of the time. But we are social reformers with a faith and a mission. We have seen the marvellous uplifting of our working people by cooperation in the places where the societies are established which we represent here today.

(E O Greening, 1899)

These paragraphs also indicate a strong emphasis on social justice, strength and determination. The category represents the degree of dedication, devotion and motivation of co-operators towards their beliefs, duties and values. Thus, strength here does not necessarily refer to physical and mental strength but also charisma, will, passion, commitment, dedication and devotion towards the co-operative movement. These are ideal factors for a co-operative leader in addition to being service-orientated.
Another side of this category is found in terms such as 'aggression', 'abuse', 'combat', 'deprive', 'eliminate', 'fight', 'force' and 'inhibit' which also suggest a certain degree of hostility and anger among co-operators (see Raffeisien's passage, 'eliminate'). This possibly reflects persistent struggles that selected speakers were experiencing during the time of their speech, such as union disputes, strikes and threats of bankruptcy as co-operative performance and survival had been unstable as a result of intense competition and internal problems, mismanagement being an example of this.

This category also contains words that are power-related such as 'authorise', chairman, 'collective', 'command', 'control', 'demand', 'discipline', 'govern' and 'judgment'. Charles Fourier's speech, for example, includes words such as creator (1), doctrine (1), duty (1), law (2), powerful (1), state# l4 (2). This category obviously relates to power and control to some extent. There has definitely been a certain degree of control by the leaders and little state influence; however, it would probably be perceived by members more as guidance than dictatorship.

Overall, the strength category can be interpreted widely among many themes, although it is certain that co-operators' speeches are mostly focused on commitment, creativity and determination. These indicate a considerable degree of charisma among co-operators rather than control, authority and domination.

4.4.2 Active word category

The 'active' category is the second most cited category by almost 74% of co-operators. However, 17.4% of the co-operators (4) have cited this category most (first rank). They are William Cooper (198), JWT Mitchell (247), Sir W Maxwell (228) and Edward E Neal (199). This corresponds to their ranking, contributions and responsibility concerning the establishment of co-operative societies. William Cooper was always active in establishing new societies such as the Rochdale District Co-operative Mill Society while J.W.T Mitchell was the Chairman of the Co-operative Wholesale Society. Sir Maxwell was Chairman of the Scottish Co-operative Wholesale Society and later on both Mitchell and Maxwell became active in the political aspects of co-operative society to encourage the movement to have more influence within Parliament.

---

4 Body politic – area of government
E.V. Neal served the co-operative movement longer and more continuously than any others of the circle. His legal ability served the movement well. He was one of the first to appreciate the possibilities of international co-operation and was one of the principal founders of the International Co-operative Alliance. Further commonalities between Neal and those mentioned in the preceding paragraph in terms of work are that they were the ones who laid down all the business plans, strategies, rules and legislation and made sure they were executed effectively.

4.4.3. SV word category

The ‘SV’ category can directly represent all kinds of emotions that co-operators went through when giving or writing their speeches as the category includes verbs describing mental or emotional states, such as love, trust and hate. This category is the third most cited by almost half (47.83%) of the selected co-operators while it was ‘most’ cited by Kagawa Toyohiko (204). However, Toyohiko has exactly the same number of word category citations as J C Holyoakes (204). Toyohiko’s speech is largely related to religion in the co-operative context where he encourages Christian values and love among co-operators and stipulates how we can help each other. For example, his concept of ‘brotherhood of economics’ refers to co-operatives. The topic is more or less related in some degree to emotions, feelings and beliefs. Toyohiko stated that

‘unless we have a co-operative economic system each individual cannot have freedom. To have liberty we must have brotherhood and loving kindness, which are the true bases of freedom......co-operatives are the foundation of world peace. They are the love principle in action. Whether we like it or not there is no other way but co-operatives’.

His written speech consists of verbs describing mental and emotional settings such as feel, know, live, love, think and taste. ‘Love’ is mentioned 13 times. Raffeisien’s speech also strongly emphasises the notion of Christianity. Nevertheless, he still has a much lower SV category citation than Toyohiko’s, J C Holyoake’s and Sir Maxwell’s. However, other emotions such as frustration are more apparent, perhaps because of social injustice.

Having SV as the third most cited category strongly supports the previous two findings. It would be almost impossible for charismatic and active leaders to give a speech without the presence or existence of some kind of emotion. Thus, this finding corresponds to the previous two and indicates a considerable degree of strength, enthusiasm and
emotion that speakers express throughout their speeches. A lack of emotion could lead to questions concerning the genuine intentions and motives of such leaders/speakers. However, this SV word category finding indicates considerable emotion, sentiment and feeling being expressed among these speech makers which is largely evidence that their motives, purposes and objectives were 'genuine'.

4.4.4 Other word categories: Positiv, IAV, Powtot and Econ@

Although these four categories do not have a significant number of citations from selected leaders, they are useful in conjunction with other issues or emotional states that that also exist among selected speeches. The Positiv category is most likely to reflect these leaders' positive outlook which could be due to new ideas and strategies that further lead to new creations and innovations. This is evidenced by the fact that the majority of them are founders and pioneers across different co-operative sectors (R Owen, E V Neal and Dr. King). Secondly, the IAV category consists of verbs that give an interpretative explanation of an action such as encourage, mislead and flatter. It has a low citation (fourth rank), used by less than half of the selected co-operators.

The PowTot category was the fourth or fifth most cited. It slightly relates selected speeches to the power domain where ideally, 'power of co-operation' and 'power of participants' dominate those of 'authority'. This indicates a reasonable emphasis on democratic control of members and teamwork spirit. The Econ@ category was fourth most cited by William Cooper, not surprising since the selected data source of Cooper is based mainly on the business transactions of Co-operative Mills.

Overall, the three main categories of 'strength', 'active' and 'SV' indicate strength, activism, being up for challenges and new ideas, along with considerable emotions, sentiments and feelings from the selected speeches or during the process of making speeches, spoken or written. In addition, although findings from other categories are less significant than the first three categories, they interestingly show some other issues and characteristics that also exist within the co-operative context such as optimism, unity and economic interests. These findings could, additionally, be compared to another set of word categories from Diction 5 for other points of interest and for cross-checking purposes.
4.5 Dictionaries 5 Findings

Diction 5 findings will be illustrated in the same format as in General Inquirer's. Table 4.5 shows below outlines findings of five master variables: activity, optimism, commonality, realism, and certainty (see definitions in Chapter 3). Master variables are calculated by translating raw dictionary totals into Z-scores, adding and subtracting them in the appropriate fashion, and then adding constants of 50 to eliminate negative numbers. Z-scores are used to indicate the number of variable citations. Findings from Table 4.5 shown below are summarised as followed:

Table 4.5 Findings from Diction’s 5 Master Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Score 5</th>
<th>N-Range 6</th>
<th>O-R 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. William Cooper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Activity</td>
<td>51.00</td>
<td>47.93</td>
<td>52.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Optimism</td>
<td>53.64</td>
<td>45.49</td>
<td>51.28 a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Certainty</td>
<td>38.65</td>
<td>47.67</td>
<td>51.89 b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Realism</td>
<td>51.94</td>
<td>47.10</td>
<td>52.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Commonality</td>
<td>49.64</td>
<td>47.38</td>
<td>52.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. E.V. Neal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Activity</td>
<td>49.65</td>
<td>47.93</td>
<td>52.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Optimism</td>
<td>49.64</td>
<td>45.49</td>
<td>51.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Certainty</td>
<td>48.73</td>
<td>47.67</td>
<td>51.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Realism</td>
<td>50.12</td>
<td>47.10</td>
<td>52.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Commonality</td>
<td>50.60</td>
<td>47.38</td>
<td>52.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Score 5</th>
<th>N-Range 6</th>
<th>O-R 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. M.L. Davies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Activity</td>
<td>50.24</td>
<td>47.93</td>
<td>52.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Optimism</td>
<td>54.55</td>
<td>45.49</td>
<td>51.28 a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Certainty</td>
<td>50.28</td>
<td>47.67</td>
<td>51.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Realism</td>
<td>47.96</td>
<td>47.10</td>
<td>52.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Commonality</td>
<td>51.26</td>
<td>47.38</td>
<td>52.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Robert Owen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Activity</td>
<td>47.70</td>
<td>47.93</td>
<td>52.37 b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Optimism</td>
<td>52.05</td>
<td>45.49</td>
<td>51.28 a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Certainty</td>
<td>54.89</td>
<td>47.67</td>
<td>51.89 a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Realism</td>
<td>48.45</td>
<td>47.10</td>
<td>52.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Commonality</td>
<td>49.27</td>
<td>47.38</td>
<td>52.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Score 5</th>
<th>N-Range 6</th>
<th>O-R 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Charles Fourier</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Activity</td>
<td>48.22</td>
<td>47.93</td>
<td>52.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Optimism</td>
<td>48.59</td>
<td>45.49</td>
<td>51.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Certainty</td>
<td>48.74</td>
<td>47.67</td>
<td>51.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Realism</td>
<td>47.67</td>
<td>47.10</td>
<td>52.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Commonality</td>
<td>47.90</td>
<td>47.38</td>
<td>52.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. William Pare</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Activity</td>
<td>48.41</td>
<td>47.93</td>
<td>52.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Optimism</td>
<td>50.87</td>
<td>45.49</td>
<td>51.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Certainty</td>
<td>45.75</td>
<td>47.67</td>
<td>51.89 b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Realism</td>
<td>46.79</td>
<td>47.10</td>
<td>52.26 b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Commonality</td>
<td>51.86</td>
<td>47.38</td>
<td>52.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5 Calculated by translating raw dictionary totals into Z-scores, adding and subtracting them in the appropriate fashion, and then adding constants of 50 to eliminate negative numbers.
6 Normal Range
7 Out of Range
8 Above Range
9 Below Range
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Activity</td>
<td>1. Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.84</td>
<td>32.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.93</td>
<td>47.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.37</td>
<td>52.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Optimism</td>
<td>2. Optimism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.26</td>
<td>62.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.49</td>
<td>45.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.28</td>
<td>51.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Certainty</td>
<td>3. Certainty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.90</td>
<td>46.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.67</td>
<td>47.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.89</td>
<td>51.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Realism</td>
<td>4. Realism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.98</td>
<td>43.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.10</td>
<td>47.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.26</td>
<td>52.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Commonality</td>
<td>5. Commonality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.61</td>
<td>50.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.38</td>
<td>47.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.05</td>
<td>52.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. J.C. Gray</th>
<th>7. J.C. Holyoake</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Activity</td>
<td>1. Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.43</td>
<td>47.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.93</td>
<td>47.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.37</td>
<td>52.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Optimism</td>
<td>2. Optimism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.19</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.49</td>
<td>45.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.28</td>
<td>51.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Certainty</td>
<td>3. Certainty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.35</td>
<td>46.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.67</td>
<td>47.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.89</td>
<td>51.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Realism</td>
<td>4. Realism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.71</td>
<td>49.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.10</td>
<td>47.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.26</td>
<td>52.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Commonality</td>
<td>5. Commonality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-8.45</td>
<td>51.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.38</td>
<td>47.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.05</td>
<td>52.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6. E.O. Greening</th>
<th>8. Thomas Hughes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Activity</td>
<td>1. Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.85</td>
<td>49.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.93</td>
<td>47.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.37</td>
<td>52.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Optimism</td>
<td>2. Optimism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.09</td>
<td>50.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.49</td>
<td>45.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.28</td>
<td>51.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Certainty</td>
<td>3. Certainty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.38</td>
<td>49.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.67</td>
<td>47.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.89</td>
<td>51.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Realism</td>
<td>4. Realism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.21</td>
<td>49.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.10</td>
<td>47.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.26</td>
<td>52.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Commonality</td>
<td>5. Commonality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.92</td>
<td>49.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.38</td>
<td>47.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.05</td>
<td>52.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9. Dr. William King</th>
<th>11. Kagawa Toyohiko</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Activity</td>
<td>1. Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.54</td>
<td>48.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.93</td>
<td>47.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.37</td>
<td>52.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Optimism</td>
<td>2. Optimism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.23</td>
<td>50.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.49</td>
<td>45.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.28</td>
<td>51.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Certainty</td>
<td>3. Certainty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.78</td>
<td>40.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.67</td>
<td>47.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.89</td>
<td>51.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Realism</td>
<td>4. Realism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.41</td>
<td>53.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.10</td>
<td>47.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.26</td>
<td>52.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Commonality</td>
<td>5. Commonality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.56</td>
<td>49.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.38</td>
<td>47.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.05</td>
<td>52.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7. J.C. Holyoake</th>
<th>19. Isao Takamura</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Activity</td>
<td>1. Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.01</td>
<td>52.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.93</td>
<td>47.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.37</td>
<td>52.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Optimism</td>
<td>2. Optimism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>54.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.49</td>
<td>45.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.28</td>
<td>51.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Certainty</td>
<td>3. Certainty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.84</td>
<td>51.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.67</td>
<td>47.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.89</td>
<td>51.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Realism</td>
<td>4. Realism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.66</td>
<td>39.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.10</td>
<td>47.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.26</td>
<td>52.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Commonality</td>
<td>5. Commonality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.48</td>
<td>61.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.38</td>
<td>47.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.05</td>
<td>52.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8. Thomas Hughes</th>
<th>20. Terry Thomas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Activity</td>
<td>1. Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.63</td>
<td>50.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.93</td>
<td>47.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.37</td>
<td>52.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Optimism</td>
<td>2. Optimism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.36</td>
<td>50.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.49</td>
<td>45.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.28</td>
<td>51.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Certainty</td>
<td>3. Certainty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.01</td>
<td>52.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.67</td>
<td>47.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.89</td>
<td>51.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Realism</td>
<td>4. Realism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.28</td>
<td>47.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.10</td>
<td>47.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.26</td>
<td>52.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Commonality</td>
<td>5. Commonality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.52</td>
<td>50.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.38</td>
<td>47.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.05</td>
<td>52.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Activity</td>
<td>1. Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.28</td>
<td>48.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.93</td>
<td>47.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.37</td>
<td>52.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Optimism</td>
<td>2. Optimism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.09</td>
<td>50.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.49</td>
<td>45.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.28</td>
<td>51.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Certainty</td>
<td>3. Certainty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.70</td>
<td>40.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.67</td>
<td>47.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.89</td>
<td>51.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Realism</td>
<td>4. Realism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.01</td>
<td>53.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.10</td>
<td>47.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.26</td>
<td>52.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Commonality</td>
<td>5. Commonality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.96</td>
<td>49.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.38</td>
<td>47.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.05</td>
<td>52.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The most often cited master variable is OPTIMISM. The variable was most often used by 39.13% of selected co-operators (9 co-operators). Optimism variables were most often cited by Sir H Plunkett (62.11), W. Cooper (53.64), M.L. Davies (54.55), A.W. Laidlow (56.63), Dr. W. King (52.23), Sir W. Maxwell (52), J.C. Gray (51.19), T. Hughes (50.36) and G.J. Holyoake (50). This is possibly because a majority of selected co-operators is constantly reviewing either new or existing concepts, values and principles of co-operative and their optimism towards them is essential and certainly present.

The second most often cited master variable is COMMONALITY. It was cited by 30.43% (7 Co-operators) including I. Takamura (61.67), B. Webb (52.64), E.O. Greening (51.92), W. Pare (51.86), C. Gide (51.61), E. Poisson (51.61) and E.V. Neal (50.60). This could possibly be because those co-operators' wants and needs are unitaristic where they share agreed-upon values of mutual gain via unity, solidarity and self-help.
• The third most often cited master variable is CERTAINTY. The variable was most cited by 29.1% of selected co-operators including C. Gide (49.90), Sir H. Plunkett (46.23) and F.W. Raffiesien (53.28). This is possibly because speeches that were obtained from these selected co-operators were mainly from written publications where language being used is structured, proper and complete which is different from spoken language.

• The fourth most cited master variable was ACTIVITY, cited by W. Cooper (51), M.L. Davies (50.24) and C. Fourier (48.22). This is possibly because these co-operators are explorers, founders and leaders who regularly explore new ideas and further review and implement them (ACTIVITY).

• The least often cited master variable was REALISM. Only K. Toyohiko (53.11) cited it most often in his speeches. Toyohiko emphasised the co-operative notion as equivalent to Christian love which concerns mainly daily life matters and emotions such as love and trust.

4.5.1 Comparisons between the findings of the General Inquirer (GI) and Diction 5

What is the correlation between the Diction 5 and GI’s word categories? Firstly, ‘Active’ (GI) and ‘Activity’ (Diction 5) are both related to constant challenges and implementation of ideas and persistent development. Second, ‘Positive’ (GI) and ‘Optimism’ (Diction 5) categories are both related to a positive outlook towards ideas as well as encouraging and endorsing their positive entailments, duties and commitment. Third, ‘Strong’ (GI) and ‘Certainty’ (Diction 5) categories are both related to resoluteness and strength, a strong sense of purpose sand determination. Fourth, both the ‘SV’ (GI) and ‘Realism’ (Diction 5) word categories interpret emotions and explanations of actions that affect people’s everyday lives. ‘PowTot’ (GI) and ‘Commonality’ (Diction 5) categories are both related to agreed-upon values, co-operation and unity.

Table 4.6 below clearly shows that there are differences between the findings provided by the two different types of software. To begin with, the strong and certainty categories have two different rankings, similar to the Active (GI) and Activity (Diction 5) category and SV (GI) and Realism (Diction 5) category. However, IAV (GI) has the same ranking as the Realism category (Diction 5). The reason for this is that both categories
primarily provide interpretative explanations of people’s daily actions and matters. The Positive and Optimism and the PowTot (GI) and Commonality (Diction 5) categories have the most different rankings. Fifth, PowTot and Commonality have four different rankings. There are two main reasons for such differences in the two findings, which are differences in functionality and dictionary arrangement (see more detail in Chapter 3).

**Figure 4.2 Word Category’s Finding Comparison between General Inquirer and Diction 5**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Inquirer</th>
<th>Diction 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Strong</td>
<td>1. Optimism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Active</td>
<td>2. Commonality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. SV</td>
<td>3. Certainty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Positive</td>
<td>4. Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. IAV</td>
<td>5. Realism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. PowTot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

First, the score from the five main variables is represented as ‘Z-scored’ while the GI score is represented as a raw score. This could have caused a slight variation between word category rankings of GI and Diction 5. Second, there is a substantial difference in dictionary arrangements between the two programs. PowTot (GI) has three sub-categories: power of co-operation, power of participants and power of authority, whereas Commonality has none. In fact, the power of co-operation is meant to be compared to Commonality but inevitably the whole category has to be compared instead. Overall, the two kinds of software provide two similar category findings but are different in other respects. Despite the questionable comparison between GI’s word categories and Diction 5’s, the latter offers other interesting findings regarding its human interest and communication variables. It was found that:
• **Under the human-interest variable**, more than half (56.52%) (13 co-operators) scored lower than the ‘normal range’. This includes W Cooper (8.19), M.L. Davies (8.19), C. Gide (13.48), E.O. Greening (11.13), John Gray (10.56), E. Poisson (14.89), Kagawa Toyohiko (15.75), W. Pare (14.15), E.V. Neal (19.13), I. Takamura (4.06), F.W. Raffiesien (4.44), P.J. Warbasse (6.38) and T. Thomas (18.11). The other 10 co-operators (43.48%) have a score within range, not higher or lower than the normal range: C. Fourier (36.72), G.J. Holyoake (37.79), T. Hughes (32.04), Dr. W. King (31.47), A.W. Laidlow (36.38), Sir. Maxwell (30.82), J.W.T Mitchell (25.27), R. Owen (31.84), Sir H. Plunkett (42.44) and B. Webb (45). This surprisingly points to a lack in human interest though approximately half of the co-operators still have concerns for human interest.

• **Under the communication variable**, more than half (60.86%) of the co-operators (14 co-operators) scored lower than the normal range. This includes W. Cooper (1.99), M.L. Davies (1.99), C. Fourier (1.77), C. Gide (3.26), E.O. Greening (3.05), R. Owen (2.98), Sir Plunkett (3.03), J.C. Gray (3.2), I. Takamura (3.01), F.W. Raffiesien (0.79), P.J. Warbasse (1.92), B. Webb (2.00), A.W. Laidlow (2.8) and K. Toyohiko (3.00). The rest of the co-operators do score within normal range; J.C. Holyoake (5.34), T. Hughes (4.95), Dr. W. King (5.75), Sir W. Maxwell (4.88), J.W.T Mitchell (6.47), E.V. Neal (3.95), E.O. Poisson (3.91), T. Thomas (4.29) and W. Pare (5.24). It is possible that communication here tends to be one way, that is, from leaders to members.

• **Under the inspiration variable**, more than half (73.91%) of the co-operators (17 co-operators) have an average score (within low-high normal range) including Charles Fourier (5.24), Charles Gide (2.83), E.O. Greening (2.50), J.C. Holyoake (12.60), Thomas Hughes (2.86), Sir W. Maxwell (4.68), J.W.T Mitchell (8.13), E.V. Neal (7.97), Robert Owen (6.65), Sir Horace Plunkett (4.51), John Gray (1.28), Isao Takamura (19.43), F.W. Raffiesien (3.37), Dr. P.J. Warbasse (2.96), E. Poisson (5.13), Terry Thomas (2.36), Beatrice Webb (8.65), Kagawa Toyohiko (5.78) and William Pare (4.52). Just over a quarter have a score higher than normal range, including W.

\(^{10}\) Frequency
Cooper (10.20), M.L. Davies (10.20), J.C. Holyoake (12.60), Dr. King (10.63), A.W. Laidlow (33.13) and Isao Takamura (19.43). This corresponds to the optimistic and active findings where co-operators are still up for challenges and are inspired by new ideas.

There are contradict findings where there is a lack human interest and communication despite moderate inspiration among selected co-operators. However, this is possibly due to the style of the speech (most likely to be lecture and report-based) where communication is one-way but inspiration is still there in relation to new ideas, concepts and strategies.

4.6 Summary

The General Inquirer’s Word Count findings indicate that co-operators use a considerable number of words classified under social descriptors while economic descriptors came second. This conclusion is supported by the sixteen selected significant words. Moreover, the word category findings indicate that the most cited category was the STRONG word category while the ACTIVE and SV categories came second and third, respectively. Interestingly, it was found that Diction 5 software produced moderately different results from those of GI due to both software differences in functionality and dictionary arrangement. OPTIMISM was found to be the most cited variable (category), followed by COMMONALITY, CERTAINTY, ACTIVITY and REALISM in second, third and fourth most cited positions, respectively. The software further indicates a lack of human concern and communication while inspiration was found to be average. This again contradicts the word count’s significant findings of social descriptors. However, social descriptors do contain a broad variety of areas that are socially related but not necessarily specific to human interest only.

Findings from the content analysis identify the main areas that co-operators are involved with: social, economic, moral and political. The word category finding identifies the main themes and characteristics that were mostly cited by selected co-operators including strength, optimism, enthusiasm and a sense of common purpose and values. Content analysis focuses mainly on word and word category quantification (though 16 words were manually evaluated by two raters). Additionally, the two content analysis software programs provide rather distinctive results from each other, though similar to
some extent. Having quantitatively interpreted the findings, in the next two chapters, the same set of findings will be qualitatively interpreted by different textual analysis methods: narrative analysis and intertextual analysis.
CHAPTER 5: NARRATIVE ANALYSIS FINDINGS

5.1 Introduction

Throughout this chapter, the concept of 'Poetic Tropes' (Gabriel, 2000) will be applied to the transcripts of the 23 co-operators' speeches in order to indicate the existence of the tropes within each speech: motive, unity, emotion, agent, responsibility, causal connections, fixed quality and providential significance from each speech. These eight tropes have been explained in detail in previous chapters. Their meanings and features will be briefly mentioned again to enable ease of understanding the analysis of the results. The results will be analysed to show the factors that are being classified under the eight Poetic Tropes above and therefore provide insights into the textual accounts offered by the co-operators.

5.2 Attribution of Motive

Attribution of motive is considered central to story interpretation. It is the extent of intention of characters achieving outcome, whether the outcome is aimed at or unintentional. It would be difficult to interpret any sense or meaning out of a story that has unmotivated characters. Thus, it is vital to start off with the interpretation of this attribution which is summarised from all selected speeches in Table 5.1.

More than half of the co-operators (65.22%) emphasised the need for future improvement and development in co-operative performance and strategy. Co-operators who emphasise such motives are M.L. Davies, Charles Gide, J.C. Gray, Thomas Hughes,
A.W. Laidlow, J.W.T Mitchell, R. Owen, W. Pare, Sir Horace Plunkett, Ernest Poisson, F.W. Raffeisien, Isao Takamura, Terry Thomas, Kagawa Toyohiko and Dr P.J. Warbasse. Some examples of their quotations are shown below:

"However, companies exist today – not in the past, and not yet in the future – so they should approach their business on the basis that they have inherited the past. Their job is to build on it and to hand over something better to future generations. What is handed over should be substantially better than our predecessors could have achieved in their time."

(T. Thomas, 1997)

"Today, we are faced with this practical task as co-operators rather than simply as social critics. Learning from the setbacks of the more market-oriented, advanced European co-operatives, we must work towards the future development of a Japanese Co-operative Movement aiming at a more human society and the improvement of the lifestyles of all people living in our communities."

(I. Takamura, 1995)

"In spite of repeated requests for information, ... relating to future studies, research and planning, not a great deal of material of this nature has reached ICA headquarters, at least, not as much as we would have liked. This may be taken to indicate, not an unwillingness to provide such material, but rather that it does not exist, at least not in substantial quantity. Perhaps co-operative systems around the globe have scarcely begun to make a careful study of the future, so occupied are they with present problems."

(A.W. Laidlow, 1980)

Terry Thomas argues that a co-operative should build on its existing foundation to generate a better future. Similarly, Takamura emphasises the future in the shape of a more humanistic society and future improvement of lifestyles and community. On the other hand, Laidlow criticises co-operatives for neglecting the importance of research and studies that are essential for the future development of the co-operative. This shows that overall, co-operatives are very much future-orientated but their approaches to future studies and development could be different as some suggest building the future from the past. This possibly explains why to some extent co-operatives persistently hold on to the tradition and values which form their strong culture.

A further number of Co-operators (26.09%) emphasise discussion and opinions to generate suitable solutions for existing and future problems. These include E.O. Greening, G.J. Holyoake, Sir William Maxwell, Robert Owen, Ernest Poisson, and Dr. P.J. Warbasse. For instance,

"With due regard to the knowledge of social pathology, we did not abate interest in a society when it failed, but continued to study it. I made it my business to go across the country and literally dig up the dead bodies of co-operative societies to subject them to post mortem examinations. We sat at the bedside of dying societies and watched them expire. ...From this was deducted, in 1918, a four page report entitled 'why co-operative stores fail'."

(Dr. Warbasse, 1942)
Saint-Simon once upon a time employed a parable which became famous: "if the idle classes disappeared, society would continue to live untroubled; but if the working class, from the engineer to the labourer should disappear, society would cease to exist'. We propose to make use of a parable of exactly the same kind in order to expound what we have called the hypothesis of the co-operative republic, the realisation of which will mean the solution of social problems. (E. Poisson, 1925)

Dr. Warbasse suggests that co-operatives must learn from their failures. Poisson suggests a solution related to Christianity by using a historic parable to clarify the co-operative objective and the meaning of social problems and to confirm the importance of the working class to society. It is apparent that often, co-operators do emphasise the spiritual side of the co-operative in keeping with their Christian background to clarify the co-operative’s fundamental emphasis which eventually will lead to a solution to problems. The co-operative way to solve problems is to go back and emphasise its roots, history of the working class and founders’ values and principles although it might be questioned whether they should be focusing more on the management and administration side instead.

Less than a quarter of the co-operators (21.74%) focus on achieving a better standard of living including good education and housing, high quality of goods and freedom from debt - usually through the theory of self-help and mutual interest. These findings correspond to Educational Principle and Value Definition in the Co-operative Identity of Statement (see detail in Appendix 1). These co-operators are William Cooper, M.L. Davies, Dr. William King, F.W. Raffeisien and Kagawa Toyohiko. For example,

As co-operators cannot attain their ultimate objective without improved education, so neither can they attain their immediate object without good management. As the ultimate object is to work for themselves upon their own capital, so the immediate one is to invest their money in some more profitable manner than the savings their bank: and in some manner, also which shall afford a constant occupation for the workers in the employment. (Dr. King, 1947)

Dr. King proposes that the ultimate aim is for co-operatives to be able to work for themselves (i.e. self-help) and wisely invest their capital. However, the tools to such success are education and good management. The ultimate goal for the co-operative is for their members to be able to ‘help’ themselves freely based on their own merits: work skill, determination and commitment to mutual interest. Dr. King’s approach is more strategic-based in comparison to Poisson’s, particularly as he emphasises education and management.
Thus, overall, the main motives that have been widely expressed by a majority of selected co-operators are future improvement of co-operatives, social welfare and problem solving where education, good management and strategic problem solving are key. Moreover, findings also indicate that these motives and concerns are driven by co-operatives’ spirit and faith which has been strongly enhanced by its history of labour, co-operative movement and Christianity.
5.3 Attribution of Causal Connection

Causal connection is related to attribution whereby two or more incidents in the narrative are linked as 'cause' and 'effect'. Table 5.2 below shows a summary of findings of attribution of Causal Connection from 23 Stories (speeches). It was found that more than a quarter of selected co-operators (30.43%) including Charles Gide, E.O. Greening, Sir William Maxwell, J.W.T Mitchell, E. Poisson, Robert Owen, Isao Takamura make causal connections related to co-operative principles as a cause of success or failure. Illustrations of this are shown below.

That policy has not succeeded in the case of what are called 'general' or 'public' middle class stores. The societies I have named as successful have been all based on a settled nucleus of membership which gives the assurance of 'espirit de corps' (E. Greening, 1899)

All these efforts, in my humble opinion, carried along with them the elements of decay and dissolution, because of their exclusiveness. There is the mainspring of the present co-operative movement – its universality is the key to its marvellous prosperity. (Sir Maxwell, 1888)

The cause of the difficulties and embarrassments under which society is now labouring in commercial affairs are attributable to 'individual interests' in the production of and distribution of wealth, and in order to remove these difficulties, it is necessary for society to be based on the principle laid down in 1832 of a 'common interest'. (J.W.T Mitchell, 1892)

Greening proposes that the success of co-operative stores is due to the co-operative membership system. Sir Maxwell, on the other hand, suggests that the dissolution of co-operatives is due to exclusiveness that contradicts open membership principles. Similarly, Mitchell claims that difficulties within co-operative societies are due to the self-interest of members themselves and the key to solve such problems is based on the principle of common interest. These findings confirm the importance and applicability of principles and values from the Identity Statement to the current co-operative context (Appendix 1).

All of them suggest what is lacking and what is the outcome as a result of this and what could be the solution to such an outcome. Again, it is apparent that success and failure of co-operatives is often the result of commitment to co-operative principles and values.

Less than a quarter of selected co-operators (17.39%), including William Cooper, Thomas Hughes, A.W. Laidlow and Dr. P.J Warbasse, cited causal connections in the management aspect of the co-operative, such as incompetent managers, failure to solve existing problems and co-operatives' complex structure which causes management failure. Illustrations of this are shown overleaf.
### Table 5.2 Attribution of Causal Connection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Casual Connection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cooper</td>
<td>Ignorance of co-operators led to mismanagement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davies</td>
<td>We are all buyers and it is in our interest to buy our goods as cheaply as we honestly can.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourier</td>
<td>Death causes the cessation of a man’s most useful enterprise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gide</td>
<td>‘Individual pursuit of profits’ can, on some occasions, cause inefficiency in the free market.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray</td>
<td>Confusions between two legislations led to limitation in members’ power for nomination.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greening</td>
<td>Membership system led to success of co-operative stores.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holyoake</td>
<td>Morality is taught in universities but rarely subject to practice due to society’s negligence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hughes</td>
<td>Previous persisting problems cause further problems within new establishments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King</td>
<td>As the ultimate object is to work for themselves upon their own capital, so the immediate one is to invest their money in some more profitable manner than the savings bank.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laidlow</td>
<td>Complex features of co-operatives led to difficulty in making general statements that would apply to all co-operatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maxwell</td>
<td>Decay and dissolution of co-operation (individual pursuit of profits) are caused by exclusiveness (restriction on member admission).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitchell</td>
<td>Difficulties of co-operative society are caused by pursuit of individuals’ interest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neal</td>
<td>Present work is sustained by the results of past work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owen</td>
<td>Chaos and conflicting feelings and sentiments in society is caused by ignorance and prejudice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pare</td>
<td>The vicious cycle is a cause of imperfect competition in the free market system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plunkett</td>
<td>People join the (Irish) agricultural co-operative because of its outstanding performance abroad.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poisson</td>
<td>Spread of the idea of solidarity achieves nothing and will continue to do so as long as it fails to be realised in practice and the self-same thing is true of co-operation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raffesien</td>
<td>Greater credit allowance causes a rise in worker accommodation in industrial towns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takamura</td>
<td>Unfairness of society led to the rebuilding of the post-war co-op in its revived form.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>New technology led to more competitiveness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toyohiko</td>
<td>Love enables us to believe in forgiveness of past sins and the healing of past offences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warbasse</td>
<td>Neglecting the existence of incompetent leaders causes failure to co-operatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webb</td>
<td>Women co-operators have less access to education since recruiters usually have their eyes on male students.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This subject is self-evident as a cause of failure. But many societies, for insufficient reasons, have neglected to dismiss incompetent employees. Managers, whose incompetence was sapping away the life of the society, have been retained because the board liked the man, or was sorry for his family, or because he was a friend of the president, or because no member of the board had the nerve to tell him he would have to go. (Dr. Warbasse, 1942)

Obviously, it would have been impossible to describe any national movement in detail. Moreover, since co-operative movements are so different and diverse around the world, it has been difficult to make general statements that would apply to situations everywhere. A fact or characteristic in one country will not hold true in another. Each region or nation will be found to have something unique about its co-operative systems. (A Laidlow, 1980)
Dr. Warbasse claims that a co-operative neglects to acknowledge incompetence in employees purely because of social sympathy described above. This, however, would create more constraints upon co-operative performance. Co-operatives differ from other organisations in that performance and skill are not the deciding factors for promotion and maintenance of employees' and leaders' positions, though they should be as far as management effectiveness is concerned.

Laidlow's argument is that it is difficult for a co-operative to generate its own theory because different co-operatives across nationalities, cultures and occupations do have different objectives and ways of organising tasks. Consequently, a co-operative uses other social and economic theories to explain its actions and operations. Moreover, Charles Gide, William Pare and Terry Thomas proposed a causal connection that concern free market performance: a new technology enables greater competitiveness (Terry Thomas), the vicious cycle is a cause of imperfect competition (William Pare) and self-interest causes inefficiency in the market (Charles Gide).

Interestingly, the causal connections mentioned above can be divided into two types: causes that bring about success and causes that bring about failure to co-operative societies. Causes which lead to co-operative failure are 'incompetent leader', 'complexity' of co-operatives', 'failure to solve existing problems', 'exclusiveness' and 'pursuit of individual interests'. Causes that lead to success are strong commitment to principles, common interest and being membership-based. Thus, overall, causal connection from the selected speeches is primarily related to the commitment to co-operative principles and values which determines either the success or failure of the co-operative's performance.

5.4 Attribution of Blame and Credit

Blame and credit determine whether an individual will be cast as a villain (he/she caused disaster), a victim (he/she suffered from it), or a hero who managed to survive heroically in the aftermath of any disastrous events. From selected speeches, not all heroes and villains are human characters but may be institutions, moral concepts, subjects or topics. These heroes and villains are summarised in Table 5.3.
5.4.1 Villains

More than a quarter of co-operators (26%) such as M. Davies, Sir William Maxwell, William Pare, Sir Horace Plunkett, Ernest Poisson and Beatrice Webb blame 'capitalism' and the 'free market', and therefore their villains are 'capitalists' and 'masters of labour' such as landlords, middlemen and traders.

Or is it come to this, that the working classes, after complaining for generations that they have been "down-trodden by landlords and capitalists," and asserting that if they had but capital they could manage things better — are, after a quarter of a century's certainly noble effort, to proclaim that they cannot rise above shopkeeping? That they who, in combination with capitalists of a distinct class, but whose interests are in many respects antagonistic, create all wealth — which, under the competitive system, is so imperfectly fabricated, so dishonestly adulterated, so inequitably distributed, and withal is so limited in amount, compared with what it would be under a scientific system of production and distribution — cannot employ themselves on their own capital; but must be content to be forever the slaves of a vicious system, which seriously deteriorates every class of society, but especially that class which depends for existence on money wages? (W. Pare, 1869)

They demonstrated that it ended merely in the pursuit of profit. They pointed out the defects of free competition, which in no sense ensures the survival of the best but only the triumph of those best adapted to a contest the motive of which is profit-seeking and the result unearned incomes. (E. Poisson, 1925)

The passage shows that an imperfect free market system widens the equality gap. Landlords and capitalists enjoy a tremendous amount of wealth which has been provided by labourers who are victims of a vicious economic cycle. Poisson also supports Pare's idea of imperfect competition, that only those with high profit-seeking motivations survive in the market and they are not necessarily the best or most effective competitors. Both blame the free market system for unfair wealth distribution.

Other co-operators also placed the blame on government for failing in their duty (Robert Owen, Charles Gide and A.W. Laidlow); on incompetent managers for poor performance (William Cooper and P.J. Warbasse); on the human condition of dishonesty (Charles Fourier and Robert Owen); and to a very small degree, on previous leaders (J.W.T Mitchell and Ernest Poisson).

5.4.2 Heroes

More than half of the co-operators (52.17%) identified their heroes as 'Co-operative Key Leaders' from the past and present such as previous leaders, directors, committee members and chairmen, and co-operators themselves. These co-operators are William Cooper, J.C. Gray, E.O. Greening, T. Hughes, A.W. Laidlow, Sir Maxwell,
Table 5.3  Attribution of Responsibility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Character</th>
<th>Heroes</th>
<th>Blame</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cooper</td>
<td>Directors,</td>
<td>Mismanagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davies</td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Capitalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourier</td>
<td>Human conditions; violence etc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gide</td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Capitalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray</td>
<td>Farmers, Mr. Maxwell and Mr. Smith (chairman and deputy chairman)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greening</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holyoake</td>
<td>Honest men</td>
<td>Travellers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hughes</td>
<td>Old leaders, the speaker himself and Christianity</td>
<td>Settlers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King</td>
<td>Labour and Father of Household</td>
<td>Workers' ignorance of their own worth to management and the organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laidlow</td>
<td>Director of ICA, Members of ICA, Secretariat, Member of Reference group and especially the Co-operators and Co-operative Organisations</td>
<td>Legal requirements and Corporate structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maxwell</td>
<td>Previous Co-operative Leaders; Lassalle, Fourier, Neal, JWT and Past Experience'</td>
<td>Exclusiveness and Middlemen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitchell</td>
<td>Capital advisers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neal</td>
<td>Columbus and Common sense</td>
<td>Evil of Destruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owen</td>
<td>Government failure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pare</td>
<td>Co-operators</td>
<td>Capitalists, Competitive System, Landlords, Capitalists and Capitalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plunkett</td>
<td>Consultative Committee of Education</td>
<td>Traders and Politicians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poisson</td>
<td>Co-operative Republic</td>
<td>Defects of free competition, Previous Co-operators; Owen and Fourier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rafflesien</td>
<td>Christian Principles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takamura</td>
<td>Consumer Co-operation and Toyohiko Kagawa</td>
<td>Local Mafia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Government and Robert Owen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toyohiko</td>
<td>God</td>
<td>Judas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warbasse</td>
<td>Incompetent managers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webb</td>
<td>Webb's father and Robert Owen</td>
<td>Mid-Victorian capitalists</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

J.W.T Mitchell, W. Pare, Sir Plunkett, I. Takamura and B. Webb. Half of these Co-operative Key Leaders served as directors, chairmen, and committee members:
The Directors doing their duties gratuitously, and devoting their best attention to the interest of the Society, and yet to loss is added loss. How could the Directors face the members at their meeting, and, what was of greater importance, how could they sustain confidence in a society that always made its balances on the wrong side? (W Cooper, 1861)

At that time the committee worked for nothing. There was no bother in those days about fees and fares. At the end of the rules it says; — "If the auditor does not attend to his duties he is to be fined 2n. 6d." And the cashier was to pay la. Now, you committee men, remember this, if the president was late, he was fined three pence, and if he did not come at all he had to pay sixpence. And so with the other committee men. (J.W. Mitchell, 1892)

Cooper admired and appreciated the degree of dedication that the directors put into the Corn Mill Society though the society was still making losses. Similarly, Mitchell was stressing the fact that the committee was working for no financial rewards at the time and in fact, would be punished if they showed any lack of commitment. Such dedication shown by these heroic leaders indicates ethical values of caring for others and commitment to social responsibility, that is, responsibility to society and its members as expressed in the Identify of Statement (see Appendix 1). Furthermore, the remainder, Lassalle, Charles Fourier, J.W.T Mitchell and especially Robert Owen identify 'Previous Outstanding Co-operative leaders' as heroes.

In conclusion, it is clear to me that Robert Owen's middle way, so ridiculed by Marx and Engels as being 'Utopian', has in fact proved to be the most successful formula, and market forces will actually ensure its continued success in the 21st Century. Robert Owen combined the disciplines of the market place with a company's natural partners to provide a blueprint for the successful business, in fact, tomorrow's company or tomorrow's co-operative.

(T. Thomas, 1997)

Robert Owen was well known for his philanthropic dedication to the working class along with his fellows. It is apparent that there are two types of heroes here: the director type and past key figures. The key figures in the past are most likely to be looked upon for inspiration while committees, directors and managers are expected to use their practical managerial skills and knowledge to deal with both co-operative, commercial and social affairs. Both types of heroes are admired, trusted and relied on by co-operators to guide and serve them.

Moreover, institutions (Co-operative Republics and Consumer co-operatives), governments (E.O. Greening and Terry Thomas) and religious faith and its application within the co-operative context, Christianity (Thomas Hughes, F.W. Raffiesien and Kagawa Toyohiko) are also credited for their contributions to the sector. It is clear that
capitalism is viewed as the 'villain' or to be 'blamed' for co-operative downfalls. This is even more interesting considering that there are reasonable economic activities in co-operative firms nowadays.

5.5 Attribution of Unity

Attribution of Unity suggests that an entire class of people are treated as an undifferentiated entity, all of them equally responsible (Gabriel, 2000:38). In speeches, characters are treated as a single unit such as working class, union and movement, which will further be summarised in Table 5.4 below. Almost a quarter of co-operators (21.74%), including Charles Gide, E O Greening, G J Holyoake, Dr. William King and Sir William Maxwell and Isao Takamura address an entire 'working class' regarding their benefits, interests, rights and entitlement to a reasonable standard of living. An illustration of this is shown below:

A far mightier success lies before manufacturing societies than has been achieved by stores. The working classes are the slaves of production. Means of opulence for all have long existed. The one science which has no recognised students is that of the distribution.

(G Holyoake, 1873)

We have seen the marvellous uplifting of our 'working people' by co-operation in the places where the societies are established which we represent here today.

(E Greening, 1899)

Holyoake describes the working class as a slave to production while Greening suggests that they are eventually saved by co-operation. Selected co-operators refer to working individuals as one particular group under whichever name strongly supports the principle of unitarism where they share the same uniteristic goals that are delivered through co-operation, namely self-help and solidarity. A few Co-operators (17.4%), including William Pare, Thomas Hughes, Kagawa Toyohiko and Peter James Warbasse refer to a group of workers and co-operators as 'Union' instead of society.

For example, 'you call yourselves co-operators, and I prefer the other name; but I am careless about names so long as we mean the same thing, and the same thing we have always hitherto professed to mean is our 'union' (T. Hughes). Labour 'Union' is preferred by most and insisted upon by a large proportion of the societies (Dr. Warbasse). Co-operatives at some point in the past have formed another type of society that is more politically involved with regulations and legislation in relation to working hours and pay standards.
### Table 5.4 Attribution of Unity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribution</th>
<th>Unity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cooper</td>
<td>Society as a whole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davies</td>
<td>Class of lords, all nations and countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourier</td>
<td>Man and all kinds of associations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gide</td>
<td>Workers’ societies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray</td>
<td>All industries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greening</td>
<td>Working people by co-operation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holyoake</td>
<td>Working class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hughes</td>
<td>Unanimous vote, Delegates, Our Union, Fellowship and Brotherhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King</td>
<td>Class of workmen and Working class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laidlow</td>
<td>Study based on global view of co-operators.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All for one and one for all. A union person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maxwell</td>
<td>Working class, Our country, Brotherhood of mankind and fellow members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitchell</td>
<td>Industrious class, nation trading class, untied interests and mankind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neal</td>
<td>Mankind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owen</td>
<td>All society, every nation and all the industrious classes of society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pare</td>
<td>Union and Delegates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plunkett</td>
<td>Association, Community and Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poisson</td>
<td>Working class, Economic society, Union and National society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raffesien</td>
<td>Entire society and Universal co-operation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takamura</td>
<td>Co-operative Movement, European nations, nation and we as co-operators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>British Society and the Co-operative Movement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toyohiko</td>
<td>Union, Brotherhood and Everybody</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warbasse</td>
<td>Fellow men and Union Labour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webb</td>
<td>As citizens of British Empire, Community with whole and the Co-operative Movement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some co-operators (13%) use unity words like ‘co-operative movement’ (Isao Takamura, Terry Thomas and Beatrice Webb), ‘man/mankind’ (Charles Fourier, J.W.T Mitchell and E.V. Neal) and ‘brotherhood’ (Thomas Hughes, Sir William Maxwell, Kagawa Toyohiko), all/entire society (William Cooper, F.W. Raffeisien and Robert Owen).

The remainder are unity words such as ‘all nations’, ‘all industries’ and ‘industrious class’. For example, ‘unless we have a co-operative economic system, each individual cannot have freedom. To have liberty we must have ‘brotherhood’ and loving-kindness, which are the true bases of freedom’ (Kagawa Toyohiko). Thus, co-operative is primarily referred to in the broad aspect as working class, sharing same common
(unitaristic) goal. The co-operative is also seen as a movement or brotherhood where working people unite together as a community.

5.6 Attribution of Fixed Quality

Fixed quality attribution concerns fixed qualities and characteristics of characters in stories where a liar is often treated as one on most occasions and the same applies for a hero. Qualities may be accorded equally to individuals, groups, organisations, or physical objects (Gabriel, 2000:38). Fixed qualities that appear in 23 selected speeches are summarised in Table 5.5.

Almost a third of the selected co-operators (30.43%) including A.W. Laidlow, Thomas Hughes, Ernest Poisson, Terry Thomas, Kagawa Toyohiko, A.W. Ladilow and Sir Horace Plunkett proposed fixed qualities to be largely related to the notion of a co-operative being a solution to working people. An illustration of this is shown below.

Unless we have a co-operative economic system, each individual cannot have freedom. To have liberty we must have brotherhood and loving-kindness, which are the true bases of freedom. (K. Toyohiko, 1937)

Laidlow describes a co-operative as a collection of ideas and concepts which focus on solving common problems of members within unions or communities. Similarly, Toyohiko suggests co-operatives offer individual freedom that is ideally based on love and kindness. Another group of selected co-operators (21.74%), including Charles Fourier, A.W. Laidlow, Sir William Maxwell, F.W. Raffeisien and Beatrice Webb consider the notion of ‘unity’ and ‘association’ as a factor that allows objectives to be accomplished, whereas this would not be the case if they were individually pursued. An illustration of this is shown below.

When consumption is compulsory, association must also be compulsory. The provision of such articles of universal consumption as water, gas, roads, streetlights, must obviously be undertaken by a compulsory association of consumers, if we desire to maintain an industrial democracy. (B. Webb, 1891)

What isn’t possible for the individual is possible for many persons acting together. (F. Raffeisien, 1970)

The concept of association and unity is closely related to the previous notion of co-operation. There are more sub-concepts under the broad concept of co-operation. On the
Table 5.5  Attribution of Fixed Quality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Fixed Quality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cooper</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davies</td>
<td>Give men a share in the profits and they will work harder and save more.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourier</td>
<td>Industrialism is the latest scientific illusion. Man is made for harmony and for all kinds of associations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gide</td>
<td>Law of supply and demand: high priced goods are those which are most in demand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray</td>
<td>The examiner has to see the work of students in order to be able to recommend methods for improving teaching and recruiting qualified teachers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greening</td>
<td>We are bound, at any cost of time, trouble, and treasure, to find means of establishing co-operation in our greatest seaports and commercial centres.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holyoake</td>
<td>We must pay our workmen wages of the day. Give to get, and divide what we gain in order to increase in the future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hughes</td>
<td>Co-operation is the application of the principles of Christianity to trade and industry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King</td>
<td>Family is a community as far as it goes and labour is everything.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laidlow</td>
<td>All for one and one for all. Co-operation is a social and economic system...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maxwell</td>
<td>Unity and good feelings should be the aim of each.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitchell</td>
<td>All charges come from consumption.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neal</td>
<td>Wealth is what remains as a result of work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owen</td>
<td>Man must be the creature of circumstances by which he is surrounded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pare</td>
<td>Rochdale pioneers' ability to supply their own necessities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plunkett</td>
<td>In the co-operative organisation, the community is the salvation of its poorer members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poisson</td>
<td>Present-day society is a commercial society or an exchange society. A co-operative is socialist in its nature.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rafflesien</td>
<td>What isn’t possible for the individual is possible for many persons acting together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takamura</td>
<td>Successful management depends on clarity of the management system itself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>• The company must have a clear mission statement on sustainable development, and how they will assist their partners in achieving this goal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Not to be greedy – not to exploit all the things that could be exploited on this planet or within our business, within one generation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Our sustainable differentiation is co-operation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toyohiko</td>
<td>• Unless we have a co-operative economic system, each individual cannot have freedom. Co-operatives are the foundation of peace.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warbasse</td>
<td>Business rules the world.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webb</td>
<td>Poverty and irregular habits form a lower limit to the growth of co-operation. When consumption is compulsory, association must also be compulsory.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

other hand, a few others (17.4%), including M. Davies, G.J. Holyoake, Dr. William King and E.V. Neal propose a fixed quality that is related to the value of labour and the need to reward workers. For example, ‘wealth is what remains as a result of work’ (E.V. Neal),
'Labour is everything' (Dr. William King) and 'give them a share in profits and they will work harder and save more' (M. Davies).

Charles Gide and Dr. Warbasse (8.69%) proposed a fixed quality concerning the economic aspects of co-operation such as 'law of supply and demand where high-priced goods are those which are most in demand, and business-related notions such as 'business rules the world', respectively. This however contradicts the anti-capitalism attitudes of the majority of co-operators. Interestingly, Thomas and Takamura both claim that 'for a company to be successful, it must have a clear management system and objectives'.

Overall, fixed qualities from a majority of speeches are largely related to the notion of co-operation and its other related concepts such as association and unity. In addition, the value of labour is also emphasised since labour creates work and wealth.

5.7 Attribution of Emotion

It is important for the reader to be able to distinguish between the emotions of the characters and the emotions aroused by the story itself (Gabriel, 2000:39). Emotions that are found among selected speeches are summarised in Table 5.6 (see overleaf). More than a quarter of the co-operators (26.1 %), including M.L. Davies, Charles Gide, J.W.T Mitchell, E.V. Neal, Robert Owen and William Pare express frustration concerning the lack of social justice, that is, the struggle of the working class. An illustration of this is shown below:

The struggle of the industrious classes of this country is not due of a score of years, but of centuries; and in its growth it has had to overcome selfishness which controlled the legislative and other forces of the nation, and which used the under classes to sustain and strengthen selfishness. ......and it will take co-operation all its time to prevent the growth of selfishness, and of selfishness controlling its financial resources. But I trust that there will be in this movement of ours that measure of unselfishness which will control its force.

(J.W. T Mitchell, 1892)

Mitchell speaks passionately of how co-operative movement control and selfishness caused by market forces and government have exploited the working class. He shows tremendous concern for the unfair treatment of the working class due to the selfishness of the minority. It is apparent that through emotion, his main motives and objectives are socially driven and dedicated. Furthermore, another quarter of the co-operators (26.1 %), including Charles Fourier, J.W.T Mitchell, Sir Horace Plunkett, Ernest Poisson, F.W. Raffeisien and Terry Thomas express a great amount of 'self-confidence'
and 'optimism' based on their opinions, knowledge, ideas and objectives. An illustration of this is shown below.

‘There is one consideration that I would put before you which I trust will make a wide and strong appeal to Irishmen. Agricultural co-operation brings far greater benefits to the small than to the large farmer. ... Now, where a community is organised on co-operative lines, the weak family can unload a large part of its business on the strong association, benefiting not only itself but the association as well. (Sir H Plunkett, 1910)

In the passage, Sir Plunkett was strongly and confidently outlining how the agricultural co-operative benefited and protected small farmers and the community as a whole. Another group of co-operators (17.39%), including William Cooper, G.J. Holyoake

Table 5.6 Attribution of Emotion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emotion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cooper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holyoake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hughes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laidlow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maxwell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitchell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plunkett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poisson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raffesien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takamura</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toyohiko</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warbasse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webb</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and Kagawa Toyohiko express 'admiration' for honesty and Christianity, respectively. An illustration is shown below.

If two adversaries fight, it is better that both be locked up in steel. Then the difference in conscience will have a chance of telling, and the honest man may fight with more spirit than he whose conscience with injustice is corrupted. The conditions being tolerably equal, the advantage is on the side of honesty. Public opinion is in favour of it – private respect is paid to it – even the knave knows honesty is a force. (G Holyoake, 1896)

Holyoake strongly supports honesty, considering it to be advantageous and widely favoured by everyone. Similarly, William Cooper, Thomas Hughes and A W Laidlow(13%) express 'disappointment', usually towards the lack of performance and commitment of co-operators. However, E.O. Greening, Isao Takamura and Kagawa Toyohiko do express some commitment towards co-operatives. The rest express dissatisfaction (J.C. Gray and William Pare) as well as satisfaction (G.J. Holyoake and Terry Thomas), usually in terms of performance of societies or co-operators. Sentiments such as gratitude and curiosity are shown here, too.

Most selected co-operators express more than one type of feeling. Emotions and feelings can be shown or expressed to a considerable extent, especially as frustration resulting from a lack of social justice; optimism and admiration; and dissatisfaction and disappointment with the co-operative's poor performance.

5.8 Attribution of Agency

Burke (1996:6) stated that 'agent' represents the means or instruments that enable the actor to pursue his or her purpose. Often, in organisational stories, agents are the organisations themselves (Gabriel, 2000:39). The summary of agents among selected speeches is shown below. More than a quarter of the agents (30.43%), including Sir William Maxwell, William Pare, Ernest Poisson, F.W. Raffeisien, Terry Thomas, Peter James Warbasse and Beatrice Webb identify 'Co-operative Institution' and 'Co-operative Body' as the agent. Illustrations are shown below:

Also the foreign corn industrial workers in all parts of the country during the past decade have been making more successful experiments in organisation than had ever before been attained. This has been due partly to the conspicuousness of profiteering and the obvious evils of the competitive system, and partly to the work of the Co-operative League of America in promoting the knowledge of the fundamentals of co-operation, and giving standardised advice. (Dr. Warbasse, 1922)
Through this kind of universal co-operation of all professional classes, the Credit Union Organisation will be an excellent instrument for improving the ability of the rural population to acquire more wealth, and for considerably increasing the agricultural production as the foremost branch of industry. (F.W. Raffiesien, 1970)

Warbasse notes that the ‘Co-operative League of America’ (agent) is partly responsible for the increase in the number of co-operators from all over Europe by promoting knowledge and awareness of co-operation. Similarly in the second passage, the Credit Union (as an institution) acts as an agent for improving the rural population's wealth. Both the co-operative body and institution are instrumental in enabling the sector to obtain greater achievement in terms of promotion and finance.

Table 5.7 Attribution of Agency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cooper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holyoake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hughes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laidlow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maxwell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitchell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plunkett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poisson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raffiesien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takamura</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toyohiko</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warbasse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webb</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A few other co-operators (13.04 %), including J.C. Gray, E.O. Greening and Sir Horace Plunkett identify ‘board’ or ‘committee’ as an agent. For example, ‘I have a few words to say which may perhaps clear the ground, and prevent a lengthy discussion of this question. For the first time, the Educational Committee has this year included in their programme a register of teachers, and have so far carried out the intention of this resolution’ (J.C. Gray).

The same number of co-operators (13.04%), including F W Raffeisien, Isao Takamura and Kagawa Toyohiko identify ‘Principles’ that include Christian principles, co-operative principles and the principle of love as agents. For example, “I am firmly convinced that there is only one way to improve social and especially economic conditions, and that is by applying Christian principles in free co-operatives” (F.W. Raffeisien).

Finally, ‘Good and proper management’ is emphasised by two great co-operative founders, Robert Owen and William King as agents in their stories (speeches). Dr. King states that ‘if co-operation is practicable, its success will be hailed as a blessing by all classes’. ‘The profits of trade’ he said, ‘depend very greatly upon ‘good management’ in buying, both as to quality and quantity: on the one hand there is an advantage in making large purchases; on the other, there is a loss in having too much dead stock’. Overall, it is the co-operative institution and co-operative body that act as a medium enabling co-operative societies to be able to achieve and accomplish aims more effectively. Help also comes from the board, the committee, co-operative principles and good management.

5.9 Attribution of Providential Significance

Attribution of providential significance is where justice is restored by outstanding intelligent or powerful figures, either by rewarding heroes or punishing villains. These figures are mainly past or present leaders in the co-operative sector (chairman, director, ministers, committees, past and present leaders), institutions and governments. A summary of providential significance from selected speeches is shown in Table 5.8.

More than a third of the selected co-operators (34.78 %), including Thomas Hughes, A.W. Laidlow, Sir William Maxwell, J.W.T Mitchell, E.V. Neal, Ernest Poisson, Terry Thomas and Beatrice Webb proposed that providential significance comes from ‘past and present fundamental co-operators’ and people in high positions of authority such
as 'Directors and Chairmen' ('Co-operative Key leaders'). An illustration of this is shown below:

When the history of that Congress came to be written, it would require to be said that it was a soldier' Congress. They had had peers, politicians, and other distinguished gentlemen for chairmen on the first day,..., in his opinion not the least important result was the elevation of men like Mr. Mitchell stood head and shoulders above many compeers in these respects.

(Sir Maxwell, 1892)

As co-ordinator of the study, I wish to thank all those who assisted me, and without whose help and advice it could not have been done at all. In particular, I wish to mention the Director of the ICA, the members of the ICA Secretariat, the members of the Reference Group and especially the co-operators and co-operative organisations that supplied information and various documents.

(A. Ladilow, 2000)

Sir William Maxwell admired J.W.T Mitchell’s devotion to the co-operative sector. Similarly, A.W. Laidlow showed gratitude to the director of ICA and his team for assisting in accessing information and documentation which otherwise would have been difficult or even impossible for him to get hold of.

Table 5.8 Attribution of Providential Significance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Providential Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cooper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holyoake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hughes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laidlow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maxwell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitchell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plunkett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poisson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rafflesien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takamura</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toyohiko</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warbasse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webb</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A few co-operators (17.39%) including William Cooper, M. Davies, William Pare and Sir Horace Plunkett suggested that providential significance came from ‘the
Committee’. For example, ‘The Board of Technical Instruction to which you today elect four members – one of each Provincial Committee – will exercise functions which may profoundly influence the industrial fortunes of Ireland’ (Sir Horace Plunkett). On the other hand, other co-operators (17.39%), including F.W. Raffesien, Terry Thomas, Kagawa Toyohiko and Dr. P.J. Warbasse, propose that providential significance came from ‘Co-operative Bodies and Institutions’.

For example, ‘But it has been especially since the year 1916 that the greatest impetus of the movement has been seen. This has been due partly to the conspicuousness of profiteering and the obvious evils of the competitive system, and partly to the work of the Co-operative League of America in promoting the knowledge of the fundamentals of co-operation, and giving standardised advice’ (Dr. Warbasse, 1945). Some (13%) such as Charles Gide, E O Greening and Robert Owen even suggested that providential significance came from ‘government’. For instance:

‘The Civil Service Supply Association is composed chiefly of employees in Government Offices, like the Post-Office and the Customs. Its committee must be, by its rules, drawn from certain departments of Government employment, each department electing a proportion. A rotation of committee work is laid down which ensures that the representatives of every Government department see in turn the inside working of every branch of the store. In this way, confidence is generated and maintained amongst the thousands of Government Employees and this confidence spreads to the general public’. (E. Greening, 1899)

The passage shows how government civil employees actively help co-operative societies and further spread quality service to the public. Generally, governmental influence is rather questionable but in less developed countries, where they are primarily faced with corruption issues, the government’s motives and intentions are always questionable. However, in some countries, the government has provided substantial help towards development. Overall, support comes from the ‘co-operative key leaders’ and ‘committee’ and on some occasions, from the co-operative institution and government.

5.10 Summary

Gabriel’s framework enables narrative analysis to interpret underlying meanings from sampled texts by revealing the main motive, heroes, villains, feelings and emotions that exist within texts and making connections between them, enabling the generation of underlying meanings from each text. The analysis of findings from Gabriel’s framework is summarised below:
• ATTRIBUTION OF MOTIVE primarily emphasises future aspects of co-operatives and their further improvement and development. Secondary emphasis concerns solutions and their generation for solving some existing problems and finally, provide an uplifting commitment towards co-operative values and purposes.

• ATTRIBUTION OF CAUSAL CONNECTION clearly shows that lack of, or strong commitment to, co-operatives can lead to failure and success in performance, respectively. In addition, incompetent leaders, complex structure and existing problems are still the cause of co-operative inefficiency, particularly where it is difficult to generalise a solution to co-operative problems due to cultural, national and occupational differences. Moreover, it was found that the pursuit of self-interest is the main cause of imperfect competition in the free market and difficulties in co-operative societies.

• ATTRIBUTION OF BLAME AND CREDIT (HEROES AND VILLAINS) - The vast majority suggest that ‘villains’ are ‘capitalism’, ‘free competition’, ‘capitalists’ and ‘landlords’ while ‘heroes’ are key co-operative leaders such as ‘previous co-operators’, ‘directors’, ‘committee’ and ‘chairman’.

• ATTRIBUTION OF UNITY mostly refers to ‘working class’, ‘union’ and ‘co-operative movement’. ‘Man/mankind’, ‘brotherhood’ and ‘society’ were referred to on fewer occasions.

• ATTRIBUTION OF FIXED QUALITY mostly refers to the notion of ‘co-operation’ and co-operation as the solution to social problems along with its essential principles of unity and association, with ‘value of labour’ being emphasised.

• ATTRIBUTION OF EMOTION from stories consists of the expression of ‘frustration’ about lack of social justice and ‘confidence’ and ‘optimism’ with their ideas and suggestions. Co-operators also show ‘admiration’, especially to leaders, for their contributions and honesty, while at the same time showing some, ‘disappointment’ and ‘dissatisfaction’ with co-operatives’ performance.
• **ATRIBUTION OF AGENCY** shows that what mostly encourages the success of the co-operative operation is the co-operative institution and body. The board or committee, co-operative principles and good management can act as agents bringing success to the co-operative sector, too.

• **ATRIBUTION OF PROVIDENTIAL SIGNIFICANCE** shows the degree of help and support from leaders such as the chairman, board or committee, past co-operators, institutions (which are rated as heroes under attribution of agent) and government.

In this chapter, by treating speeches as stories, the analysis provides greater depth and detail where heroes, villains, motives and others are identified allowing clearer and simpler interpretation of the meaning behind stories (speeches). The main findings indicate that past and present co-operative leaders are considered as heroes who provide significant contributions and support to co-operative sectors while capitalism is considered as a villain. Also, the emphasis was based mainly on the notion of unity and co-operation as a solution to unfair wealth distribution. The main emotion expressed during these speeches was frustration due to a lack of social justice, however, there were also sentiments of confidence and optimism among these co-operators towards their ideas, and admiration towards co-operative leaders, for their contributions to the society.

Another textual analysis method which can detect and identify such differences as well as similarities and changes among them in relation to concepts, beliefs and sentiments, is intertextual analysis. This method is ideal where some co-operative document sources are fragmented, as intertextuality can deal with the prevalence of fragmented and polyphonic storytelling findings (Boje, 2000).
CHAPTER 6: INTERTEXTUALITY FINDINGS

6.1 Introduction
In this chapter, co-operative speeches will be analysed using Gennette's Intertextuality Framework to explore connections and linkage between these texts. The framework consists of 'intertextuality', 'paratextuality', 'metatextuality', 'hypertextuality' and 'architextuality' (see Chapter 3, section 3.9.2). Each speech was made or written at a different period of time by a different co-operator. Thus, as a starting point for analysis it is perhaps helpful to consider the time of speech/publication and to list them chronologically (see Table 6.1) to enable a clear distinction and presentation of the different time periods that each co-operator was in at the time of his/her speech. Gennette's framework will be applied after this arrangement is completed. Table 6.1 (see overleaf) shows the co-operators' life periods and the dates of their speeches both in oral and written forms.

6.2 Intertextuality
As a subset of transtextuality, 'intertextuality' deals with the connection between texts; hence, speeches with quotations, references and plagiarism. The primary aim is to explore the extent to which each speech is linked and connected to other texts. Almost half of the co-operators (47.83%) quote and refer to each other. These co-operators are William Cooper (who refers to JWT Mitchell), JWT Mitchell (who refers to Robert Owen), Sir Maxwell (who refers to Fourier, E V Neal and Mitchell), Charles Gide (who
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Co-operators’ Life Periods and Dates of Speeches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Robert Owen (1771-1858)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Charles Fourier (1772-1837)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Dr. William King (1786-1865)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>William Pare (1805-1873)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Edward V Neal (1810-1892)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>William Cooper (1822-1868)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Thomas Hughes (1822-1896)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>John WT Mitchell (1828-1895)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>E O Greening (1836-1923)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Sir W Maxwell (1841-1922)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Charles Gide (1847-1932)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Sir Horace Plunkett (1854-1932)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Margaret L Davies (1862-1944)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Dr J P Warbasse (1866-1957)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Ernest Poisson (1882-1942)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Isao Takamura (after 1897)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1. Selections from the work of Fourier: with an introduction by Charles Gide, translated by Julia Franklin, Swan Sonnenschien & Co., Lim, Paternoster Square, E.C, 1901
2. Gide, C, and Rist, C. (1922), *A History of Economic Doctrines from the time of the physiocrats to the present day*, authorized translation for the second revised and augmented edition of 1913, under the direction of the later Prof. W. Smart and R. Richards, George G. Harrap & Co. Ltd, 2 & 3 Portsmouth Street Kingsway, W.C
3. By Dusedau, Arno, and Dr. Joachim Kleinhan (1970)
5. Quote of Charles Gide from P Lambert reprinted in 1963
6. Quote from 30th Annual Co-operative Congress 1989
7. (Original 1883-1904),
8. Quote from Lambert, 1963
9. Quotes from other authors; David Griffiths (1973)
10. Quotes from Hugh T. Kerr (1978)
refers to Poisson), J.C. Gray (who refers to Sir Maxwell), Sir Horace Plunkett (who refers to J.C. Gray), Beatrice Webb (who refers to Robert Owen), Ernest Poisson (who refers to R. Owen and C. Fourier), A Laidlow (who refers to K. Toyohiko), Terry Thomas (who refer to R. Owen) and Isao Takamura (who refers to K. Toyohiko).

In Figure 6.1 (see overleaf), the name of each co-operator is listed chronologically and connections are made. The majority of co-operators refer to earlier co-operators such as R. Owen (see the arrow pointing upwards). Occasionally, senior co-operators such as William Cooper and Charles Gide refer to later co-operators (see arrow pointing downward) such as J.W.T Mitchell and Ernest Poisson. On the other hand, the findings show that Terry Thomas (1995), one of the most recent co-operators, still refers to Robert Owen, the first original founder. Most selected co-operators refer to R. Owen. For example:

Have we citizens of Great Britain then any certain ground for faith or even for hope that through the concurrent action of the Co-operative and trade union organisation we shall attain Robert Owen’s New System of Society; a state in which the earnings of all workers will represent efficient citizenship, while all citizens will render willing service according to their highest ability?

(B. Webb, 1891)

In conclusion, it is clear to me that Robert Owen’s middle way, so ridiculed by Marx and Engels as being ‘Utopian’, has in fact proved to be the most successful formula, and market forces will actually ensure its continued success in the 21st Century. Robert Owen combined the disciplines of the market place with a company’s natural partners to provide a blueprint for the successful business.

(T. Thomas, 1997)

There is an honourable name connected with those days - Robert Owen - but, so far as I can gather, he did not believe so much in co-operation; he thought the tribe of merchants could do business for them as well as they could do it for themselves. The rank and file did not believe in co-operation as we understand and practice it.

(J. Mitchell, 1892)

The first two passages show that Webb and Thomas admire Robert Owen’s contribution which is responsible for the success of co-operative society while Mitchell questions whether Owen really understood or believed so much in co-operation as Mitchell did. The second most cited co-operators include J.W.T Mitchell, Charles Fourier, Kagawa Toyohiko, and the third most cited were E.V. Neal, Ernest Poisson and Sir Maxwell. Often, co-operators were referred to as a group such as the ‘Rochdale Pioneers’ who were involved during the Rochdale Society’s time and its establishment.

11 Quotes from Isao Takamura (1993)
Figure 6.1 Chronological Ranking of Co-operator Publication Date and Referencing among them
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More than a quarter (26%) referred to 'Rochdale pioneers', including E.V. Neal, G.J. Holyoake, William Cooper, William Pare, Thomas Hughes, J.W.T Mitchell, Sir William Maxwell, Sir Horace Plunkett and M. Davies. An illustration of this is shown below:

Now we come to 'the Pioneers'. It has been said that they were men of large ideas, yet men of small practice. This may be true, and still not detract from the splendid foundation they laid. They could doubtless, draw admirable pictures of the power of association effort. They could and did talk largely of making a new moral world; whilst all they could do in practice was to buy a few groceries in bulk and retail them to each other, saving the retailer's profit.

(Sir Maxwell, 1888)

The success of the undertaking, the happy result of the mutual confidence of these twenty-eight working men, induced others to join the famous 'Rochdale Pioneers'. The business quickly grew, and the members, instead of spending the profits realised, invested them in the ever-growing concern. This was the real secret of success - the workman felt that he had a chance of becoming a capitalist, and so the improvement in his condition which was effected by buying in a better market ...

(Sir Plunkett, 1890)

Similar in many ways to Owen, the Rochdale Pioneers were on many occasions said to be linked to and responsible for the success of many co-operative societies. However, the first five co-operators in chronological order, R Owen, C Fourier, Dr. King, W Pare, and EV Neal, did not refer to anyone largely due to the fact that co-operative society was only at the beginning of its establishment. Instead, they refer to Christianity and other social role models such as Abraham Lincoln and Columbus.

The overall results show that there is a considerable degree of connection between selected co-operators. They refer to each other in their speeches, especially to Robert Owen. Also, later co-operators also refer to earlier ones as a group called 'Rochdale Pioneers' who also made considerable contributions to society. To sum up, there is a connection between many speeches where co-operators refer back to those whom they see as role models (past co-operators) while only a few refer to and quote later co-operators.

6.3 Metatextuality

Metatextuality refers to the case when the text being commented upon is not directly cited or even named. In this research, the emphasis is on whether the speeches of these co-operators have similar arguments, debates and emphasis. In this section, findings will be illustrated to indicate any similarity, reinforcement, emphasis and deviation of any specific concepts, ideas, topics, values and beliefs among 23 selected co-operators.
6.3.1 Importance of management and managers

More than a quarter of the co-operators (30.43%) emphasise the importance of management in co-operatives and propose that it is an essential factor which is responsible for future expansion, growth and development. The co-operators are: Robert Owen, Dr. King, William Cooper, Thomas Hughes, Dr. P.J. Warbasse, Isao Takamura and A. Laidlow in chronological ranking. Here are some quotes from these co-operators:

I was directly opposed to Orbiston because I saw that the arrangements were not according to the circumstances which would ensure success. It is as necessary that individuals should be trained for a Community as it is necessary they should be trained for any trade; and this can only by done be proper arrangements for the purpose.  

(R. Owen, 1831)

As co-operators cannot attain their ultimate object without an improved education, so neither can they attain their immediate object without good management.

(Dr. W King, 1947 from original 1828)

The Co-operators were comparatively ignorant of the Corn Milling business, so they appointed at first as head miller, a man who professed to have a practical knowledge of the business. It was believed that he mismanaged, the Directors discharged him, and the Society went on to the end of the December quarter, 1851, without a manager,.....

(W. Cooper, 1861)

This subject is self-evident as a cause of failure. But many societies, for insufficient reasons, have neglected to dismiss incompetent employees. Managers, whose incompetence was sapping away the life of the society, have been retained because the board liked the man, or was sorry for his family, ...... The problem is easily solved when directors understand that the first duty of directors is to do.

(Dr. Warbasse, 1942)

Therefore, I have presented in ‘Principles of Co-operative Management’ my belief that we as co-operative managers must be the new ‘Pioneers’ leading the fight to negotiate the present impasse in which the Japanese Co-operative Movement finds itself. ......Co-operators and co-operative business managers are commonly thought of as existing on separate levels, but this is not actually so. It should be accepted that people who fully understand and put into practice the essence of Co-operation are entirely capable of realising proper and creditable co-operative business practices.

(I. Takamura, 1993)

The passages above show that Robert Owen sees an improper arrangement and therefore predicts there will be possible problems as a result. In this case, ‘improper management’ is equivalent to ‘mismanagement’. Similarly, Dr. King (1947) stated in his speech that an important tool for achieving immediate or short-term objectives is ‘good management’.

William Cooper and Dr. P.J. Warbasse both refer to cases where incompetent managers brought about a failure of co-operation and therefore should be eliminated.
Takamura (1993) further suggests that there is a need for competent co-operative leaders/managers who can compete on co-operative tasks efficiently and successfully by having a full understanding of the essence of the Co-operatives’ principles and missions and putting them into practice. There is a strong emphasis on an ideal leader who can lead the co-operative to greater success; the closest leadership models are charismatic/heroic leadership as well as ‘servant leadership’ in which leaders are expected to ‘guide’ and ‘serve’.

Thus, effective management has always been a major concern for co-operators. Findings indicate that co-operators strongly propose the idea of ‘ideal’/‘right’ leaders almost as the sole solution to co-operative effectiveness and success whereas other types of organisations emphasise other factors such as effective strategic management, investment in new technology and employee training.

6.3.2 Self-interest, pursuit of profit and capitalism

Self-interest, pursuit of profit and capitalism have been used interchangeably in selected speeches. Though they do not have the exact same meaning, they are closely related to the same concept. Self-interest can be considered as the initial motive, profit-seeking is the result, while capitalism can be seen as a tool allowing such action to take place. Almost a third of the co-operators (30.43%) oppose acts of ‘self-interest’ and ‘pursuit of profit’ and ‘capitalism’. This especially applies to R Owen who regards ‘capitalism’ as ‘evil’ and ‘immoral’ while many later co-operators reinforce his views as shown below. These co-operators are William Pare, Sir W Maxwell, M. Davies, Beatrice Webb, J.W.T Mitchell and Ernest Poisson, in chronological ranking.

In this new dispensation none will he instructed to endeavour as a business of life " to buy cheap and sell dear;" but all will be taught the true essential business of life, that is, to aid in giving a good character to all, and in producing the best wealth in the best manner for the free use and enjoyment of all, without the necessity of buying with money or price to be fixed for it; ....Buying and selling for money profit, whatever may be the apparent sanctity of the buyer and seller, demoralise the man, and unfit him to become a Christian or to acquire and practice the essential qualities of Christianity, of universal love and charity.....

(R. Owen, 1857)

Or is it come to this, that the working classes, after complaining for generations that they have been " down-trodden by landlords and capitalists," and asserting that if they had but capital they could manage things better — are, after a quarter of a century's certainly noble effort, to proclaim that they cannot rise above shopkeeping? That they who, in combination with capitalists of a distinct class, but whose interests are in many respects antagonistic, create all wealth — which, under the competitive system, is so imperfectly fabricated, so dishonestly
adulterated, so inequitably distributed, and withal is so limited in amount, compared with what it would be under a scientific system of production and distribution. (W. Pare, 1869)

We have had selfishness in centuries past, there is selfishness in our own day, and there is selfishness even amongst us. Pure as we profess ourselves to be, there are manifestations of that most unholy quality even amongst ourselves: and it will take co-operation all its time to prevent the growth of selfishness, and of selfishness controlling its financial forces. But I trust that there will be in this movement of ours that measure of unselfishness which will control its force. (J. Mitchell, 1892)

I also might remind you how several communities in the United States of America have taken hold of the co-operative idea, but only so far as it concerned or brought profit to their own little sect. All these efforts, in my humble opinion, carried along with them the elements of decay and dissolution, because of their exclusiveness. (Sir Maxwell, 1888)

The supremacy of the People in Industry — that was their aim, and is also ours. It is in the sharpest conflict with the aim of Capitalism, which is the power and profit of the few. We are still far from realising the revolutionary ideals of the Pioneers, and today, in the enormously changed conditions of our time, we must have the same courage, imagination, and inventive wisdom. (M.L. Davies, 1931)

Despite these opinions, the associationists denounced individual interest and showed that it was not the only motive and its furtherance not the only aim of economic activity. They demonstrated that it ended merely in the pursuit of profit. They pointed out the defects of free competition, which in no sense ensures the survival of the best but only the triumph of those best adapted to a contest the motive of which is profit-seeking and the result uneearned incomes. (E. Poisson, 1925)

Robert Owen clearly states that ‘buying and selling for profit’ is a demoralisation of man while William Pare (1869) condemns landlords and capitalists for abusing their capital power on labour, creating wealth only for their own possession under the free market system, which causes ‘inequitable distribution’. The anti-capitalism attitude was reinforced in the 1900s by M.L. Davies (1931) and Ernest Poisson (1925). Davies points out that ‘capitalism’ is in sharpest conflict with the aim of co-operation as power and profit are channelled to few people, while Poisson (1925) points out that free competition only leaves those whose motive is profit-seeking to survive, not necessarily the best or most efficient.

Interestingly, Sir Maxwell (1888) and J.W.T Mitchell (1892) both mention that selfishness exists among co-operators too. Mitchell further suggests that at least a co-operation is a tool to cure or eliminate selfishness of people within that co-operation, or if not, at least to keep ‘selfishness’ under control to a reasonable extent. Although all passages above oppose profit-making, the pursuit of individual interest and capitalism, some co-operators such as Charles Gide (an early co-operator) and Dr. Warbasse (a later
co-operator) do believe that free market forces stimulate producers to produce what will sell best. This indicates changes in the perceptions and ideas of later co-operators toward capitalism, though a majority still share the same view as R Owen and many others who oppose ‘capitalism’ and profit making.

6.3.3 Solidarity, unity and self-help

Almost half of the co-operators (47.83%) similarly support the idea of solidarity, unity and self-help. This is logical since these have been fundamental principles and values of co-operatives since their early establishment and are still being imposed and reinforced at the present (See Autonomy and Independence Principle and Value Definition in Appendix 1). This shows that the notions are still being widely shared among Rochdale Pioneers, early co-operators, and recent co-operators such E.V. Neal, F.W. Raffeisien, Thomas Hughes, E.O. Greening, Sir William Maxwell, Ernest Poisson, Kagawa Toyohiko, A.W. Laidlow and Terry Thomas, in chronological ranking. An illustration of their quotations is shown below.

In answer to this I would refer to the German co-operative banks which had the same difficulty to solve and solved it very effectually as we know. In Germany, the aim was to help working men to become their own employers, in the sense of each man becoming a little master.

(E.O. Greening, 1882)

You may not, some of you at least, accept the form of my belief that co-operation is " the application of the principles of Christianity to trade and industry," and above all of that central principle—" Bear ye one another's burthen." But you have laid it down as the basis of your union that men are meant to be fellow-workers, not rivals, and that justice, and not the haggling of the market, must regulate exchange; so that you have only put the Christian Socialist formula into different words, meaning the same thing.

(T. Hughes, 1884)

Thus it can be asserted to begin with that co-operation is essentially solidarity put into practice and that co-operation therefore is of necessity a means of propaganda for this moral principle.

 ......The spread of the idea of ‘solidarity’ achieves nothing and will achieve nothing so long as it fails to be realised in practice, and the selfsame thing is true of co-operation. In a co-operative society each member feels that he is attached to his neighbour.

(E. Poisson, 1925)

Unless we have a co-operative economic system each individual cannot have freedom. To have liberty we must have brotherhood and loving-kindness, which are the true bases of freedom...Co-operation is a foundation of peace.

(K. Toyohiko, 1937)

Co-operation as a social and economic system is not based on one specific concept or social theory but on a collection of many ideas and concepts, such as mutuality, the weak combining in solidarity for greater strength, equitable sharing of gains and losses, self-help, a union of persons with a common problem, the priority of man over money, the non-exploitative society, even the search for Utopia.

(A. Laidlow, 1980)
Poisson stresses the concepts' importance as a way for achievement to be applied daily to co-operative practice. Moreover, E O Greening (1882) and Toyohiko (1937) both suggest that co-operatives based on association and brotherhood allow co-operators to be free by being their own employers. Similar to the brotherhood notion, Hughes (1884) notes that co-operators see each other as fellow workers instead of rivals. Finally, A Laidlow confirms that these concepts exist in co-operatives, putting human interest above financial interest. The 'common problem' on the other hand also suggests the common interest (unitarism); therefore, these concepts are perceived as tools to enable members to achieve unitarist goals and interests as in Sir H Plunkett's essay titled, 'Self-help by mutual help'.

Interesting ideas shared among co-operators include the formation of the human character (human dishonesty and social evils) as being the outcome of the surrounding environment (R. Owen, M.L. Davies, E.O. Greening, E.V. Neal, Sir H. Plunkett, Ernest Poisson and Terry Thomas), the value of labour and labour exploitation (M. Davies, G.J. Holyoake, Dr. William King and E.V. Neal) and Christian love (universal love) (Toyohoiko, Raffiesien, Hughes and Holyoake).

In terms of sentiments and emotions, the majority of selected co-operators share a similar frustration and concern towards the ill treatment that the working class has received in the past and a feeling of disappointment towards the poor performance of some co-operative societies. However, the co-operators are confident and certain of their arguments, suggestions and ideas. The main concepts and issues that have been persistently reinforced across selected co-operators are 'Importance of management and managers', 'Ideal co-operative leaders' and 'Opposition to pursuit of self-interest and profit', 'Solidarity', 'Unity' and 'Self-help'.

### 6.4 Hypertextuality

Hypertextuality is a more specific form of metatextuality where a writer directly and intentionally incorporates elements of an earlier text (hypotext) into the text under scrutiny (the hypertext). The findings indicate that just less than a quarter (21.74%) directly support or criticise each other's ideas. These co-operators are Ernest Poisson (R. Owen and C. Fourier), Isao Takamura (Kagawa), A. Laidlow (Kagawa), J.W.T Mitchell (R. Owen) and Terry Thomas (R. Owen), ranked in chronological order. The majority of
comments were made regarding Robert Owen’s ‘middle way’ and Toyohiko Kagawa’s idea of ‘Brotherhood of Economics’. Illustrations of this are shown below:

To begin with they knew nothing of co-operation, that is of consumers’ co-operation of the kind that has spread throughout the world during the last half-century. Fourier's Phalanstere may appear at first sight to resemble a co-operative society, but it does so only in appearance. Robert Owen's communism does not embody modern co-operative doctrine either in the labour exchanges or the communistic colonies. It is true that in the labour exchange he advocated the principle of distribution to each according to his needs, but he tried in fact to work out through the exchanges and his scheme of barter a system based on labour and on labour alone.

(E. Poisson, 1925)

The great Japanese leader and reformer, Kagawa, called the co-operative movement, ‘Brotherhood of Economics’. The overriding concept present in all co-operatives is this: a group of people, small or large, with a commitment to joining action on the basis of democracy and self-help in order to secure a service or economic arrangement that is at once socially desirable and beneficial to all taking part.

(A. Laidlow, 1980)

In conclusion it is clear to me that Robert Owen’s middle way, so ridiculed by Marx and Engels as being ‘Utopian’, has in fact proved to be the most successful formula, and market forces will actually ensure its continued success in the 21st century. Robert Owen combined the disciplines of the market place with a company's natural partners to provide a blueprint for the successful business.

(Thomas, 1995)

Poisson, on the other hand, argues that Fourier's and Owen's ideas are inapplicable to modern co-operatives because they are out of date. This leads back to the issue of applicability of co-operative principles, values and theory, which is an issue that has been regularly debated and reviewed (Dunn, 1988; Itoken, 1996; Rokholt, 1999, 2000; Reynold, 2000; see Chapter 2, section 2.2.2). On the contrary, Terry Thomas has a high regard for Owen's utopian style that has proven to be a successful solution that is still applicable in the twenty-first century. Finally, Laidlow admires and supports the 'Brotherhood of Economics' of Kagawa Toyohiko. In general, there has not been much direct commenting or criticising in heavy terms among the selected co-operators.

6.5 Architextuality

Architextuality (Gennett, 1997:1) refers not to the relations among individual texts, but to the ‘theme’ and ‘style of a text’, which position it within the larger body of the texts. Thus, here architextuality involves the style and presentation of co-operators' speeches and themes such as medium, context of speech and style of speech (formal/informal), form of presentation (factual accounts, reports, opinions, stories and so on). The table that sums up all speech components is shown in Chapter 3, Table 3.4.
The findings indicate that more than half of the co-operators (52.17%) made oral speeches while a greater number (78.26%) wrote their speeches. It needs to be pointed out that a documentary source of a selected co-operator derives from more than one document, whether a speech or in written form. Almost all oral speeches (91.76%) were made during the ‘Co-operative Congress’ and almost all (88.9%) written speeches were written for ‘publication purposes’. This shows almost an equal distribution of oral and written speeches, each with a different style of presentation.

6.5.1 Style of presentation

The style and presentation is very similar for all congress speeches: they are ‘informative’ and ‘formal’. Speeches during the congress are informative as they are report-based which means that co-operative speakers have to inform audiences of co-operative performances, identify problems, generate solutions, propose ideas and strategy as well as discuss new opportunities and ideas that regard co-operative sector welfare. Usually, these speeches are well prepared so they are to some extent structured. Once they were made, they were recorded, edited and finally published as reports of the congress. They are also formal as the speeches were made during congresses.

Despite the formality, the findings indicate the presence of emotion and feelings of frustration and disappointment, but also show self-confidence during the making of those speeches. Apparent constraints of public speaking are that it can be affected by external pressure such as stage fright, being nervous about public speaking, time pressures and the presence of possibly hostile audiences. The final factor could affect the speakers’ freedom of speaking, if the listeners have a different view but are higher ranking or are the speakers’ work colleagues.

More than a quarter of the written speeches (43.59%) were written for general and academic reading in the form of academic texts and journals such as Principle of Co-operative Management of Isao Takamura (1993) and ‘Inclusive Partnership’ in the Journal of Co-operative Studies 1997 by Thomas Hughes. Overall, written speeches are presented in a clear, organised format with the use of formal and proper language. Written speeches that have been written for publication purposes tend to be highly structured whereas documents such as letters, diaries or personal accounts are less structured. Written speeches from these personal documents can be unstructured and very self-expressive and therefore less formal because the writers are not subjected to the constraints mentioned.
earlier. Cases in point are *The New Moral World* by Robert Owen, *The Co-operator* by Dr. William King and *My Apprenticeship* by Beatrice Webb. A quotation from Robert Owen's work is shown below.

*Did man form for himself any of these propensities?*

*No: he is incapable of forming for himself the least part of any one of them.*

*Can he be justly or beneficially praised or blamed, rewarded or punished, or in any manner made responsible to man, or to any other existence, for the formation of them, or for any of their peculiar qualities or powers?*

*No: the notion is most preposterous, and it has proved most pernicious in practice.*

The quotation above shows Owen's style of writing for asking questions and answering them himself. It seems as if he is informally talking to a reader while writing his opinions. His use of language is informal, casual but very self-expressive and spontaneous. His writing seems to be concurrent with his thoughts of that very moment. His writing expresses his social opinions and beliefs. In general, co-operators produce rather, 'formal' but yet 'expressive' and 'spontaneous' styles of speeches as the nature of written works is unobtrusive in contradiction to speakers in congress with external pressures.

6.5.2 Theme

Another factor which has to be taken into consideration in terms of architextuality of speech is its 'theme'. The most cited theme is 'Success and Failure Factors for Co-operation'. This theme can be found in the speeches of E.O. Greening, Sir William Maxwell, Sir Horace Plunkett, Dr. P.J. Warsbasse and Isao Takamura. The second most cited themes are both 'Co-operative Principles and Values' (Robert Owen, G.J. Holyoake, Thomas Hughes and Terry Thomas) and 'Education' (Charles Fourier, Dr. W. King, J.C. Gray, B. Webb, M. Davies). The third most cited themes are both 'Unity' (William Pare, F.W. Raffiesien, Sir H Plunkett and Ernest Poisson and 'Co-operative Policy' (G.J. Holyoake, Charles Gide and M. Davies).

Other themes come up such as human welfare, labour and report of societies' performance. The issue of education has not come up until now and this shows that adopting multi-textual methods does provide a wider angle of findings for this research.
Findings from this chapter will be summarised in the next section. It is obvious that selected co-operators share and reinforce similar concepts and sentiments. Findings from intertextuality will be summarised further below.

6.6 Summary

Genette’s transtextuality enables intertextuality analysis to identify a connection and relation between each text. It also enables the analysis to reveal interests, sentiments, concepts, support and criticism that are shared by different co-operators. The findings of the analysis are summarised below:

- **INTERTEXTUALITY** - almost half the co-operators refer to each other, especially to founder Robert Owen and modern Kagawa Toyohiko. In addition, more than a quarter of the co-operators referred to the Rochdale Pioneers.

- **METATEXTUALITY** - almost half of them strongly emphasise the notions of solidarity, unity and self-help. Moreover, more than a quarter of the co-operators emphasise the importance of management and ideal leaders as well as opposition to capitalism and any form of pursuit of self-interest. They also share the same frustrations, disappointment and a high degree of self-confidence.

- **HYPERTEXTUALITY** - less than a quarter of the co-operators comment negatively on or criticise each other’s ideas. On a few occasions, this includes outside co-operators. R Owen receives a fair share of both support and criticism similar to a few others such as Kagawa (support) and Fourier (criticism).

- **ARCHITEXTUALITY** - almost all selected speeches are written in publication form and more than half were verbally presented during congress on a regular basis. Written speeches are unobtrusive, so the writer has a greater freedom of expression and argument while a congress speaker can be affected by nerves and time constraints. Still the style is formal, informative and yet expressive. Furthermore, a majority of co-operators stress ‘success factors of co-operatives’: values, principles, and education.
Intertextuality, by looking at the whole set of (23) speeches, indicates a considerable degree of connection among selected co-operators whether through commentary, proposition, criticism, ideas or values. It was found that a majority of selected co-operators share similar ideas, sentiments and values which vary across different co-operators and time. The overall style of speech making is formal, informative and expressive in terms of ideas and beliefs while the main theme is the concern about success (solidarity, unity and self-help) and failing factors (incompetent leaders) within co-operatives. Intertextuality provides very different kinds of findings in comparison to the previous two textual analysis methods. This provides a fruitful foundation for discussion in Chapter 7.
CHAPTER 7:

DISCUSSION

7.1 Introduction

After outlining the findings from all three textual analytical methods (content analysis, narrative analysis and intertextuality), there have emerged several outstanding values, concepts and ideas which eventually need to be selected in order to narrow down the scope of argument and discussion due to the actual scope of this research. Consequently, findings that are considered as significant are those that are most prominent, have the most influence, and are aligned with the co-operative's future development and growth. These significant findings are largely related to the topics of 'charismatic leaders', 'Unitary and Collectivism', 'Co-operative dual objectives', 'Capitalism/anti-capitalism', 'Principle contradictions', 'Co-operative Inflexibility' and 'Co-operative Convergence'. Each of these points will be outlined and discussed further with regard to their significant values, relevance and contributions towards the co-operative movement and its future.

7.2 Charismatic/Heroic Leaders VS Shared Responsibility

Leaders here refers to co-operative founders, past and present (outstanding) co-operators/leaders to floor managers, managers (employed), chairmen, and directors, and to chief executive of co-operatives. In the intertextuality analysis, more than a quarter of the selected co-operators stress the importance of the manager where incompetent leaders are the cause of management failure and vice versa. Success is greater for an ideal/desirable leader who is competent and committed to co-operative values and principles. Similarly, narrative analysis indicates that almost half of selected co-operators identified some
specific leading figures as 'heroes'. Content analysis attempts to identify possible desirable characteristics and values of co-operative leaders where evidence of determination, confidence and optimism were found.

The findings strongly indicate that selected co-operators share the same preferences and emphasis for the idea of 'charismatic/heroic' leaders and there is a greater requirement for these leaders at present. This could be explained by the co-operative past history and movement which have often been paternally led by outstanding figures like R Owen of the New Society and Dr. King of the Rochdale Society. It is not just past leaders who share this view. Recent co-operators such as Isao Takamura (19930 and Dr. P J Warbasse also express a similar preference for 'ideal/desirable' leaders (see below for exemplary quotations of Isao Takamura, Dr. Warbasse and others).

Have we citizens of Great Britain then any certain ground for faith or even for hope that through the concurrent action of the Co-operative and trade union organisation we shall attain Robert Owen's New System of Society; a state in which the earnings of all workers will represent efficient citizenship, while all citizens will render willing service according to their highest ability? (B. Webb, 1891)

In conclusion it is clear to me that Robert Owen's middle way, so ridiculed by Marx and Engels as being 'Utopian' has in fact proved to be the most successful formula, and market forces will actually ensure its continued success in the 21st Century. Robert Owen combined the disciplines of the market place with a company's natural partners to provide a blueprint for the successful business. (T. Thomas, 1995)

The paragraphs illustrate that co-operators regard co-operative founders or 'first leaders' as spiritual guides, and that their theories are still applicable to co-operatives today. Overall, from speeches relating to co-operative leadership, there seems to be a strong emphasis on the notion of a 'heroic/charismatic' leader who would bear considerable responsibility to guide, serve and set policy that reflects members' needs and requirements. This corresponds to the ethical values of co-operatives where social responsibility and caring for others are the main requirements for any co-operative members, in this case, applied to co-operative leaders (see Appendix 1). Also, its leadership model closely reflects the charismatic, transformational, paternalistic and servant style of leadership where the leader guides the movement from his inspirational vision, particularly in the initial stages of a co-operative's establishment.

Furthermore, early co-operatives were constructed as a social and political movement whose nature was to be guided and served by a heroic figure through his/her vision and paternalism, such as Robert Owen. Thus, the co-operative leadership model
actually reflects mixed leadership approaches from charismatic, transformational, servant and paternalistic leaders.

This places substantial demands and expectations on the leader which impose a substantial number of tasks and responsibilities. This transfers into today's co-operative management style where the board and hired professionals are subjected to many responsibilities and decision-making on which lie the success of the co-operative. Interestingly, within a co-operative it is ideal for everyone to share responsibility equally, and therefore the notion that a few should have more tasks with more power in their hands seems to contradict this value. Here is a statement by Laidlow regarding the leadership of co-operatives:

It is not too much to say that the quality of co-operatives will depend on whether the first class leaders are leading them, not necessary supermen but democratic leaders who share responsibility with others in groups and teams.

(A. Laidlow, 1980)

Laidlow suggests that first class leaders are those who share responsibility with others and groups. Today's co-operative proves this case where the board and hired professionals are in charge of all marketing, management strategy and planning, and the only way they can do this in the most democratic terms is to set policies that correspond to members' needs and requirements via two-way communication. Diction 5's findings (see Chapter 4) indicate a shortcoming in communication attributes among selected co-operators, and it is therefore questionable how democratic the whole co-operative leadership process is if all members do not turn up and formally state their opinions and views. Shortcomings in communication surprisingly were found among recent co-operators such as Isao Takamura, F.W. Raifissien and Dr. Warbasse who supposedly had reasonable communication technology facilities available for two-way communication between representatives (board) and members.

Further evidence that supports this is Bickle and Wilkins's (2000) study on values which shows that Co-operative Wholesale Society's (CWS) members had low contact and empathy because managers in the hierarchy of CWS had little chance for contact with members and therefore little empathy with them. Thus, the notion of heroic/ideal figures not only contradicts the co-operative's value of shared responsibility but also leads to the most likely possibility where democracy among members is rarely reflected by board
policy making. Consequently, co-operative identity could be slowly weakening its own principles and values by its own management and leadership style.

Heroic/ideal figures could be seen as a kind of ‘cult leader’ with specific characteristics expected. Findings from content analysis indicate that ideal co-operative leaders should be determined (GI), active (GI and Diction 5), optimistic (Diction 5) and have collective (shared) values (Diction 5). However, it is important to note that, as these characteristics resulted from one single content analysis, their validity and reality is still questionable. It is just an interesting outcome to be outlined within this discussion. The notion of heroic figure always bears the risk of the ‘wrong leader’ as mentioned earlier in this research since human motives and intentions are unpredictable and unknown. Also, the effects are ‘temporary’ when such a leader leaves. Given today’s dynamic global changes, co-operatives simply cannot afford to wait for the right one to come along or risk having wrong leaders, especially, according to Bartus (1996) because it may be hard to get rid of such leaders due to their connections.

Both the heroic figure and the democratic value of co-operatives are traditions that were established in the early stages of the co-operative movement. They could have worked well together if the co-operative society remained small and stakeholders were just members and representatives/leaders. Under these circumstances, the heroic figure could work well given that he/she maintains strong co-operative commitment along with high integrity and morality. Also, in the past co-operatives represented mostly social and political movements whereas now they are social and economic enterprises. However, regardless of its purpose, it is inevitable for a co-operative to be as competitive as other organisations are and for that, having a particular heroic figure is simply not enough. There are other factors required such as effective management and marketing strategies, advanced technology and responsiveness to change.

An interesting alternative approach to the heroic, servant and paternalistic leader is called the ‘distributed leadership approach’ where there is no single individual as ideal leader. Rather individuals at all levels in the organisation and in all roles can exert leadership influence over their colleagues and thus influence the overall direction of the organisation (Bolden, 2004:13). The key to this approach is a distinction between the notions of ‘leader’ and ‘leadership’. The fundamental aim is to produce a culture that encourages high levels of integrity, creativity, imagination, care and collective ambition for ‘excellence’ (Ibid, p. 13) which match perfectly with co-operative purposes and
values. In fact, this may be the kind of ‘leadership’ that the co-operative needs in theory, but in practice, it is the (heroic) leader that is preferred.

The reason why co-operatives are caught between heroic figures and shared responsibility (member democracy) could be largely due to the fact that co-operatives carry a tradition of social and political movement where the leader is central to the movement while at the same time it is an economic enterprise where effectiveness and response to change are vital its survival. This is why the co-operative is said to have a complex structure, as it combines different concepts and ideas that have accumulated since from its early days of the movement until now. It has somehow failed to apply the right values and traditions to effective management formulas. However, its tradition of heroic figures certainly persists until now where there is still a strong preference for ‘follow-the leader’ style rather than ‘walk with the leader’.

7.3 Unitarism VS Pluralism

The three textual analysis methods have strongly indicated evidence of collectivism and unitarism, emphasising co-operation to achieve common goals. First, Content analysis’s Diction 5’s ‘Commonality’ word category was the second most cited. The category indicates language that highlights the agreed-upon values of a group and that rejects idiosyncratic modes of engagement. Similar findings were found under narrative analysis’s unity attribution where characters or people within the speeches (story) are treated and referred to mostly as a collective group of ‘working class’, ‘union’ and ‘co-operative movement’. Under intertextuality, the notion of unity and solidarity are significant factors that have been widely shared and reinforced among the majority of selected co-operators.¹ (See quotations in Chapter 6 under metatextuality). This strongly indicates that those co-operators support unitaristic interests, as opposed to individualistic interests or, as mentioned above, reject idiosyncratic modes of engagement.

Furthermore, narratives emphasise a collective group of people instead of individual while intertextuality emphasises solidarity and unity, corresponding to ethical values as stated in the Identity of Statement (see Appendix 1). These findings seem to stress the commonality and oneness from one group of people rather than any kind of pluralism. Thus, despite the fact that pluralism exists within a co-operative, it is the
traditional notion of unitarism that co-operators value. An example of this is shown below:

Co-operation as a social and economic system is not based on one specific concept or social theory but on a collection of many ideas and concepts, such as mutuality, the weak combining in solidarity for greater strength, equitable sharing of gains and losses, self-help, a union of persons with a common problem, the priority of man over money, the non-exploitative society, even the search for Utopia. (A.W. Laidlow, 1980)

Laidlow here refers to a co-operative as to ‘a union of persons with a common problem…’, as group of the weak that gather together as a union to solve ‘common’ problems. However, common goals (unitarism) can also cause a lack of participation and involvement from members as they assume that their goals and interests are widely shared with others and leaders. Therefore, there is no need for them to participate or be involved as it is most certain that someone else might have or will express the same kind of thoughts, opinions and views as them anyway. Interestingly, sharing different interests (pluralism) could provide the reverse effect where people participate more in meetings and get more involved in order to protect their own interests.

At present, a co-operative actually consists of a number of different stakeholders such as management, investors and consumers. Therefore, we can talk of a pluralistic interest which makes it possible that pluralism could be used as a true indicator of a co-operative’s democracy and autonomy between different groups of stakeholders. Successful co-operatives are those that manage to achieve the most mutual interests and resolve their conflicts; hence, they are genuine co-operatives. Co-operatives should not be alarmed by pluralistic interests or any factors that are capitalist-related as these factors do exist among co-operatives and occasionally can stimulate performance (e.g. encourage more participation).

It is also apparent that co-operatives label different factors to the extreme. For example, profit is bad, competition is unfair, and all members share the same interests. These factors therefore have been given their own assumptions and, as a result, are difficult to change or readjust according to the present situation. Just consider that different interests are acceptable and can be beneficial where differences can help to solve conflicts and create an even greater spirit of unity in the co-operative. Thus, instead of co-

1 Robert Owen, Dr King, E.V. Neal, F.W. Raffeisien, Thomas Hughes, E.O. Greening, Sir W Maxwell, Ernest Poisson, K. Toyohiko, A.F. Laidlow and Terry Thomas.
operatives seeing pluralistic interests as a sign of self-interest, they should embrace such differences among co-operatives as representing a sign of genuine democracy.

Unitarism seems more applicable to the past when co-operatives consisted of members as the primary group. The situation is different nowadays, as there are many different cardinal stakeholders within a co-operative society. Therefore, it could be more applicable to regard unitarism on an organisational level such as success of the co-operative, management effectiveness and member satisfaction while pluralist can be viewed at the managerial level. Thus, unitarism is more suitable as an abstract or spiritual value to remind co-operatives of their fundamental purpose but is not related to their management. Commonality/unitarism can be used as support to the process of reconciliation and democratic agreement among different stakeholders. However, findings from this research indicate that unitarism, collectivism and commonality are more highly valued than pluralism and individualism by far.

7.4 Dual Objectives

The findings from three textual methods related to social and economic orientation can be applied directly or used to explain co-operative’s dual nature (Faquet, 1951; Munkner, 1999). The content analysis’s GI word counts indicate that words that have been most cited are classified under ‘social’ descriptors. Economic, moral and political came second, third and fourth, respectively. It was also shown that social descriptors (1,248) outweigh the economic ones (649) by a large extent. Similarly, narrative analysis also indicates that more than a quarter of the selected co-operators expressed frustration over the lack of social justice and equality, including M.L. Davies, Charles Gide, J.W.T Mitchell, E.V. Neal, Robert Owen and William Pare.

For example, JWT Mitchell states that ‘the struggle of the industrious classes of this country is not due of a score of years, but of centuries; and in its growth it has had to overcome selfishness which controlled the legislative and other forces of the nation, and which used the under classes to sustain and strengthen selfishness...’. Interestingly, Diction 5 findings (content analysis) indicate contradictory findings where more than half of the selected co-operators were found to be lacking in concern for human interests while the other half had moderate but not exceptionally high concern for human interests.

The dual nature of a co-operative makes it difficult in terms of performance evaluation. Dual objectives seem to pressure a manager to achieve both on equal terms.
For example, the co-operative may yield higher profits (economic success) while still lacking in participation (social failure). Thus, achieving more in one objective will indirectly suggest that the others have been undervalued. Furthermore, it is difficult to evaluate and compare both objectives with each other. Social objectives are more difficult to measure and evaluate. This is because it is difficult to put value on member satisfaction and morale while profits (economic) can be measured and evaluated in numerical terms. Furthermore, focusing on profit-making can cause a stir to some members as it contradicts the co-operative’s cultural value of ‘reasonable profit’ (Hogeland, 2003; Griffith, 2003). On the other hand, emphasising the social objective could lead to a loss and therefore would be less beneficial for members. In some cases, societies can face bankruptcy.

Munkner (1999) argued that the two characters ‘social’ and ‘economic’ could be integrated. This might cause even further confusion and difficulty in goal setting, policies and strategies. Thus, the dual character seems like a lose-lose situation here, as it is certainty impossible to achieve both on equal terms, as one will always outweigh the other. However, the fact that a co-operative includes profit-making as one of its main objectives also shows that it develops and adjusts itself along with contemporary commercial realities where profit-making is essential for survival and secure placement in the market. In general, it is most likely that some co-operators prefer social objectives to be prioritised over economic ones since they believe strongly that the co-operative’s identity is its social-orientation purpose.

Furthermore, it is possible that the lack of human interest revealed by Diction 5 does not necessarily mean that selected co-operators were emphasising economic interests instead. However, word count’s description (GI) indicates that economic descriptors were the second-most frequently cited while under the word category of @Econ they were only cited by William Pare. The findings indicate a certain degree of economic involvement, thus, it is quite certain that ‘economic’ is also one of the co-operative’s priorities as well as ‘social’. However, narrative findings indicate that a majority of selected co-operators cast ‘capitalism’ and ‘pursuit of self-interest’/‘profit’ as ‘villains’.

Intertextuality also supports this finding where more than a quarter of co-operators oppose ‘profit-making’ and ‘self-interest’ (see exemplary quotation in Chapter 6, section 6.3.2 Metatextuality). This indicates that the social objective outweighs the economic one. Thus, although findings from three methods support Munkner’s (1999) theory of dual
characters; social and economic, the social or human interest far outweighs the economic interest.

Human interest has always been one of co-operative’s features that distinguish it from others. However, with the evolution in contemporary management of HRM in the 1980s, the extent of the co-operative’s distinctiveness with regard to this feature becomes questionable. The evolution has shed a new light on contemporary management where employees’ welfare is emphasised. It is now recognised that the focus should be on the ‘common interests’ of management and the workforce in leading to the success of the business (Storey, 1995; Truss et al, 1997). Thus, now co-operative and contemporary management both emphasise human resource welfare. The convergence between co-operative and contemporary management suggests that the social objective gap between co-operatives and other forms of business is closing (See section 7.8 Co-operative Convergence).

This raises the question of how a co-operative can differentiate itself from other organisations, especially in the private business sector. In fact, co-operatives are still characterised by many other distinctive features such as collectivism, unitarism, solidarity, unity and mutuality.

7.5 Capitalism and Anti-Capitalist

Since Robert Owen’s time, antagonism towards capitalism has been expressed widely among co-operators. Here anti-capitalism represents an alternative form of profit orientation that is co-operative, for example, where co-operative members still accept and participate under the standard rules of business practice as opposed to an anti-capitalist who seeks extreme actions, revolutions and global protest movements. Findings from the narrative and intertextual analysis indicate a strong opposition by the majority of the co-operators to capitalism.

Under the narrative analysis’s attribution of ‘responsibility’, more than a quarter of co-operators identified those operating under capitalism as ‘villains’. In the past, these villains referred to landlords and middlemen, while nowadays capitalists are perceived to be anyone whose motive is driven by profit-seeking, such as business people, private companies and investors. Furthermore, under the attribution of ‘fixed quality’, selected
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2 M.L. Davies, Sir W. Maxwell, William Pare, Sir Horace Plunkett, Ernest Poisson and Beatrice Webb.
co-operators claim that capitalists/investors are to blame for the exploitation of the working class. For example, William Pare (1869) states that

That they who, in combination with capitalist of a distinct class, but whose interests are in many respects antagonistic, create all wealth – which, under the competitive system is so imperfectly fabricated, so dishonestly adulterated, so inequitably distributed, and withal is so limited in amount, compared with what it would be under a scientific system of production and distribution – cannot employ themselves on their own capital; but must be content to be forever the slaves of a vicious system, which seriously deteriorates every class of society but especially that class which depends for existence on money wages.

The paragraph describes the defect of capitalism where a certain class was able to create wealth but unfortunately at the expense of the working class and this is where the free market system went wrong: it failed to deliver perfect, honest and fair distribution to the population under the free market system. Similar findings emerged from intertextuality analysis where more than a quarter of the co-operators including R Owen, William Pare, Sir W. Maxwell, M.L. Davies, Beatrice Webb, J.W.T Mitchell and Ernest Poisson opposed pursuit of self-interest or pursuit of profits which is almost equivalent to capitalism. Such a view seems to be dated. However, recent co-operators such as Poisson (1925) also shared the anti-capitalism view. For instance:

Despite these opinions the associationists denounced ‘individual interest’ and showed that it was not the only motive and its furtherance not the only aim of economic activity. They demonstrated that it ended merely in the pursuit of profit. They pointed out the ‘defects of free competition’, which in no sense ensures the survival of the best but only the triumph of those best adapted to a contest the motive of which is profit-seeking and the result unearned incomes.

(E. Poisson, 1925)

Both paragraphs above describe the outcome of an imperfect market economy having negative effects, especially on working people. However, an economist would perceive the free market as an effective tool that allows an economy to operate smoothly. Sloman (1995: 447) argues that even imperfect markets could have positive advantages. Their automatic demand and supply adjustment system outweigh the costs of those imperfections themselves. Despite the general hostility and opposition of the majority of selected co-operators, some co-operators such as Charles Gide and Dr P.J. Warbasse agree with Sloman’s claim that the free market system is effective as it allows everyone to be better off. Gide’s and Dr. P.J. Warbasse’s exemplary quotations are shown below:

The individual pursuit of profit, however, is in no way opposed to the general interest, but quite the reverse, for it stimulates every producer to produce what will sell best. Now, given the law of supply and demand, those goods or services that fetch the highest price are
obviously those which are most in demand, most useful in the economic sense, and most eagerly desired It therefore precisely owes to the desire of profit that the most urgent wants are first met. (C. Gide in Ernest, 1992)

While co-operatives are not organised to make profit, as commonly understood, there need be no quarrel with those who say that co-operatives do make profit. It is a matter of definition. From the current business standpoint, co-operatives sell at the market price and make a profit. This profit they pay out as dividends to the stockholders; they pay it not in proportion to the stock held, but in proportion to the patronage given to the business by each stockholder. It is a different disposal of dividends. The profit is given back to the people who created it by over-payment. This is the profit business interpretation of co-operation, not the co-operative interpretation. (Dr. Warbasse, 1945)

Gide’s paragraph seems to support Solomon’s argument for a free market system where profits will stimulate a producer to sell the best product according to present demand and supply within the economy. Similar views are expressed by Dr. Warbasse (1945) where he suggests a different interpretation of profit for co-operatives as dividends that are beneficial to members and society. He further points out the difference between ‘capitalistic profit’ and ‘co-operative profit’ where the former will be distributed to investors according to the proportion of their shares in stock whereas the latter is distributed according to one’s patronage to the business from each stockholder.

Similarly, Ake Book (1992) perceives ‘profit making’ as a matter of survival and fulfilling the social requirement of members. In fact, in a ‘business co-operative organisation’, its objective is exactly the same as for private companies, that is, profit maximisation, only profits are distributed to members while private companies distribute to investors.

Despite previous anti-capitalism findings, there is also evidence of reasonable economic-related findings. Under content analysis’s GI word count, the second most cited descriptors were ‘economic’ descriptors which consists of words such as ‘business’ (95 citations), ‘capital’ (52) and ‘economic’ (45). Even in mutual co-operatives such as agricultural co-operatives, farmers would still like to be profitable as well as able to secure their place in the market.

The idea of profit-making is a point of contention within co-operatives. It has been perceived as a ‘villain’ while at the same time has been used as a tool to maximise dividends and surplus. Dr. Warbasse has attempted in his writing to encourage greater familiarity with and acceptance of the idea by introducing ‘profit-making’ based on ‘co-operative sharing’. In this research, the findings show an anti-capitalist bias from the majority of co-operators, not just those from the past but also from more recent co-
operators. This really indicates a strong anti-capitalism value embedded within the co-operative. It is beneficial when the value is strong and widely shared; however, if such culture or values do not correspond to a co-operative's actual practice, it can cause more complications (conflicting messages) than benefits (strong co-operative culture and identity).

### 7.6 Principles Contradict Practice

In sections 7.2, 7.3, 7.4 and 7.5, there is a strong indication that several espoused values contradict co-operative actual practice. In this section, these values and principles will be further compared to co-operative theory as is shown in Table 7.1. A comparison summary will be further discussed relating to the values' contribution, connection and applicability to today's co-operative practice. Table 7.1 below outlines the comparison between co-operative cultural values, co-operative theory discourse and co-operative practice discourse.

**Table 7.1 Comparison of Co-operative Values, Theory and Practice**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Co-operative Values and principles</th>
<th>Co-operative Theory Discourse</th>
<th>Co-operative practice Discourse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social/Human-orientation</td>
<td>Dual nature; social and economic (Munkner, 1999)</td>
<td>Member interest and profit making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member democracy</td>
<td>Members control via representatives (Griffith, 2003)</td>
<td>Members follow leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unitarism (common goals)</td>
<td>Collective (Hofstede, 1990, 2000)</td>
<td>Several cardinal stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-capitalism</td>
<td>Service over profit (Hogeland's Cultural value)</td>
<td>Profit-making as main objective</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

First, generally and traditionally, human interest has always been the co-operative's distinctive characteristic and single objective. This contradicts Faquet and Munkner's (1999) recent notion of dual characters (social and economic) and modern co-

---

3 From identity of statement in Chapter 2.
4 Based on these research findings.
5 See quotations in Chapter 6 under section 6.3.2.
operative practice, too (see section 7.4). Second, the co-operative value of member
democracy is to be exercised via representatives according to co-operative procedure.
However, in practice, members follow leaders. Third, the value of unitarism achieved
through common goals corresponds to Hofstede’s collective culture which is adaptable to
coop-eratives, whereas co-operative practice today involves several stakeholders: namely,
pluralistic interests.

Finally, the co-operative tradition of anti-capitalism and Hogeland’s culture of
service over profit are more espoused than actual values since there is still an emphasis on
profit-making in co-operative practice today. It is clearly shown that the co-operative’s
cultural values have little bearing or influence on co-operative practice. Worse, they only
bring about confusion, ambiguity, uncertainty and reluctance among members and leaders
in terms of their goal settings and actual performance. Kilmann et al (1985:187) argue that
the difference between values and practice (in discourse) is called the ‘culture gap’. This
is possibly the case here.

It is clearly shown in sections 7.2, 7.3, 7.4 and 7.5 and in Table 7.1 that selected
coo-operators overall still hold on to what worked in the past (desired behaviour): a
common goal concept and anti-profit making, instead of adapting to the present situation
(actual behaviour): pluralistic interest groups and profit-making objectives. The effect of
this contradiction is questionable and open to further debate. Nevertheless, these
contradictions between values and practice have two outcomes.

First, the majority of selected co-operators, and predictably a lot of others too, have
a strong commitment to co-operative traditional values for strengthening the co-operative
identity. Second, some co-operative values and principles contradict co-operative practice,
thus weakening co-operative identity. It is possible to classify these values according to
Selfridge and Sokolik’s (1975) Iceberg Value framework which is shown in Figure 7.1
below.

It is apparent that visible values are often emphasised during meetings, on bulletin
boards or as a set of guidelines for members to commit to and follow. An example of this
is the values and principles in the Identity of Statement (1995). While invisible values
were established and reinforced by early co-operators such as R Owen, they have become
embedded within a co-operative organisation that members, leaders and employees are not
even aware of. For example, despite the emphasis on democracy and leadership at all
levels, members still prefer to be guided by heroic leaders. It is possible that these
invisible values are strongly embedded within UK co-operatives and less so in others. For example, under the anti-capitalism finding, Charles Gide (France) and Dr. P J Warbasse (US) supported the idea of profit-making while others in the majority (mainly British) opposed it.

**Figure 7.1 Co-operative's Invisible and Visible Values**

Overall, both kinds of values contradict co-operative practice as mentioned earlier. Thus, there is an immediate need for co-operatives to do something about this, otherwise there may be further confusion and ambiguity among co-operative members and leaders in every step of their tasks and responsibilities. To solve the problematic values matter and be clearer about existing applications and interpretations in co-operative daily operation, they should either be 'separated' from or 'related' to co-operative management and strategy. There is no sense in imposing and reinforcing these values on co-operators if there is no actual strategy or procedure to apply them in actual practice.

It is possible that some values, possibly invisible ones, are there to remind members and co-operators of the fundamental purposes for which co-operatives were established. They can be treated as a pure story or an abstract and have no connection or relation to co-operatives in practice. It is possible to carry out more research on principle and value application, finding ways to apply some of these values such as member democracy and control of the co-operative management's daily operations. There is immediate need for attention to this incongruence between co-operative values and the
practice issue since having values and principles that are supposed to be a guide for co-operators but bear no significance or relevance to co-operators’ daily tasks could promote a sense of emptiness instead of a source of inspiration and hope. Also, it is important to tackle this issue soon as the longer the problem persists, the more permanently the effects will be embedded making it more and more difficult to solve.

7.7 Co-operative Inflexibility

The three textual analysis methods reveal that there exists a significant amount of optimism, confidence and activism. Content analysis’s Diction 5 indicates that the ‘optimism’ category was ‘the most cited’ category out of the existing five. This is supported by GI’s finding of ‘positive category’ as ‘the fourth most cited’ out of 25 chosen categories. Optimism, being open-minded and optimistic to new challenges is an excellent catalyst. In addition, Active category (GI) and Activism (Diction 5) support such optimism, suggesting a willingness to explore and seek out new challenges, (see subcategories of feature movement, change, the implementation of ideas and the avoidance of inertia). Similarly, under narrative analysis, attribution of emotion indicates strong evidence of self-confidence and optimism about the future which was found in over a quarter of co-operators including Thomas Hughes, A.W. Laidlow, J.W.T Mitchell, Sir Horace Plunkett, Isao Takamura and Terry Thomas. Furthermore, intertextuality identifies optimism in the majority of co-operators.

However, to be able to explore, experiment with and implement new concepts and strategies to exploit the competitive edge to keep up with the new technological advanced global market of the twenty-first century, a co-operative has to be adaptable and flexible in its structure and environment. This is supported by Michael Fulton addressing the need to ensure that members understand the economic forces impacting their co-operative, and how well they are positioned to respond to change (Wadsworth, 2002:23), while potential pitfalls arise when there is failure to change direction quickly (Rural Co-operatives, 2005:23).

Similarly, Douglas D Sims, CoBank’s CEO said that ‘we are continually looking for ways to deliver more value and adapt to our customers’ needs and to the market place. Adaptability has been key to our customers’ success and to CoBank’s’ (Rural Co-
Flexibility has also been emphasised among selected co-operators, as follows:

Management and administration must be very largely decentralised. Room must be made for the widest autonomy, and control must be as flexible as possible. These, of course, are practical problems which all co-operators and every leader will have to attempt to solve, not in a theoretical manner, but with reference to facts, and in the light of that experience which can be gained. (E. Poisson, 1925)

In order to fit into the great many situations in which co-operatives are being and will in the future be used, our interpretation of co-operative ideology must be abroad and flexible rather than narrow and stringent. But still there must be general agreement on essentials and inexpendable elements. In other words, what are the features without which an organisation cannot be considered a co-operative? We would assume, for example, that ‘democracy in ownership and control’ would be one such essential feature, although there may not be agreement on how to interpret and apply it. (A.W. Laidlow, 1980)

Poisson stresses flexibility in management control, that is, decentralisation and individual autonomy. Similar views are shared by many others such as Terry Thomas, Beatrice Webb, Raffeisien, Thomas Hughes, J.C. Gray, E.O. Greening, Dr. King, and Dr. Warbasse. A. Laidlow emphasises that ‘a co-operative needs to be more flexible in terms of its ideology, concepts and theories while stressing the importance of full commitment towards inexpendable values, and principles’. Both co-operators state the need for a greater degree of flexibility in both theory and direction of control. Laidlow’s ideological flexibility and principle inexpendability corresponds to Peter and Waterman’s (1992) Loose-Tight Properties where excellent companies are both centralised and decentralised and this could be the case too for co-operatives.

Overall, findings indicate that optimism and activism from selected co-operators require co-operatives to be more flexible and willing to adapt and adjust to new ideas and technology. However, to be flexible and able to adjust to changes, it is important to see how flexible a co-operative is in terms of structure, management and leadership. Therefore, I will identify contingency variables and causal connections between them. Table 7.2 summarises certain aspects that represent strong co-operative culture, the contingency variables and their degree of flexibility and inflexibility.

First, leadership style depends on variables such as geographical differences, communication between members and leaders, members’ skills and education, and member autonomy. According to Hofstede (2000), in Japan respect for seniority is expected of subordinates, and therefore the authoritative style of leadership is effective,
while in the USA, members require almost total autonomy and democracy from leaders. Given the tradition of the co-operative as a social and political movement and the early findings in section 7.2 of members' preferences for heroic figures, it is difficult to deny the importance of heroic figures. However, it is likely that the American (ideal) leader will grant members greater autonomy and freedom than the Japanese (ideal) leader would.

Thus, the tradition of ideal/charismatic leader would be there but members' autonomy and empowerment would be subject to his/her reinforcement. This could be related further to members' skills and education where highly skilled members are less dependent on leaders and therefore tend to exercise and reinforce their wants and needs in a more effective manner. Moreover, according to the findings from Diction 5 under the communication attribute, there was a shortcoming in communication and this is often the case in co-operatives. However, despite these variables, according to previous findings, members still prefer to be served and guided by leaders.

Table 7.2 Co-operative Contingency Variables of Inflexibility and Flexibility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Co-operative Context</th>
<th>Co-operative tradition/culture</th>
<th>Contingent variables discourse</th>
<th>Flexibility/Inflexibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>Charismatic leaders</td>
<td>Geographical differences. e.g., local, regional, national</td>
<td>Inflexible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Type of Societies</td>
<td>Inflexible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Communication channel between leaders and members</td>
<td>Inflexible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>Principles and values application</td>
<td>Effectiveness of principles and values application. e.g. democratic control</td>
<td>Inflexible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitments</td>
<td>Strong commitment (leaders and members)</td>
<td>Understanding, clarity, practicality and applicability of principles in reality</td>
<td>Inflexible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objectives</td>
<td>Social objectives</td>
<td>Leaders and Board Preference</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Stakeholders</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>External forces, such as state of economy, regulations, production technology and competitors</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Second, according to findings of contradiction between shared responsibility and democratic control for heroic figures who bear most of the responsibility, this shows that the applicability of co-operative principles and values in co-operative management is questionable. These values are applied (although there was never any instruction as to how) along with other factors that contradict them. An example is common goal (unitarism) while also having several different interest groups (pluralistic). Thus, it can be said that these values and principles are questionable in their applicability to co-operative management and could in fact cause further confusion as they contradict some of today’s practice in co-operatives.

Thirdly, according to the findings, co-operators strongly commit to values and principles (inflexible). For example, Laidlow (1980) states that ‘But still there must be general agreement on essentials and inexpendable elements. In other words, what are the features without which an organisation cannot be considered a co-operative? We would assume, for example, that ‘democracy in ownership and control’ would be one such essential feature, although there may not be agreement on how to interpret and apply it. He confirms that fundamental values such as democracy should be inexpendable elements. Finally, a co-operative’s long-term emphasis is on ‘social objectives’ and responsibility which nowadays depend largely on leaders preferences (against economic objectives), stakeholders’ influences and the external situation such as the rate of competition and the economic situation.

Overall, co-operative characteristics derived from its discourse are inflexible. Leadership and management in the end are obligated to the co-operative tradition of the heroic leader who guides members. While co-operative values and principles are strongly committed to by co-operators, whether they have full understanding of the purposes and relation of these values to actual practice is questionable. It is only co-operative objectives that can be flexible, as it is up to the very leader her/himself to decide, possibly depending on other stakeholders’ influence as well. The first three factors are dominated by strong co-operative tradition. However, from discourse, it is fair to say that communication channels and member autonomy tend to be more inflexible than flexible as it is mostly a scenario where there is a lack of communication and participation from members. Thus, in discourse, these factors also tend to be inflexible factors which is largely due to the over-optimism of co-operators, who believe that all their management strategies are impeccable and efficient and have no weaknesses.
According to Ogbonna and Harris (2002:781-3), strongly held values are appropriate only 'if' the culture is geared towards the external environment. Similarly, Barney (1991) and Holmstrom (1999:416) argue that for organisational culture to provide a source of sustainable competitive advantage, the culture must be ‘adaptable’ to external contingencies. In fact, the only aspect that has adjusted to external contingencies is the co-operative objective, that is, economic interests. Overall, invisible values are an unseen barrier, preventing co-operatives from adjusting to the external environment and changes. Despite the co-operators’ optimism and activism, it is questionable whether new concepts, ideas and changes can ever be introduced and implemented effectively and easily in co-operatives due to this strong cultural barrier.

There is a need for co-operatives to do something about their strong cultural barrier since it has acted as an obstruction to external environments, technology and global changes. Co-operatives’ lack of response to changes is one of the main reasons why they are often seen as being dated and too traditional. For example, they could begin by checking what other sectors are up to in terms of the latest issues, trends or marketing and technological opportunities, and then adapt accordingly.

Strong culture can have an effect at a subconscious level, obstructing co-operative performance from moving towards greater growth and development. According to Hogeland (2003), a co-operative has a culture that values the ‘small and personal’ over the ‘large and impersonal’. Hogeland’s (2003) outline of the cultural values of the co-operative, clearly shows that a co-operative prefers to act in a moderate manner and therefore would hesitate to take any kind of investment that might represent them as capitalistic, including profit maximisation and branch expansion.

Thus, there is persistent reluctance to make large financial deals as profit-maximisation seems to suggest an investment-led style. Therefore, reasonable profit is preferred without further growth or expansion, however, this is probably less the case for co-operative business organisations such as PLCs and joint ventures whose structure is almost the same as investment-led companies. It makes co-operatives unable to respond or adapt or even be aware of any external changes and this makes them inevitably and unconsciously rigid and inflexible. However, given today’s global changes and competition, every organisation has to take drastic steps in order to survive in the market. They need to be more aggressive, more innovative and invest more in technology and
development. This is supported by Chris Paterson\(^7\) who recently stated that co-ops, like their competitors, are being forced to innovate and it is important to implement innovative ideas constantly (Zeuli et al., 2005:4-5). Moreover, Migros Co-operatives has invested in excess of CHF 1.5 billion in modernising and centralising its distribution and logistics by piloting the new RFID technology (Latchezar, 2004: 29).

The whole discussion started off from the existing significant level of optimism that the majority of selected co-operators have which indicates a certain level of openness and willingness to explore and adapt to new ideas and strategies. This however seems to be obstructed by some invisible values and strong historical traditions that subconsciously prevent co-operatives from fully exploiting their resources or from being as explorative as they should be. Thus, there should be some readjustment of co-operative values and their application. They should take immediate action to adapt their strong traditions to external changes that may threaten the co-operative’s survival in today’s competitive market. However, as culture adjustment is difficult and complex, co-operators should seek help from outsiders who are likely to have a clearer and more objective view.

### 7.8 Co-operative Convergence

While co-operative values and principles tend to be fixed and rigid, contemporary management has been capitalising on these co-operative values and principles to exploit its uniqueness and competitive edge. This section examines the extent to which investment-led firms have tried to incorporate co-operative principles and values by comparing co-operative values and principles to co-operative actual practice, investment-led actual practice and investment-led theory.

Table 7.3 below outlines theory and practice in discourse of an investment-led company and a co-operative. Co-operative members benefit from facilities such as a library and a gym while the same also applies to the investment-led firm’s employees with the addition of pension funds. Evidently, Vodafone apart from its profit orientation\(^8\) has also recently introduced two new global health and safety standards thus reducing work-related lost-time accidents by over 20% since 2004.\(^9\)

\(^7\) Chris Paterson, a professor at Michigan State University
\(^8\) Vodafone with latest revenue increased from 26,678m (2004/5) to 29,350m pounds (20005/6) (Vodafone’s Performance and Summary Report, 2006) (http://www.vodafone.com).
Table 7.3 Comparison of Theory and Practice of Co-operative and Investment-Led Companies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Co-operative Theory (Values and Principles)</th>
<th>Co-operative Practice Discourse</th>
<th>Investment-led Theory Discourse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Member welfare orientation (human orientation)</td>
<td>Profit making and member welfare and interest</td>
<td>Profit and employee welfare (Truss et al, 1998); club members, pension funds and health and safety standard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member democracy</td>
<td>Heroic and paternalistic leader who guides and is responsible for most tasks and decision-making.</td>
<td>Transformational leadership; inspire and work as a team (Hartog et al, 1996) and Loose tight properties (Peter and Waterman, 1992) - decentralisation and employee empowerment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Ownership</td>
<td>Receive dividends, surplus and have one vote</td>
<td>Employee Share Ownership of firm (Cotton, 1996).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutuality (common goals)</td>
<td>Several stakeholders</td>
<td>Several stakeholder (pluralism)(Griffiths, 2003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-capitalism</td>
<td>Profit-making as one of the main objectives (see dual nature above)</td>
<td>Profit-making (Griffith, 2003)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Second, co-operative members have democratic control and ownership over their society, while investment-led companies stress decentralisation of power and employee empowerment. The co-operative emphasises servant and charismatic-type leaders (people over organisation) while investment-led companies emphasise transformational leadership (organisation over people). For example, current MTV and VH1 leader, Christina Norman who is perceived to be an inspirational leader under whose leadership MTV has won numerous advertising, design and promotion awards from Broadcast Design Association, Promax, the Cable & Telecommunication Association for Marketing and the Art Director’s Club (Umstead, 2006).¹⁰

Third, co-operative ownership is similar to investment-led firms in that co-operatives control society through voting and dividends in proportion to their patronage while investment-led companies allow employees to buy shares in their companies, for instance, McCarthy V McCarthy & Stone PLC [2006] where there exist employee share

¹⁰ http://www.multichannel.com/
option schemes (Stretch et al, 2006). Fourth, traditional unitaristic goals of the co-operative contradict co-operative practice where there exist several interest groups. The same also applies to investment-led companies’ theory and practice of pluralism. For example, Unilever Plc consists of several stakeholders including consumers, customers, suppliers, employees, environment and communities.12

Finally, despite the co-operative’s anti-capitalist culture that opposes profit-orientated activities operating under invest-led companies, in practice, two objectives are emphasised by co-operatives: profit making and social welfare. This however corresponds to findings from this research where a few co-operators such as Charles Gide and Dr. P J Warbasse support the idea of profit-making. Dr. Warbasse says that ‘from the current business standpoint, co-operatives sell at the market price and make a profit. This profit they pay as dividends to the stockholders...but in proportion to the patronage given to the business...’. Also, word counts show that economic descriptions are the second most cited. Overall, co-operative practice corresponds well with investment-led theory and practice while contradicting co-operative values.

The summary in the table indicates that investment-led firms are leaning towards a co-operative human-interest orientation attitude. Examples of this are their employee welfare objective and employee share scheme. On the other hand, co-operatives have been converging towards the capitalism and pluralism of investment-led companies with their profit-making objective and pluralistic interests. It is important to note that any changes within co-operatives that reflect similarities with investment-led firms do not always satisfy the co-operators who still hold the invisible value of anti-capitalism. However, overall, the gap between them is most likely to become smaller and smaller. In short, it could be said that the co-operative is caught between committing to its values and trying to adjust to the external requirements of being profitable, innovative and effective.

Co-operatives and investment-led companies have converged to the point that they virtually share the same features and characteristics mentioned above: employee democracy and empowerment, human orientated values, profit-making objectives and

11 Recently, McCarthy v McCarthy & Stone plc [2006] have been involved in an Employee Share Scheme dispute and are waiting for a High Court decision on whether its remuneration committee had appropriately exercised its discretion under a share option scheme when it prevented a former employee from exercising his option in full even though the performance targets for his option had been fully satisfied (See Mondaq Website, http://www.mondaq.com).

pluralistic interests. Furthermore, in terms of convergence, the co-operative ideas of members sharing ownership or the loyalty system have been adopted as a popular marketing strategy by many investment-led companies such as Boots, Sainsbury and Debenhams. These companies use a ‘Loyalty card’ where returns are based on consumers/members’ patronage and transactions at the stores. This practice is much like the co-operative’s idea of dividend and surplus distribution.

Therefore, this questions the difference between co-operatives now and other companies such as Debenhams and Boots. Does such convergence between co-operatives and others indirectly weaken co-operative identity? What should be done to regain co-operative identity? Should it be done soon? And how? It is ironic that while all these ideas were established long before by co-operatives, those who are actually exploiting them for competitive advantage are outsiders. Again, could co-operative culture prevent itself from losing these competitive advantages?

7.9 Summary

Seven main findings are significant to this research. First, a co-operative has a strong tradition of heroic/charismatic leaders but interestingly contradicts this principle in terms of member democratic control and ownership. Second, the majority of selected co-operators put emphasis on commonality and unitarism which contradicts the actual existence of co-operative pluralism: there are several groups of stakeholders. Third, the findings indicate dual social and economic objectives, though the former outweighs the latter. Fourth, a persistent anti-capitalist attitude is obvious among selected co-operators which somehow again contradicts the co-operative’s dual objectives. Fifth, it was found that co-operative practice contradicts co-operative values, representing a culture gap within co-operatives. Sixth, it was found that co-operators are optimistic and active in exploring and experimenting with new ideas; however such enthusiasm has been obstructed by the co-operative’s strong cultural barriers. Finally, there is a convergence between the practices of co-operative and investment-led firms; consequently, the gap between them is closing.

The findings summary above has outlined seven main findings that bear significant importance to co-operatives. Their contributions will be outlined and discussed in the next

13 See footnote (8), Example of Vodafone.
chapter along with the methodological contribution, findings' implications, ongoing challenges and possible future studies and concluding comments on this research.
CONCLUSIONS

8.1 Introduction

This research is distinctive insofar as the discursive study has been carried out on co-operative texts (by the use of the multi-textual analysis method). The discourse analysis approach has rarely been recognised within the co-operative area, especially as an effective research methodology. Co-operative establishment and context are deeply rooted in social and political history with information and data being recorded mainly in documentary sources such as journals, documents, literary works, reports and diaries. This is why the discourse analysis methodology is one of the most suitable approaches for the study of co-operatives as it focuses on written sources, stories, narratives and speeches (talk and text).

This chapter draws conclusions from the findings that have been presented in Chapters 4, 5 and 6 and relates them to the set of research questions outlined in Chapter 3. It will provide a commentary on both the literature and methodological contributions, followed by implications in the co-operative context. In addition, I will present ongoing challenges for co-operative organisations and identify possible areas for further study.

8.2 Reconceptualising Co-operative Leadership

The primary contribution of this section directly addresses questions (1) and (2) from chapter 3 that largely relate to issues of co-operative leadership. Namely, Q1) What philosophies underpin co-operative ideology, concepts, culture and values (including the
implications for leadership and management style)? and Q2) What contemporary leadership discourse has been disseminated to the co-operative sector?

Findings from narrative analysis and intertextual analysis indicate a strong embedding of co-operative history, traditions, values and principles and their reinforcement in co-operative practice involving management and leadership. There is a strong preference for heroic figures, common goals (unitarism), anti-capitalism and democratic control. Co-operatives focus on the issues of equality, social justice, honesty, unity and mutuality as concepts intrinsic to the notion of a co-operative. With a tradition of strong social and political movement, co-operative members prefer to be guided and served by ideal leaders whom they perceive as being charismatic and heroic (as well as paternalistic and service-orientated).

The two methods previously also indicate a strong emphasis on individualistic figures, that is, 'charismatic' and 'heroic' figures. Generally, according to content analysis, these ideal leaders are optimistic, active, determined and highly confident. Findings indicate that most members prefer desirable leaders to guide them to a better future. It is questionable whether such behaviour is conscious or unconscious. However, the notion of cult/heroic/charismatic leader contradicts co-operative principles and values of democracy and shared responsibility, respectively.

Findings strongly indicate that power lies mainly with leaders who bear many tasks and responsibilities such as planning policy and strategy, handling daily management operations, reinforcing and shaping values and principles and applying them to co-operative management. This, however, contradicts the co-operative value of shared responsibility. Findings further reveal that such a leader does not always reflect the members' concerns and interests, probably due to a lack of communication (revealed by content analysis). Thus, not only does such leadership style contradict the shared responsibility value of the co-operative, it also poorly reflects the democratic control principle of members.

Nevertheless, the notion of heroic figures has been persistently favoured by co-operators up until the present due to its strong adherence to the tradition of paternalistic leadership. Unfortunately, heroic/charismatic leaders have limitations. Their tenure may be temporary (frequent change of job and department). In addition, they are difficult to identify (and even more difficult to get rid of if they are bad). Too much power often leads
to activities that undermine the co-operative values of honesty and mutuality (see examples in Chapter 2, p. 18).

One alternative is transformational leadership. However, given poor communications, centralisation of power (by heroic leaders) and average inspiration, the effect of transformational leadership is minimal. Servant leadership can again raise the issue of equal responsibility among co-operative members and leaders. This is because leaders are there to serve members. Ideal leaders of co-operatives, according to the findings, seem to be a mixture of heroic and servant leaders, expected to both serve and guide. However, one promising contemporary leadership style that is congruent with co-operative principles and values is ‘distributed leadership’ where individuals at all levels in an organisation could influence the direction of the organisation (Bolden, 2004:13).

The approach aims to produce a culture that encourages high levels of integrity, creativity, imagination, care and collective ambition for ‘excellence’ (Ibid, p. 13), thus encouraging high levels of commitment, involvement and participation that match co-operative values. Thus, such leadership style matches perfectly to co-operative purposes and values. This style of leadership can help to further prevent the issue of ‘inappropriate leaders’ that has been rather an embarrassment to co-operatives. Co-operatives are perceived to strongly represent morale and unity among members and leaders, and for that, their leaders’ commitment should be impeccable.

It is likely that many non-profit organisations might have been facing similar situations where they rely on the guidance, inspiration and commitment of one individual. However, these non-profits do not have such an obligation to adhere to moral standards, therefore, having heroic leaders is in fact not perceived as drawbacks and does not contradict their rules of conduct in any way. However, one particular form of non-profit organisation, that is, social enterprise has to some extent adopted democratic control (to a lesser degree than co-operatives) and share of responsibilities, where members do have ‘some’ say in decision-making (Thompson and Doherthy, 2006).

Thus, for any form of organisation that allows democratic control by its employees, a preference for charismatic leaders would appear to contradict their democratic values. However, Mort et al (2002) propose that social entrepreneurship is a ‘behavioural characteristic’ and stress that leaders can be trained to exhibit certain behaviour so that they can become better leaders (Bryman, 1992:4), rather than choosing leaders for their charismatic qualities (Dee, 1998). SEs therefore share the same concern
as co-operatives for the importance of training and education (Wilson, 1998; Baarda, 2002; Wadsworth, 2004).

However, to what extent should the contradiction between the notion of heroic leaders and shared responsibility and democratic control be perceived as problematic since co-operatives have been operated for over a hundred years with such a leadership style without such issues being raised? It is possible that such a contradiction has been ignored as it is perceived to be of little detriment to co-operatives. However, values that contradict practice can create tensions, either hidden or apparent, particularly to members and employees. Perhaps there is a need to reconceptualise co-operative leadership if the co-operative wants to encourage greater democracy, maybe more investment in education and training that would eventually enable members to become more engaged, enthusiastic and therefore wanting to gain more control of management and leadership. However, any attempts are rather daunting as the co-operative has been strongly constructed in a ‘follow the leader’ tradition. Members still favour heroic leaders to guide and serve them regardless of their downsides.

8.3 Rethinking Co-operative Principles, Values and Management

A further contribution can be divided into two themes. The first theme is that of co-operative principles and values which is related to question 3 in Chapter 3, *How does the discourse of co-operative management differ from that of mainstream organisations (non-co-operative organisations)*? The second theme is of co-operative convergence, related to question 4 in Chapter 3, *What is the relationship between the contemporary co-operative practices and traditional co-operative discourse*?

8.3.1 Co-operative principles and values

Referring to question 3 above which addresses the management of co-operatives, the findings from three textual analyses (content analysis, narrative analysis and intertextual analysis) indicate a contradiction between co-operative principles and values. One example illustrated above indicates a conflict between heroic figures and the values of shared responsibility. The word count of content analysis reveals the strong social purpose of co-operatives contradicting their practice of dual objectives where commercial interests (profit-making) are included. The existence of dual objectives makes it difficult for a manager to maintain a balance between the two, as achieving more in one means
failing in the other. It is again questionable whether co-operatives should continue to espouse only one goal (human interest); so profit making becomes a sideline or vice versa.

However, the narrative findings indicate strong opposition to capitalism (profit-making), labelling it a 'villain' despite the fact that profit-making is inevitable in co-operative practice and in fact is one of the main objectives at present. Intertextual analysis reveals a strong emphasis on unitarism that worked well in the past but at present does not apply to co-operatives consisting of several interest groups. In short, the findings indicate a strong commitment to co-operative values and principles whereas actions described in the discourse indicate otherwise. This raises the question of whether a 'culture gap' exists within the co-operative. How big is the gap? How can we resolve this incongruence and is it a cause of present confusion and ineffectiveness for co-operative management? Has the problem been recognised or has it been ignored due to over enthusiasm and commitment to traditional values and principles?

Related issues also involve the application of these values and principles to co-operative management. Co-operators try to apply them to co-operative management, but since values and practice completely contradict each other, this brings into question the extent of the relevance and connection of these values to co-operative management. If this is the case, do co-operators really understand the meaning of these values and principles? Is it better to separate them from co-operative management and use them simply as a spiritual guide for the movement?

In comparison to other non-profit organisations and business organisations, co-operative values and principles seem to provide more complication than benefits for their management and operation. As mentioned in Chapter 2, the board has the responsibility of preserving the unique character of co-operatives (Baarda, 2002). Thus, co-operatives in terms of management and leadership have burdened themselves with extra requirements and demands where other non-profit organisations have the simple choice of whether to rely on donations (charities and foundations) or to make profits (business organisations and social enterprises (profits first to fund social missions)). Social enterprises have always clearly presented their priority of seeking business solutions to social problems (Thompson and Doherty, 2006) and similarly, of trading for social purposes (Kasim and Hudson, 2006). Their emphasis is on the importance of being financially sustainable as their first objective in order to effectively achieve their social goals, whereas for co-operatives it is the other way round. Thus, overall, other non-profit organisations have one
main clear objective while co-operatives are burdening themselves with multi-objectives. Achieving one objective is already difficult, but for co-operatives to achieve three seems almost impossible: social gains, value commitment and profitability.

It is important to note that in general whenever organisations aim to be involved with more than one objective, it is highly possible that one will eventually outweigh the other. Thus, the fact that co-operatives and social enterprises consist of dual character, social and commercial, it is likely that this would be the case. For instance, if they were to prioritise mainly social activities, the question of financial sustainability would also arise, and if their main focus was on financial activities, their dedication and commitment to social purposes would also be questioned. It is always difficult to achieve or maintain the right balance between dual objectives, even though such a notion can mutually benefit both social and market economy.

However, with the difficulty of attempting to change traditional values, it is more realistic for co-operatives to shift their practice towards capitalistic behaviour which is necessary and essential to the co-operative’s profitability and development. It seems that co-operatives fear losing their identity if they are to engage in any form of capitalistic practice that exists in investment-led firms. It is important for them to be aware that by engaging in any practice they consider investment-led orientated does not necessarily indicate that they are no longer co-operative. In fact it is important that co-operators should realise that economic motivation was also part of the co-operatives’ purpose and objectives, since what previous co-operative founders and leaders attempted to do was to rescue those who had weak economic status from social and economic exploitation. It is important to tackle this issue soon as the longer the problem persists, the more permanently the effect will be embedded, making it harder to solve.

8.3.2 Co-operative convergence

Referring to management question (4) above, content analysis findings indicate strong optimism, activism and confidence among selected co-operators. Narrative analysis and intertextual analysis indicate emphasis on the need to be more flexible in terms of ideology, concepts and theories, though values and principles should not be considered expendable. However, despite co-operative optimism and enthusiasm from selected co-operators towards co-operatives’ being more flexible and adaptable, the summary of co-operative structure (objectives, leadership, management and commitment) indicates that
the majority of them are inflexible except with regard to objectives. This is because recently co-operators have become more committed to profit-making as one of their main objectives. Some authors, such as Fairbairn (2003:1), argue that co-operatives are highly ‘adaptable’ and complex institutions. His statement is rather questionable since if the co-operative is adaptable, how could it be complex? This indicates over-enthusiasm and optimism of co-operators in view of the fact that many co-operative objectives and values are unclear and often contradict each other, leading to further confusion within co-operative management.

It was found that four factors (leadership, management, objectives and commitment) are still largely influenced by co-operative culture and tradition. These include cult leader, a ‘follow the leader’ pattern of members, commonality that neglects the co-operative’s reality of pluralism, and the continuing anti-capitalist attitude which opposes profit-making. Optimism and enthusiasm for flexibility is being hindered by strong cultural barriers that prevent the co-operative from adjusting to any kind of changes.

Resistance to change can be expected from co-operators and members. It is possible that there is a fear factor involved and that change has been introduced improperly given the unsuitable co-operative environment. Holmstorm (1999:416) argues that co-operatives will continue to have distinct competitive advantages if they are alert to changes in the economic environment. Nevertheless, the findings indicate that co-operative identity has been weakened via a convergence between the co-operative itself and others: namely investment-led and public firms.

Investment-led companies since the 1980s have paid special attention to employee welfare and benefits (e.g. pension funds and club members). This is consistent with the evolution of soft HRM. Also, they have exploited the co-operative’s competitive edges such as member ownership. Cases in point are the Employee Share Scheme and consumer loyalty schemes where advantages or free credits are given on the basis of an individual’s patronage (e.g. Boots, Debenhams, House of Frasers and many other retail companies). Co-operatives, on the other hand, are tending towards the model of investment-led companies where profit-making is one of its main objectives and where interests have become increasingly pluralistic instead of unitaristic.
It seems that both co-operative and investment-led firms favour a charismatic/heroic figure to inspire, guide and motivate them, though co-operatives to a large extent require such a leader to be paternalistic and service-orientated, too. This shows that overall, investment-led firms have become increasingly human-orientated with an emphasis on employee empowerment and co-operation, that is, converging towards the co-operative model. Co-operatives on the other hand, have become increasingly aware of the importance of financial gain as a way to survive in the competitive global market and allow further development and improvement, converging towards the investment-led model.

Evidently, Bob Yuill (2006), a senior project manager from Scottish Agricultural Societies said that ‘I dislike when I hear people say, co-ops aren’t about making money. It’s dishonest. Otherwise they are bankrupt’. Thus, it is possible that at a practical level, ‘some’ co-operators do understand the essence of profitability for the survival of co-operatives but, formally, in particular where public image is concerned, they do not want to associate themselves with any form of commercial activities, preferring to be perceived solely as social organisations. There is further evidence of such convergence where there has been a transformation of some existing co-operatives towards Public Limited Companies, that is, new generation co-operatives (Nilsson et al, 1997; Harte, 1997; Cross and Buccola, 2004). Interestingly, another form of non-profits, Social Enterprises, share similar characteristics with this new generation of co-operatives where they both aim to be financially and socially thriving.

Consequently, the gap between co-operatives and private and public firms is closing and this directly weakens co-operative identity. This raises many questions. For example, how different are co-operatives from other forms of organisation now? What should they do to regain co-operative identity? Should it be done? And if so how? Could co-operative values and principles reinforced by co-operative leaders prevent co-operatives from exploiting their own competitive edges?

It can be concluded that the factors which have caused co-operative management ineffectiveness are strong traditions that are responsible for co-operative structural inflexibility. This is because a co-operative is caught between committing to its values and principles while attempting to adjust itself to others in order to be able to respond to the external environment including market conditions and changes in government policy. This
is also the reason why co-operatives are perceived to be dated since they feel too comfortable in their own environment.

8.4 Methodological Contribution

Using three textual analysis methods in conjunction with each other allows a more thorough analysis of speeches, yielding a greater number of significant findings from this research. Thus, the multi-textual analysis method produces a synergistic outcome to this research where the effect of three different textual methods being used in conjunction with each other produces an outcome that is greater than had only one textual method been applied (see further detail later in this section). Also, this provides a contribution in the area of textual analysis as it highlights the benefit of applying multi-method approaches (i.e. three textual analysis methods have been used in conjunction with each other).

Each textual analysis method has a different focus and an emphasis on different levels of analysis which therefore provide different angles of findings. First, content analysis focuses on fragments of text (micro level analysis), that is words and sentences in order to quantify each word’s number of citations, and eventually classify them into different word categories (themes). The analysis provides distribution and prevalence of key words and concepts from speeches (text). Second, narrative analysis focuses on the whole text (meso level analysis), treating it as a story and trying to identify causes of action that contribute to the outcome, characteristics, motives, heroes, villains and so on that exist within the text in order to interpret the underlying meanings of the story. Finally, intertextual analysis focuses on clusters of texts, that is, 23 speeches (macro level analysis), trying to identify possible connections and relationships between co-operators. It can also investigate patterns of similar sentiments, concepts and theories across different co-operators and times.

Using the techniques in combination, the three methods also contribute additional factors or identify possible hidden meanings behind findings that would be lacking had one of the three methods not been adopted. The first example is a combination between narrative analysis and intertextual analysis. Narrative analysis identifies that a majority of heroes are ‘past co-operative founders and leaders’ while intertextual analysis further indicates changes in this pattern, from past leaders such as R Owen and Dr. King (at the start of the co-operative era) towards those such as chairmen, board members and managers (beginning of the twenty-first century).
Another example is in Chapter 7, section 7.5, where narrative analysis classifies capitalism as a villain and intertextual analysis indicates that strong anti-capitalism has been shared widely among selected co-operators since R. Owen’s time (1771-1855) up until E. Poisson (1925). However, content analysis indicates a reasonable level of word citations that are related to the business and commercial fields which help to support the prospect of the co-operative’s dual social and commercial responsibilities.

The results from Diction 5 (content analysis) reveal ‘commonality’ to be the second most cited word category, indicating agreed-upon values of a group. This corresponds to the intertextual findings of an emphasis on collectivism, unity, solidarity and self-help that has been reinforced and shared widely among selected co-operators. The narrative analysis’s attribution of unity indicates that generally co-operators do refer to one unified group of ‘working class’.

Combining all three methods triples the scope of finding interpretations whereas using one method can only reveal one angle/aspect. In short, the combination of three methods multiplies the effects of the other(s) rather than merely adding to them, producing a synergistic outcome to this research. The synergetic outcome is illustrated by Figure 8.1. The diagram shows that each method reveals only one angle. For example, if a researcher uses only content analysis, findings will only be interpreted and revealed within angle B. If narrative analysis and intertextual analysis are used, the outcome would represent the area of A and C. However, if three methods are used in conjunction with each other, the outcome from them is not just (A+B+C) but instead the whole area of the triangle, A+B+C+D. This is because the D area represents the ‘synergistic effects’: additional insights that result from collective usage of the three textual analysis methods.

Figure 8.1 Synergy Effects from Multi-Textual Analysis
Adopting the three multi-methods where three aspects findings provide a synergetic effect allows findings to be interpreted in more aspects and in at least three ways. Using one less method would highlight fewer aspects of findings that could have been further explored and this can affect the findings’ interpretation.

Apart from the contribution that this study has made to the field of discourse analysis, another core contribution from this study is the demonstration of the credibility and the merit of multi-textual method research. The multi-textual analysis used in this study offers a contribution in the area of textual analysis. Moreover, the multi-textual method ensures a considerable degree of validity and reliability for this research study. It involves both the qualitative and the quantitative approach, a system of triangulation which according to Jick (1979) would neutralise any bias from sources, investors and methods.

Under triangulation (using multiple methods), Brannen (2002:11) further argues that the ‘within method’ (same method used on different occasions) involves cross-checking for internal consistency or ‘reliability’ while the ‘between method’ (different methods but same objectives) tests the degree of external validity. Here a multi-textual method is considered as both the ‘same’ (textual analysis) and ‘different’ methods (using different analytical processes), and therefore provides reliability and validity for this research study and findings.

Each textual analysis method focuses on a different level of discourse analysis; micro (words and themes), meso (story and narrative) and macro (connection between authors and similarities or differences that they share). Findings can be interpreted on an individual basis and on a collective basis; on a collective basis, the multi-method analysis produced a synergetic outcome (area D) that allows greater interpretation of possibilities and angles than one method would have provided.

8.5 Concluding Remarks

The co-operative is a complex form of organisation based on strong values and principles. The multi-textual method was used here to explore and identify the role of these values and principles in the co-operative and suggests possibilities for future related research. The discourse analysis methodology has proven an effective tool for investigating and exploring many aspects of the co-operative context such as its roots,
purposes, objectives, values and beliefs based on historical events, narratives, stories and discourse.

This discursive study of the social construction of the co-operative points to three main necessities that co-operatives will have to further explore and investigate in order to be more competitive and effective in the free market. The study strongly suggests the reconceptualisation of co-operative leadership. More specifically, there is a need to rethink the traditional notion of ‘heroic leader’ type that co-operative members favour. Does it reflect the co-operative’s democratic control principle and does it facilitate the co-operative’s success and prosperity? An alternative to this would be to adopt the distributed leadership approach where leadership is exercised at all levels. By providing increased training and education to members, the co-operative would be less dependent on the leader and better able to make their members’ voices heard and allow them to exercise their rights and control. However, it is often the case that after receiving a reasonable amount of training and education, young co-operators may not stay with the co-operatives, instead joining other private and public firms.

Second, general or ideal co-operative values and principles are expected to influence largely co-operative daily life, management and leadership at all levels, including conceptual, spiritual and practical. However, the outcomes of this study indicate that values and principles of co-operatives contradict the practice and instead they are most likely to have an effect on the conceptual and the spiritual, particularly when related to ideas of unity, mutuality and social justice. At present, there is a tremendous involvement of co-operatives with commercial interests and these values largely contradict such interests. On the other hand, interestingly, investment-led companies have become increasingly concerned with employee welfare and co-operation, that is, becoming more human-orientated. Thus, this shows that co-operatives are increasingly converging towards an investment-led style of management serving several groups of interests and becoming more profit-orientated regardless of their awareness.

It could be said that the co-operative is caught between committing to its values and trying to adjust to the external requirements of being profitable, innovative and effective. It can be summarised that the social construction of the phenomena points to a rethink of assumptions about the operation, philosophies and values of the co-operative, and to what extent they are advantageous and applicable to modern day co-operatives.
This further raises an issue of whether there should be a clear protocol and procedure to assist application of these values and principles.

However, it seems difficult or almost impossible to impose any kind of guidelines on or restrictions to the application of factors such as values and principles. In general, they indicate that the moral and ethical ground that co-operators should hold in relation to their work, cannot be translated into the practical. Thus, it is most likely that the idea of co-operative management, where values and principles are being translated into its daily routine and operation, seems rather too vague or bears little relevance to its actual working practice. It is necessary for co-operatives to review the notion of management to provide clearer and more constructive grounds and meanings applicable to the co-operative working environment. Co-operative management itself has been built on unstable foundations.

It seems that on the practical level co-operatives are more understanding and accepting of commercial activities but on the surface concerning public image, co-operatives are afraid of losing their identities by associating with any commercial activities and therefore rather present themselves as solely social organisations, consisting of one main objective, that is, social interest. This apparently suggests that co-operatives need a solution to help break through this uncertainty and hesitation. There is a possibility of encouraging co-operatives to be more familiar and more accepting towards profitability. Recent ‘emergence of social enterprises’ to a reasonable extent has shown that for many other non-profit organisations, profit-making and social objectives are compatible and go well with each other. They can act as a bridge between the co-operative or possibly many social organisations and the business model. However, the notion of SEs is still new and further research and empirical study are needed to confirm whether such forms of organisations work practically and theoretically.

It is likely that co-operatives and SEs can learn from each other since co-operatives have years of social experience and SEs are new, and therefore experimental, optimistic and bear no discrimination against business solutions for social problems. Second, SEs are largely similar to co-operatives, being also partly governed democratically by members, thus both allow for generating a suitable democratic governance model rather than relying on charismatic leaders. Third, as SEs engage equally in terms of profitability and social activities, they may in the future offer solutions for co-operatives on how to merge these two aspects together at both a practical and a conceptual level, solving the previous
problem of the contradiction between practice and values and principles. Fourth, they also share similar challenges in recruiting new talents, and finally, they can both benefit from a pool of resources through working to generate more constructive concepts of management and leadership that they are currently lacking.

Overall, findings indicate problems that co-operatives inherited from permanent deep-seated traditions and values that, being generated by previous founders and leaders, are in reality incongruent to co-operative practice in discourse. This would almost certainly create some tension and confusion among members and management in co-operatives where co-operators have chosen to ignore the matter as it is easier or less problematic to do so. It is advisable for co-operators to be more understanding and accepting in their attitudes towards capitalism since this is essential to co-operatives’ developments and prosperity. This provides room for further research into this matter, that is, a study and investigation of how these tensions are being unfolded or managed daily by co-operators. Such a topic can be investigated and researched in application across types of co-operatives and different countries, which could even be further considered another comparative study.

Having suggested that co-operatives need to reconsider some of their notions and assumptions, it is however unlikely those values can be adjusted easily. This is because they have been strongly embedded by its historicity and reinforced by prominent founders and leaders and particular continue to benefit co-operators at conceptual and spiritual levels. Thus, for values and principles, an ideal alternative would be for co-operatives to necessarily retain certain values that strengthen co-operative identity (i.e. uniqueness) such as collective community-based, democratic leadership and responsibility while relaxing values that contradict their current operations, such as anti-capitalism. However, many non-profit organisations, particularly social enterprises, are great eye-openers for co-operatives, promising business solutions for social problems. Also, they share similar challenges to co-operatives and therefore have more than one party working on the same problems, allowing a greater chance of finding successive solutions.
APPENDIX 1:

CO-OPERATIVE

IDENTITY STATEMENT

Values
Co-operatives are based on the values of self-help, democracy, equality, equity and solidarity. Co-operative members believe in the ethical values of honesty, openness, social responsibility, and caring for others.

Principles

1. Voluntary and Open Membership
Co-operatives are voluntary organisations open to all persons able to use their services and willing to accept the responsibilities of membership without gender, social, racial, political or religious discrimination.

2. Democratic Member Control
Co-operatives are democratic organisations controlled by their members who actively participate in setting policies and making decisions. Men and women serve as elected representatives accountable to the members. In primary co-operatives members have equal voting rights (one member, one vote) and co-operatives at other levels are also organised in a democratic manner.
3. **Member Economic Participation**

Members contribute equitably to and control the capital of their co-operative. They usually receive limited compensation, if any, on capital subscribed as a condition of membership. Members allocate surpluses for any or all of the following purposes: developing the co-operative; benefiting members in proportion to their transactions with the co-operative; and supporting other activities as approved by the membership and particularly those activities related to goals arising from principles 5, 6, and 7.

4. **Autonomy and Independence**

Co-operatives are autonomous, self-help organisations controlled by their members. If they enter into agreements with other organisations (including governments) or raise capital from external sources, they do so on terms that ensure democratic control by the members and maintain their co-operative independence.

5. **Education, Training and Information**

Co-operatives provide education and training for their members, elected representatives, managers, and employees so they can contribute effectively to the development of their co-operatives in economic, governance, social and cultural terms. They inform the general public - particularly young people and opinion leaders – about the nature and benefits of co-operation.

6. **Co-operation among Co-operatives**

Co-operatives serve their members most effectively and strengthen the co-operative movement by working together through local, national, regional and international structures.

This remain a highly problematic as a principle practice of co-operatives is their reluctance to enter into trade procurement involving a sharing type collaboration in advance of a crisis.

7. **Concerns for Community**

While focusing on member needs and wishes, co-operatives work for the sustainable development of their communities.
APPENDIX 2:

GI’s 23 WORD CATEGORIES

Two large valence categories (new)

1. Positiv 1,915 words of positive outlook. (It does not contain words for yes, which has been made a separate category of 20 entries.)

2. Negativ 2,291 words of negative outlook (not including the separate category no in the sense of refusal).

Harvard IV-4 categories:

3. Strong 1902 words implying strength.

   A subset of 689 words are tagged Power, indicating a concern with power, control or authority.

4. Weak 755 words implying weakness.

   A subset of 284 words are also tagged Submit, connoting submission to authority or power, dependence on others, vulnerability to others, or withdrawal.

5. Active 2045 words implying an active orientation.

6. Passive 911 words indicating a passive orientation
Words reflecting the language of a particular "institution"

These categories reflect a sociological perspective, especially as reflected in the writings of Talcott Parsons. A high score reflects use of the language of that institution, talking like a lawyer, professor, or military officer.

7. **Econ@** 510 words of an economic, commercial, industrial, or business orientation, including roles, collectivities, acts, abstract ideas, and symbols, including references to money. Includes names of common commodities in business.

8. **Polit@** 263 words having a clear political character, including political roles, collectivities, acts, ideas, ideologies, and symbols.

Caution: There is also a **POLIT** broader category of 507 words that is used in disambiguation.

Words referring to roles, collectivities, rituals, and forms of interpersonal relations, often within one of these institutional contexts.

9. **COLL** 191 words referring to all human collectivities (not animal). Used in disambiguation.

Motivation-related words:

10. **Means** 244 words denoting objects, acts or methods utilised in attaining goals. Only 16 words overlap with Lasswell dictionary 77-word category **MeansLw**.

11. **Complett** 81 words indicating that goals have been achieved, apart from whether the action may continue. The termination of action is indicated by the category **Finish**.

12. **Fail** 137 words indicating that goals have not been achieved.
New categories based on social cognition: work of G. Semin (Univ. Sussex) and K. Fiedler (Univ. Giessen)

See *J. of Personality and Social Psychology*, 1988, 54, 558-568 for details.

16 Verb types.

13. **IAV** 1947 verbs giving an interpretative explanation of an action, such as 'encourage, mislead, flatter'.

14. **SV** 102 state verbs describing mental or emotional states. Usually detached from specific observable events, such as 'love, trust, abhor'.

**Power**: A valuing of having the influence to affect the policies of others.

15. **PowCoop** = Power cooperation, 118 words for ways of cooperating

16. **PowAuPt** = Power authoritative participants, 134 words for individual and collective actors in the power process

17. **PowPt** = Power ordinary participants, 81 words for non-authoritative actors (such as followers) in the power process.

18. **PowTot** = 1,266 words for the whole domain

**Rectitude** is concerned with moral values and has fewer subcategories:

19. **RcEthic** = Ethics, 151 words of values concerning the social order.

**Well-being** refers, according to Lasswell, to the "health and safety of the organism".

20. **WlbPhys** = 226 words connoting the physical aspects of well being, including its absence.
21. $WlbPsyc = 139$ words connoting the psychological aspects of well-being, including its absence.

Remaining Lasswell dictionary categories not specific to one of the value domains.

22. $SureLw = 175$ words indicating 'a feeling of sureness, certainty and firmness.'

23. $If = 132$ words 'denoting feelings of uncertainty, doubt and vagueness.'
APPENDIX 3:

DICTION 5’S MASTER VARIABLES

1. Diction 5’s Master Variables

1.1 Certainty
Score Type: Calculated
Additive Variables: Tenacity, Leveling Terms, Collectives, Insistence
Subtractive Variables: Numerical Terms, Ambivalence, Self-Reference, Variety
Mode of Calculation: 8 sets of standardised scores

Formula of Certainty:

1.2 Optimism
Score Type: Calculated
Additive Variables: Praise, Satisfaction, and Inspiration
Subtractive Variables: Blame, Hardship, and Denial
Mode of Calculation: 6 sets of standardised scores

Formula of Optimism:
= [Praise + Satis. + Inspir.] - [Blame + Hard. +Denial]
1.3 Realism
Score Type: Calculated
Additive Variables: Familiarity, Spatial Awareness, Temporal Awareness, Present Concern, Human Interest, Concreteness
Subtractive Variables: Past Concern, Complexity
Mode of Calculation: 8 sets of standardised scores

Formula of Realism:

1.4 Activity
Score Type: Calculated
Additive Variables: Aggression, Accomplishment, Communication, Motion
Subtractive Variables: Cognitive Terms, Passivity, Embellishment
Mode of Calculation: 7 sets of standardised scores

Formula of Activity:

1.5 Commonality
Score Type: Calculated
Additive Variables: Centrality, Cooperation, Rapport
Subtractive Variables: Diversity, Exclusion, Liberation
Mode of Calculation: 6 sets of standardised scores

Formula of Commonality


URL: http://cbae.nmsu.edu/~dboie/papers/narrative_methods_intro.htm


Chandler, D (1994), 'Semiotics for beginners',
URL: http://www.aber.ac.uk/media/Documents/S4B/semiotic.html.

Chandler, D (2001), 'The Grammar of Televisions and Films', *Images and Text*, URL: 
www.aber.ac.uk/media/Documents/short/gramtv.html.


Chouliaraki, L (1998), Regulation in Progressivist Pedagogic Discourse: individualized 

Ciriec (2000), *The Enterprise and Organisations of the Third System*, University of Liege, 
Ciriec.

Clegg, Stewart R (1975), *Power, Rule and Domination: a critical and empirical 
understanding of power in sociological theory and organisational life*, Routledge and 

Cochran, D M. (1953), ‘Three new Brazilian frogs’, *Herpetologica*, Vol. 8, No. 4, p. 111-
115.


Union Ltd.

Collinson, D L (1988), 'Engineering humour: Masculinity, joking and conflict in shop 

Collinson, D L and Hearn J (1994), ‘Naming men as men: Implications for Work, 
Organization and Management, *Gender, Work and Organization*, Vol 1. No. 1, p.2-
22.

Comte, Auguste (1896), *The Positive Philosophy of Auguste Comte*. (Translated and 

Conger, J A (1989), *The Charismatic Leader: Behind the Mystique of Exceptional 


Conger, J A and Kanungo, R N and associates (1988), *Charismatic Leadership: The 
Elusive Factor in Organizational Effectiveness*, forward by Warren Bennis, Jossey-

Conte, M and Tannenbaum, A S (1978), ‘Employee Owned the Companies: Is the 


Curtis, W (Ed) (1988), Revelations: A collection of gay male coming out stories, Alyson, Boston, MA


Davies, P and Donaldson, J (2001), Survey of Retail Co-operatives, LUMC, Leicester.


Dirlik, A (1999), ‘Place-based imagination: globalism and the politics of place’, unpublished manuscript, Duke University, Durham, NC.


Edwards, D and Potter, J (1995a), 'Attribution', In R. Harré & P. Stearns (Eds.), *Discursive psychology in practice* (pp. 87–119), Sage, London.

Eisner, Elliot W (1988), *The role of discipline-based art education in America's schools*, Getty Center for Education in the Arts, Los Angeles, California.


Fletcher, B (1998), *May Day Speech on Class*, Presented at the University and College Labor Education Association AFL-CIO Conference, San Jose California, May 1.


Gagliardi, P (1986), 'The creation and change of organisational cultures: a conceptual framework', *Organisation Studies*, 7, 117-134


Genette, Gerard (1992), *Introduction to the Architext*, (J.E. Lewins, transl), Berkeley, CA, Univ of California, Berkley.

Genette, Gerard (1997a), *Palimpsests*, University of Nebraska Press, Lincoln.


Greetz, C (1973), *The Interpretation of Culture*, SAGE, NY.

Griffiths, D (2003), ‘What is a co-operative Manager?’, EFFP, Oct.


Herman, J L (1992), Trauma and Recovery: The Aftermath of Violence from Domestic Abuse to Political Terror, Basic Books, New York.


Hoagland, Heath (2002), Co-operative Management, Department of Agricultural Economics, University of Kentucky College of Agriculture, October.

Website: http://www.uky.edu/Ag/AgEcon/


Holsti, O. R (1969), *Content analysis for the social sciences and humanities*, Addison-Wesley, Reading, MA.


Keichel, K (1992), The leader as servant, Fortune, 125(9), 121-122.


Krippendorff, K (1980), *Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology*, Sage, Beverly Hills, CA


Larey, T S and Paulus, P B (1999), Group preference and convergent tendencies in small
groups: A Content Analysis of Brainstorming performance, Creativity Research
Journal, 12, 175-84.

Kaplan, D., Mintz, A., Pool, I. D. S and Yakobson, S. (1949), The Language of

Latchezar, H (2004), ‘Driven by Corporate Principles and an Obsession with Customers
and Quality: Interview with Claude Hauser, Chairmain of the Board of the Federation
of Migros Cooperatives, European Retail Digest, Issue 44, p.25-30.

Latour, B and Woolgar, S (1986), Laboratory Life: the Construction of Scientific Facts,
Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ.

Lawler, E.E (1986), High Involvement Management, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco


Leming, James S (1989), ‘The two cultures of social studies education’, Social Education,
Vol.53, No. 6, p.404-408.

Lester, P and Smith, R (1990), ‘African-American photo coverage in Newsweek and

34: 1-44.

Structural Anthropology (1968), Penguin, Harmondsworth.


Levi-Strauss, C (1978), Myth and Meaning: The 1977 Massey Lectures, Routledge,
London.

In: Landow, George P. (Hg.), Hyper/Text/Theory, Baltimore, London 1994, S. 87–
121.


McCarthy, J D (1996), 'Constraints and Opportunities in Adopting, Adapting and Inventing, in McAdams, Dough, J D McCarthy and Mayer N Zald (eds), Comparative Prospective on Social Movements: Political Opportunities, Mobilizing Structure and Cultural Framings, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.


Mercer, T W (1936), *Towards the Co-operative Commonwealth*, Co-operative Press Manchester


Muenkner, Hans H (1991), 'Chances of the cooperatives in the nineties', structure questions of the German cooperatives part of IV, publications of the DG BANK, Bd. 19, Frankfurt/Main.


Pareto, Vilfredo (1968), The Rise and Fall of the Elites: an Application of Theoretical Sociology, The Bedmister Press, US.


URL:http://www.co-opstudies.org/Conference/Conf%2000/parnell_paper.htm


Phillips, N and Hardy, C (1997), Managing multiple identities: Discourse, legitimacy and resources in the UK refugee system, *Organization*, 4, 159-86.


Redwood, R (1999), Narrative and narrative analysis, *Journal of Clinical Nursing, 8*, 674


Samra-Fredericks, D (1996a), 'The interpersonal management of competing rationalities — A critical ethnography of board-level competence for ‘doing’ strategy as spoken in the face of change', Unpublished PhD, Brunel University


Schein, Edgar H (1985), Organizational culture and leadership, 1st edition, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco
Schein, Edgar H (1992), Organizational culture and leadership, 2nd edition, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco


Stodghill, R M (1948), 'Personal factors associated with leadership: A survey of the literature, Free Press, NY.


Walton, R.E. (1985b), 'Toward a strategy eliciting employee commitment based on policies of mutuality', in Walton, R.E., Lawrence, P.R. (Eds), HRM Trends and Challenges, Harvard University Press, Boston, MA.

Waples, D., Berelson, B and Bradshaw, F R (1940), *What Reading Do to People*, Chicago, University of Chicago Press.


Weick, K E (1995), Sensemaking in organizations, SAGE, Thousand Oaks, CA


Wilkins, A. L (1983), 'Organizational stories as symbols which control the organization' in L. R. Pondy, P. J. Frost, G. Morgan and T. C. Dandridge (eds), Organizational symbolism, JAI Press, Greenwich, CT.

Wilkins, A and Martin, J (1979), Organizational legends, No. 521, Graduate School of Business, Stanford University, unpublished research paper.


Wilson, M (1998), 'Developing leaders in consumer co-operatives – contemporary issues in the training of directors and members', extract from the Word of Co-operative Enterprise 1998, URL:http://www.plunkett.co.uk


Writz, B (2005), 'Foster Board Diversity', *Credit Union Magazine*, December, p. 17, see further www.cuna.org.


Zeuli, K (2005), 'Innovation a necessity, not a choice, for 21st century co-ops', *Rural Cooperatives*, May/June.

**Miscellaneous**

- 'Benefit of Co-operatives’, [www.coopzone.com](http://www.coopzone.com)
- 'Key to success...and pitfalls', *Rural Cooperatives*, September/October, p.23

• Camere Di Commercio d’ Italia, ‘Secondo rapporto sulle imprese cooperative’, from Italian Chamber of Commerce available on internet: http://www.camcom.it/

• Co-operative News, October 1997


• International Cooperative Alliance, Statistics and information on European co-operatives. Geneva.

• Quayside Debate November 2006, Will social enterprise take us to the promised land?, at Business School, University of Huddersfield, http://www.hud.ac.uk/schools/

• Social enterprise Unit Seminar, ACCORD (2003), Australian Centre For Co-operative Research and Development Website: www.accord.org.au/social/commentaries/social_enterprise.html


• The Union of Co-operative Enterprises (2004), “Proactive procurement: achieving quality services and implementing policy objectives by procurement from social enterprises”, Jointly produced by the Union of Co-operative Enterprises (Co-operative), Social Enterprise East of England and Anthony Collins Solicitors, October (Guidance note by Mark Cook and David Alcock of Anthony Collins Solicitors).

• UN and ICA, a joint report, July 1, 1995

• www.coop.org

• www.ica.coop