

Mihai TALMACIU¹, Krisztina Melinda DOBAY²

¹ *“Alexandru Ioan Cuza” University, Iași*

² *Romanian Academy, Iași Branch, “Gh. Zane” Economic and Social Research Institute
mtalm@uaic.ro*

THE INFLUENCE OF NATIONAL CULTURAL VALUES ON THE ASSOCIATION STRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT

ABSTRACT

Cooperatives are autonomous and voluntary associations consisting of several individuals pursuing economic, social or cultural objectives, a type of enterprise with a dual economic and social purpose, and activity governed by cooperative principles: free and voluntary association, economic democracy, autonomy, transparency, solidarity, cooperation among cooperatives, concerns about community issues. In this paper we intend to compare the evolution of associative structures in different countries of the world by reference to certain national cultural values that influence the economic behaviour of the members of society (trust, social capital, entrepreneurial culture, attitude towards work, etc.) and have a close connection with respect for cooperative principles.

Key words: cooperative, cooperative principles, cultural values.

JEL Classification: Q13, M14.

1. INTRODUCTION

The studies conducted worldwide reveal that the incidence and the economic and social impact of cooperatives on the economies of the countries have wide variations from one geographical region to another and by countries. According to the global cooperative census, conducted on the initiative of the UN Department for Economic and Social Affairs, in the period 2013-2014, for 145 countries, it was found that there are around 2.6 million cooperatives in the world, with over 1 billion members and clients. The same study reveals that 9 of the most cooperative 10 global economies are in Europe. The cooperative organizations have a prevailing social character, so that the natural cultural dimensions could explain, to a certain extent, the uneven development of cooperation by regions of the world and by counties.

The existence of certain distinct cultural areas in the world, which are reflected in the people's systems of values, was pointed out in the research studies on social phenomena (Inglehart, 1997; Inglehart & Baker, 2000). In the present study, we intend to analyze whether the differences in cooperation development, noticed in different countries of the world, can be explained by the influence of certain variables

of the cultural context. For this purpose, various studies and data were used on cooperation development in countries from different continents, data on the cultural values provided by World Values Survey, as well as data on the organizational cultural dimensions provided by the study conducted by Hofstede (Hofstede et al., 2010)

2. STATE OF KNOWLEDGE

Cooperatives are mutual support organizations based on relational contracts (Jones & Kalmi, 2009), which serve the interests of their members, are controlled by members and the democracy principle is the essential element of cooperation (Österberg & Nilsson, 2009). According to a pattern of social behaviour, personal interest is a dominant behavioural force, therefore cooperation to improve well-being would be doomed to failure if the small groups did not interact on the long run (Axelrod, 1984; Sigmund, 2010, Gächter et al., 2010).

According to the cooperation theories, collaboration within a self-help organization is motivated, in the first place, by individual considerations that arise as a result of making decisions to maximize individual utilities. Thus, the cognitive factors that lead to the desire to cooperate (or not) can be identified. The theory delimits the intentions to cooperate, defined as a history of actual behaviour, based on three components: attitudes towards behaviour, subjective norms and perceived behavioural control (Gächter et al., 2010).

Recent research suggests that there is a significant individual heterogeneity in prosocial behaviour, mainly in the context of cooperation (Fischbacher et al., 2001; Kurzban & Houser, 2005; Kocher et al., 2008; Herrmann & Thöni, 2009; Fischbacher & Gächter, 2010; Bergmüller et al., 2010). Thus, the individual differentiations between the members of the group have the potential to explain the aggregate behaviour and the heterogeneity at the level of the group (Kurzban & Houser, 2005; Fischbacher & Gächter, 2010), which can play an important role for the cooperation stability (McNamara & Leimar, 2010).

The investigation of differences in the cooperation behaviour at macro level, in the context of different cultural backgrounds, can be interesting and can explain, to a certain extent, the unequal development of cooperation across the countries of the world. Thus, when we want to investigate the influence of certain variables of the cultural context on certain economic and social phenomena, we have in view those sets of beliefs and values that most people from these societies have and that are "transmitted quite unchanged from generation to generation" (Guiso et al., 2006:23; Guiso et al., 2008).

Two relational factors, highlighted by the authors, which influence the synergic potential of collaboration relations, are trust and power (Campos & Vazquez-Brust, 2016; Handfield & Bechtal, 2004; Lasker et al., 2001; Hardy et al., 1998). Trust based on mutual communication and on common interest (Hardy et al.,

1998), favours the establishment of synergies, as it increases the commitment to relationships and the desire to invest in a relationship (Capaldo & Giannocaro, 2015). At the same time, when the power asymmetries between the parts in a transaction are significant, collaboration is affected, thus hindering the integration and commitment between partners (Campos & Vazquez-Brust, 2016). This power differential creates opportunities for the most powerful actor to behave in an opportunist manner, forcing the less powerful actor or simply eliminating this from the dialogue and decision making (Hardy et al., 1998).

The specialty studies point out that trust and transparency are important aspects, mainly for the emerging groups, which motivate small farmers to sell their products through marketing cooperatives (Markelova et al., 2009; Bakucs et al., 2012).

The analysis of cooperation in socio-psychological terms reveals that the members evaluate their cooperatives mainly in social terms rather than in economic terms (Gächter et al., 2010). Some studies revealed that the development of cooperatives is hindered by certain socio-psychological variables: lack of cohesion and understanding (Robinson & Lifton, 1993), conservative and individualistic attitude (Siebert, 1994), traditionalist ideologies of members that explain their preference for not investing their own capital in a cooperative organization (Fahlbeck, 2007).

According to an empirical questionnaire-based survey, conducted among the members of several types of agricultural cooperatives from Sweden, the confidence and support of their members are extremely important for cooperative viability. The management bodies of cooperatives must promote decisional transparency, through the implementation of ITC systems that allow their members to understand that managers' decisions are in agreement with their interests (Osterberg & Nilsson, 2009). In these conditions, the aspects strictly linked to the cultural matrix of a country or region (attitudes, skills, abilities and moral principles characteristic to people's behaviour) are more important for the viability and operation of cooperatives than in the case of other types of enterprises (Talmaciu et al., 2017).

People's interest in setting up cooperatives and their involvement in the development of these organizations can be analyzed in terms of the influence of certain cultural values, namely: trust, social capital, social capacity, entrepreneurship and organizational (managerial) culture, attitude towards intense work or new ideas from outside, as well as in terms of the so-called "Asian values": dignity, self-esteem, patience, perseverance, parsimony (temperance), virtuous behaviour (Weil, 2007; Hofstede, 2010).

The concepts of managerial culture, leadership or organizational culture appear in the business literature, which are strongly linked and influenced by the national cultures and their dimensions. The culture results from the values, beliefs, symbols, social ideals or moral perceptions shared by the members of a community or social group, which begin to be formed even since early childhood (Hofstede, 1980); it is influenced by the institutional framework and leads to the establishment of behavioural patterns that manifest a relative stability and continuity in time (Hofstede, 1980; Mueller & Thomas, 2001).

3. MATERIAL AND METHOD

In order to reveal the link between cooperation development and various variables of the cultural context, a rich literature was consulted on: organizational culture, cultural organizational dimensions, important cultural values for the stability and development of cooperatives, as well as studies on the implications of certain variables on the relation management/members of cooperatives (Hofstede, Triandis, Weil, Osterberg, Nilsson, Hansen, Siebert).

The model developed by Hofstede includes 6 national cultural dimensions that make their mark on organizational culture (Hofstede, 2010): distance to power, collectivism versus individualism, masculinity versus femininity, avoidance of uncertainty, short-term orientation versus long-term orientation, permissiveness versus austerity.

Statistical data on cooperation development worldwide coming from different sources were analyzed on comparative basis: *Cooperatives and employment. Contribution of cooperatives to decent work in the changing world of work – Second global report 2017*, *Global Census on Cooperatives 2013-2014* and *The power of cooperation. Cooperatives Europe key figures 2015*. These analyses were completed by qualitative evaluations from reports, studies and other scientific studies in this field.

In a first stage, the present paper applied the Hofstede model based on the 6 cultural organizational dimensions. Pearson correlation coefficient was used to analyze the link between cooperation development and the organizational cultural values. For this purpose a database was used, with indicators on cooperation development and the values of organizational cultural dimensions for 80 countries from all continents (for which both data sets were available).

In order to analyze the link between certain national cultural variables (trust, suspicion degree, attitude towards work, attitude towards the accumulation of wealth, attitude towards private property of business) and cooperation development in different countries, the Pearson correlation coefficients were next calculated. For this purpose, the *World Values Survey Wave 6: 2010-2014* database was used, selecting 65 countries from all continents for which data on cooperation development and data on cultural values were equally available.

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

According to the *Global Census on Cooperatives 2013-2014*, if the activity of cooperatives were concentrated in only one country, the contribution of cooperatives to global economy would be higher than the economy of France and

would rank 5th at global level, next to the economy of Germany. The incidence and socio-economic impact of cooperatives widely varies from country to country and from one geographic region to another (from one continent to another). Thus, the above-mentioned study, conducted at the initiative of the United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs, reveals that there are about 2.6 million cooperatives worldwide with more than 1 billion members and clients. The same study reveals that in the countries with high levels of the cooperative economy index, the contribution of cooperatives to GDP exceeds 10%.

The top 10 countries with the most developed cooperative economies include 9 European countries (France, Switzerland, Finland, Italy, the Netherlands, Germany, Austria, Denmark and Norway). These countries with developed cooperation have certain common characteristics in terms of Hofstede cultural values: they are countries with small distance to power, all the 10 countries are characterized by individualism (they are not countries with collectivist mentality), most of them are characterized by permissiveness and long-term orientation (Talmaciu et al., 2017).

According to the data from Table 1, the Asian countries have three quarters of the total number of cooperatives and 85.35 of the population employed in cooperatives worldwide. Yet their size is low. Thus, the average number of members per cooperative is 254 in Asia, as against 2325.53 members/cooperative in America, or 733 members/cooperative in Europe (Table 2).

One can notice from the data of Table 2 that the countries from Asia and Africa have the largest number of cooperatives in 100000 inhabitants, followed by the countries from Europe, America and Oceania. However, if we analyze the size of cooperatives in terms of the indicator average size of cooperative (average number of members per cooperative) we can notice that the cooperative organizations from Africa and Asia have a low number of members, as compared to those from Europe, America or Oceania.

Table 1
Distribution of cooperatives by continents and regions of the world

Region	Cooperatives		Members		Employment	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Africa	375,375	12.78	54,086,432	4.44	22,387,970	7.43
America	181,378	6.17	421,800,174	34.65	6,116,035	2.03
Asia	2,156,219	73.41	547,951,194	45.01	257,121,871	85.35
Europe	221,959	7.56	162,765,046	13.37	15,418,608	5.12
Oceania	2,391	0.08	30,843,215	2.53	222,509	0.07
Total	2,937,322	100.00	1,217,446,061	100.00	301,266,993	100.00

Source: authors' calculations based on "Cooperatives and employment. Contribution of cooperatives to decent work in the changing world of work – Second global report 2017" data

Table 2
Social impact of cooperation by regions of the world

Region	Cooperatives in 100 thousand inhabitants	Members/cooperative	Members in total population (%)
Africa	43.13	144.1	3.87
America	18.61	2,325.53	43.28
Asia	54.93	254.13	13.96
Europe	30.26	733.31	22.19
Oceania	6.29	12,899.71	81.18

Source: authors' own calculations based on "Cooperatives and employment. Contribution of cooperatives to decent work in the changing world of work – Second global report 2017" data

However, if we analyze the social impact of cooperation, from the perspective of the indicator share of cooperative members in total population, we can notice that the highest social impact of cooperatives can be seen in the countries from the region Oceania, where cooperative members account for about 81 in total population, followed by the countries from (43.23%), Europe (22.19%), Asia (13.96%) and Africa (3.87%).

The cooperatives from Europe contribute by about 50% to the gross annual revenue worldwide, and on cumulated basis with the cooperatives from North America the contribution is higher than 75% (Table 3). The cooperatives from America and Europe also have higher values than those from Asia or Africa in terms of the indicators: gross annual revenue per cooperative, gross annual revenue per member and gross annual revenue per employee.

Table 3
Economic impact of cooperation by regions of the world

Region	Annual gross revenue (AGR)		AGR/cooperative (USD)	AGR/member (USD)	AGR/employee (USD)
	(mil. USD)	%			
Africa	4,471	0.15	18,020.96	194.00	91,995.88
America	762,771	25.74	10,170,280	4,179.81	299,537.01
Asia	653,629.2	22.06	338,089.90	1,350.18	151,777.36
Europa	1,482,482	50.03	4,159,600.45	3,820.76	282,436.62
Oceania	59,543.3	2.01	29,771,650	4,210.15	129,357.59
World total	2,962,896	100	1,133,125.33	2,713.79	234,949.10

Source: authors' calculations based on "Global Census on Cooperatives 2013-2014" data

The data on cooperation incidence in countries from different continents, presented in the tables from Annex 1, reveal the concentration of the number of cooperatives, of the number of members and of employed labour force in a low number of countries, with more developed cooperation, on each continent (the countries from top 10 on each continent have more than three-quarters of cooperatives, members or employees in cooperatives).

Thus, the situation by continents is the following:

– North and South America, in the top 10 countries (out of 39 countries) have 95.47% of the number of cooperatives, 94.51% of total number of members and 93.85% of total employed labour force in cooperatives. The country with the most developed cooperation is the United States, which has 83.18% of the total number of members and 24.46% of the population employed in cooperatives. In terms of Hofstede cultural dimensions, the largest part of the Latin-American countries is characterized by great distance to power and collectivism, while the United States and Canada are characterized by small distance to power and individualism. Most American countries are characterized by permissiveness.

– In Africa, the top 10 countries (out of 33 countries) concentrate 93.9% of the number of cooperatives, 77.25% of the total number of members and 97.34% of the total labour employed in cooperatives. The most developed countries in terms of cooperation are the following: Egypt with 23.29% of the total number of members and 31.09% of the population employed in cooperatives, Kenya 20.55% of members and 35.92% of employment and Ethiopia with 12.15% and 20.78% respectively. All the African countries are characterized by great distance to power, collectivism and medium to high values of permissiveness (Ghana and Nigeria are characterized by austerity).

– In Asia, the top 10 countries (out of 29 countries) have 93.9% of the number of cooperatives, 77.25% of total number of members and 97.34% of total labour force employed in cooperatives. The most representative countries in terms of cooperation are the following: India with 45.51% of the total number of members and 15.33% of labour force employed in cooperatives and China with 29.32% of members and 71.94% of employed labour force in cooperatives. From the perspective of cultural dimensions, the Asian countries are characterized by great distance to power, collectivism and propensity for austerity.

– In Europe, the top 10 countries (out of 36) have 87.88% of the number of cooperatives, 81.47% of the total number of members and 78.47% of total labour employed in cooperatives. The most representative countries in terms of cooperation are France with 45.51% of total number of members and 11.34% of labour employed in cooperatives, Germany (14.16% and 16.72% respectively), Russia (18.98% and 6.41% respectively), Italy (7.73% and 19.2%), Great Britain (10.13% and 2.9%). In terms of cultural dimensions, the European countries are divided into: countries with small distance to power – those from the northern part of the continent (Anglo-Saxon and Scandinavian) and countries with medium to great distance to power – the countries from the south, east and the Latin countries; individualist countries – Central and Western European countries and collectivist countries – the Eastern European countries (also Portugal and Greece); countries characterized by permissiveness – in Northern Europe and by austerity – the countries in Southern, Central and Eastern Europe. Romania has 0.76% of the number of cooperatives in Europe (it ranks 18th in the 36 countries), 0.41% of the total number of members in cooperatives (rank 21) and 0.19% persons employed in cooperatives (rank 24). In terms of cultural dimensions, the main characteristics of Romania are the following: great distance to power, collectivism and austerity.

– In Oceania, the first 4 countries (out of 12) concentrate 97.49% of the number of cooperatives, 98.59% of the total number of members and 99.76% of total labour employed in cooperatives. The most representative countries in terms of cooperation are the following: Australia with 94.02% of the total number of cooperatives, 11.7% of labour employed in cooperatives and New Zealand with 4.56% of total members and 87.87% of employment. In terms of cultural dimensions, the countries from this region are characterized by small distance to power, individualism and permissiveness.

In order to reveal the link between cooperation development and different variables of the cultural context, Tables 4 and 5 present the values of Pearson correlation coefficients. Thus, in Table 4 one can notice an acceptable association degree between the values of indicator share of cooperative members in total population and the values of three cultural dimensions: distance to power (-0.45), individualism vs. collectivism (0.5) and permissiveness vs. austerity (0.35).

Table 4
Correlation coefficients between the cooperation indicators and the values of cultural dimensions (Hofstede)

	Distance to power	Individ. versus collectivism	Masculin. vs. femininity	Avoid. of uncert.	STO vs. LTO	Permissiveness versus austerity
Number of cooperatives	0.18	-0.12	0.12	-0.12	0.14	-0.12
Share of members in total population	-0.45	0.50	0.08	-0.26	-0.02	0.35
Cooperatives in 100 thousand inhabitants	0.07	-0.14	-0.09	-0.07	-0.15	0.11
Members per cooperative	-0.17	0.26	0.23	-0.16	-0.09	0.38

Source: authors' calculations based on "Cooperatives and employment. Contribution of cooperatives to decent work in the changing world of work – Second global report 2017" data and Hofstede G. (2010)

Table 5
Correlation coefficients between the cooperation coefficients and confidence

	Confidence in:			Suspicion degree
	Neighbours	Most people	Unknown persons	
Share of members in total population	0.16	0.48	0.51	0.33
Cooperatives in 100 thou. Inhabitants	0.35	0.26	0.23	0.25
Members per cooperative	0.08	0.20	0.22	0.22

Source: authors' calculations based on "Cooperatives and employment. Contribution of cooperatives to decent work in the changing world of work – Second global report 2017" and "World Values Survey Wave 6: 2010-2014" data

This indicates that the countries with a higher share of cooperative members in total population have the following characteristics: small distance to power, propensity for individualism and permissiveness.

As regards the relation between the degree of confidence and suspicion and the cooperation characterization indicators, the values of correlation coefficients presented in Table 5 indicate an acceptable association degree between the values of indicator share of cooperative members in total population and the values of confidence in most people (0.48), confidence in unknown persons (0.51) and those of the suspicion degree (0.33). The correlation is weaker with regard to the other two cooperation indicators: cooperatives in 100 thousand inhabitants and average number of members per cooperative.

5. CONCLUSIONS

The need to study the link between cooperation development and the different variables of the cultural context are justified due to the double character of cooperatives, i.e. economic and social.

The researchers of the social phenomena pointed out that there are distinct cultural areas in the world, which are reflected in the people's systems of values and which are closely linked to the economic phenomena.

The studies on the economic and social impact of cooperatives conducted worldwide reveal great differences in cooperation development across countries, geographic regions and continents.

In this paper, in which cooperation was investigated in socio-economic terms, the authors highlighted different national cultural variables that are linked to the pro-social behaviour, specific to cooperatives, to their stability and development, namely:

- trust and power, which influence the stability and synergic potential of cooperatives;
- personal interest, transparency and individual considerations, which influence the propensity for cooperation, the stability and viability of cooperatives;
- entrepreneurial and organizational culture that put its mark on the management of cooperatives;
- conservative and individualist attitude that can hinder the development of cooperatives.

The statistical data on cooperation, available worldwide, reveal the stronger development of this sector in Europe and America, followed by Asia and Africa. At the same time, about 90% of the number of cooperatives are concentrated in maximum 10 countries, on each continent.

The situation is similar if we analyze the distribution by countries of the total number of cooperative members on each continent or the distribution of labour force employed in cooperatives by countries. In the case of European countries, a link was noticed between the development of cooperation and GDP/capita, with a more important economic and social impact in the countries with a higher GDP/capita.

From our analysis, it results that the national cultural dimensions favourable to cooperation development are the following: small distance to power, propensity for individualism, permissiveness, high level of confidence, low suspicion level and the favourable attitude towards the active involvement in the activity of certain groups (associations).

In Romania's case, the weak development of cooperation can be justified by the great distance to power, propensity for collectivism, for austerity, low level of confidence and high suspicion.

REFERENCES

1. Axelrod R., (1984), *The evolution of cooperation*, New York, NY: Basic Books.
2. Bakucs Z., Ferto I., Szabó G. G., (2012), *Benefits of a marketing cooperative in transition agriculture: Mórakert purchasing and service co-operative*, Society and Economy in Central and Eastern Europe, 34, 453–468.
3. Bergmüller R., Schürch R., Hamilton I. M., (2010), *Evolutionary causes and consequences of consistent individual variation in cooperative behaviour*, Phil. Trans. R. Soc. B Biol Sci, 365(1553), 2751–64, doi:10.1098/rstb.2010.0124.
4. Campos L.M.S., Vazquez-Brust D.A., (2016), *Lean and green synergies in supply chain management*, Supply Chain Management: An International Journal, Vol. 21 Issue: 5, pp. 627-641, <https://doi.org/10.1108/SCM-03-2016-0101>.
5. Capaldo A., Giannocarò I., (2015), *How does trust affect performance in the supply chain? The moderating role of interdependence*, International Journal of Production Economics, Elsevier, Vol. 166, pp. 36-49.
6. Fahlbeck E., (2007), *The horizon problem in agricultural cooperatives—only in theory?*, in K. Karantininis & J. Nilsson (Eds.), Vertical markets and cooperative hierarchies. (pp. 255–274). Dordrecht: Springer.
7. Fischbacher U., Gächter S., Fehr E., (2001), *Are people conditionally cooperative? Evidence from a public goods experiment*, Econ. Lett. 71, 397–404. (doi:10.1016/S0165-1765(01)00394-9).
8. Fischbacher U., Gächter S., (2010), *Social preferences, beliefs, and the dynamics of free riding in public good experiments*, Am. Econ. Rev. 100, 541–556. (doi:10.1257/aer.100.1.541).
9. Gächter S., Herrmann B., Thöni C., (2010), *Culture and cooperation*, Philosophical Transaction of the Royal Society B 365, 2651–2661, doi:10.1098/rstb.2010.0135, <http://rstb.royalsocietypublishing.org/> on January 25, 2017.
10. Guiso L., Sapienza P., Zingales L., (2006), *Does culture affect economic outcomes?*, J. Econ. Perspect. 20, 23–48. (doi:10.1257/jep.20.2.23).
11. Guiso L., Sapienza P., Zingales L., (2008), *Social capital as good culture*, J. Eur. Econ. Assoc. 6, 295–320. (doi:10.1162/JEEA.2008.6.2-3.295).
12. Handfield R., Bechtal C. (2004), *Trust, power, dependence and economics: can SCM research borrow paradigms?*, International Journal of Integrated Supply Chain Management, vol 1, pp. 3-32.

13. Hardy C., Philips N., Lawrence T., (1998), *Distinguishing trust and power in interorganizational relations: forms and façades of trust*, in Lane C. and Bachman C. (Eds.), *Trust in and within organizations*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 64-87.
14. Herrmann B., Thöni C., (2009), *Measuring conditional cooperation: a replication study in Russia*, *Exp. Econ.* 12, 87–92. (doi:10.1007/s10683-008-9197-1).
15. Hofstede G., (1980), *Culture's Consequences: International Differences in Work-related Values*, Sage, Newbury Park, CA.
16. Hofstede G., Hofstede G. I., Minkov M., (2010), *Cultures and organizations. Software of the Mind. Intercultural cooperation and its importance for survival*, McGraw Hill companies New York USA.
17. Inglehart R., (1997), *Modernization and postmodernization: cultural, economic and political change in 43 societies*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
18. Inglehart R., Baker W. E., (2000), *Modernization, cultural change, and the persistence of traditional values*, *Am. Sociol. Rev.* 65, 19–51. (doi:10.2307/2657288).
19. Jones D. C., Kalmi P., (2009), *Trust, inequality and the size of the co-operative sector: Cross-country evidence*, <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/50d6/3eec1bd680e85d3dcfc4f2a77b9e9c4d6d7b.pdf>.
20. Kocher M., Martinsson P., Visser M., (2009), *Social background, cooperative behavior, and norm enforcement*, Gothenburg, Sweden: University of Gothenburg. (Working Papers In Economics No. 385).
21. Kurzban R., Houser D., (2005), *Experiments investigating cooperative types in humans: a complement to evolutionary theory and simulations*, *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* 102, 1803–1807. (doi:10.1073/pnas.0408759102).
22. Lasker R., Weiss E., Miller R., (2001), *Partnership synergy: a practical framework for studying and strengthening collaborative advantage*, *The Milbank Quarterly*, vol. 79, no. 2, pp. 179-205.
23. Markelova H., Meinzen-Dick R., Hellin J., Dohrn S. (2009), *Collective action for smallholder market access*, *Food Policy*, 34(1), 1–7.evidence. *Annals of Public and Cooperative Economic*, 80, 165–195.
24. McNamara J. M., Leimar O., (2010), *Variation and the response to variation as a basis for successful cooperation*, *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. B* 365, 2627–2633. (doi:10.1098/rstb.2010.0159).
25. Mueller S.L., Thomas A.S., (2001), *Culture and entrepreneurial potential: a nine country study of locus of control and innovativeness*, *Journal of Business Venturing*, Vol. 16.
26. Osterberg P., Nilsson J., (2009), *Members' perception of their participation in the governance of cooperatives: The key to trust and commitment in agricultural cooperatives*, *Agribusiness* vol. 25 (2) 181-197, Wiley Periodicals Inc., DOI 10.1002/agr.20200.
27. Robinson L., Lifton D., (1993), *Convincing growers to fund cooperative marketing activities: Insights from the New York wine grape industry*, *Agribusiness*, 9(1), 65–76.
28. Siebert J.B., (1994), *Co-ops: What farmers think!*, Berkeley, CA: University of California, Department of Agricultural and Resource Economics, Center for Cooperatives.
29. Sigmund, K., (2010), *The calculus of selfishness*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
30. Talmaciu M., Dobay K.M., Apetroaie C., (2017), *O posibilă abordare din perspectivă socio-econommică a cooperăției agricole din România*, vol. „Economie agroalimentară și dezvoltare rurală într-o perspectivă regională”. Editura Academiei Române, București, 2017, pp. 355-375.
31. Weil David, (2007), *Economic Growth*, Pearson International Edition.
32. *** *Cooperatives and employment. Contribution of cooperatives to decent work in the changing world of work – Second global report 2017*, CICOPA.
33. *** *World Values Survey Wave 6 2010-2014*, Official Aggregate v.20150418. World Values Survey Association (www.worldvaluessurvey.org). Aggregate File Producer: Asep/JDS, Madrid SPAIN.
34. *** *Global Census on Cooperatives 2013-2014* ,conducted at the initiative of United Nations Department for Economic and Social Affairs with Rabobank support), www.DaveGraceAssociates.com.

ANNEX 1. COOPERATION IN THE WORLD

1.1 North and South America

Crt. No.	Country	Cooperatives		Members		Employment	
		Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
1	Venezuela	94,141	51.90	601,732	0.14	698,146	11.42
2	USA	29,285	16.15	350,871,790	83.18	1,495,750	24.46
3	Argentina	13,047	7.19	6,082,026	1.44	377,135	6.17
4	Brazil	6,582	3.63	12,706,164	3.01	1,781,334	29.13
5	Bolivia	6,220	3.43	3,000,000	0.71	0	0.00
6	Nicaragua	6,100	3.36	144,432	0.03	119,866	1.96
7	Canada	5,769	3.18	18,136,141	4.30	298,131	4.87
8	Cuba	5,569	3.07	529,076	0.13	529,076	8.65
9	Colombia	4089	2.25	5,823,347	1.38	438,363	7.17
10	Honduras	2,360	1.30	750,328	0.18	1,927	0.03
Total top 10 (out of 39)		173,162	95.47	398,645,036	94.51	5,739,728	93.85
Other countries		8,216	4.53	23,155,138	5.49	376,307	6.15

Source: authors' calculations based on "Cooperatives and employment. Contribution of cooperatives to decent work in the changing world of work – Second global report 2017" data

1.2 Africa

Crt. no	Country	Cooperatives		Members		Employment	
		Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
1	Nigeria	181,279	48.29	4,300,000	7.95	100,000	0.45
2	Ethiopia	43,534	11.60	6,570,000	12.15	4,652,074	20.78
3	Burkina Faso	30,000	7.99	955,000	1.77	955,000	4.27
4	Kenya	17,326	4.62	11,112,588	20.55	8,040,790	35.92
5	Morocco	17,229	4.59	2,971,308	5.49	444,440	1.99
6	Zambia	16,133	4.30	199,694	0.37	6,000	0.03
7	Niger	13,000	3.46	500,000	0.92	0	0
8	Egypt	12,728	3.39	12,595,000	23.29	6,961,000	31.09
9	Uganda	10,641	2.83	1,200,000	2.22	10,339	0.05
10	Tanzania	10,596	2.82	1,379,373	2.55	623,519	2.79
Total top 10 (out of 33)		352,466	93.90	41,782,963	77.25	21,793,162	97.34
Other countries		22,909	6.10	12,303,469	22.75	594,808	2.66

Source: authors' calculations based on "Cooperatives and employment. Contribution of cooperatives to decent work in the changing world of work – Second global report 2017" data

1.3 Asia

Crt. no	Country	Cooperatives		Members		Employment	
		Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
1	China	1,008,266	46.76	160,650,000	29.32	184,964,417	71.94
2	India	610,020	28.29	249,367,111	45.51	39,421,014	15.33
3	Indonesia	150,223	6.97	574,451	0.10	574,451	0.22
4	Bangladesh	126,215	5.85	4,803,721	0.88	2,456,565	0.96
5	Iran	74,938	3.48	10,290,343	1.88	3,458,029	1.34
6	Turkey	31,902	1.48	6,517,355	1.19	3,010,793	1.17
7	Nepal	29,830	1.38	700,000	0.13	760,000	0.30
8	Vietnam	18,682	0.87	5,442,527	0.99	5,738,207	2.23
9	Korea	11,017	0.51	27,849,724	5.08	2,638,232	1.03
10	Malaysia	10,914	0.51	7,609,204	1.39	1,222,246	0.48
Total top 10 (out of 29)		2,072,007	96.09	473,804,436	86.47	244,243,954	94.99
Other countries		84,212	3.91	74,146,758	13.53	12,877,917	5.01

Source: authors' calculations based on "Cooperatives and employment. Contribution of cooperatives to decent work in the changing world of work – Second global report 2017" data

1.4 Europe

Crt. no.	Country	Cooperatives		Members		Employment	
		Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
1	Russia	67,209	30.28	30,897,997	18.98	988,000	6.41
2	Italy	39,599	17.84	12,584,572	7.73	2,960,047	19.20
3	Spain	21,725	9.79	7,296,629	4.48	1,581,047	10.25
4	France	17,897	8.06	26,606,263	16.35	1,779,144	11.54
5	Sweden	11,919	5.37	4,451,902	2.74	309,133	2.00
6	Poland	9,521	4.29	7,976,600	4.90	649,600	4.21
7	Germany	7,615	3.43	23,050,000	14.16	2,578,334	16.72
8	Greece	7,188	3.24	833,956	0.51	728,697	4.73
9	Great Britain	6,797	3.06	16,492,320	10.13	447,400	2.90
10	Norway	5,592	2.52	2,411,038	1.48	77,500	0.50
Total top 10 (out of 36)		195,062	87.88	132,601,277	81.47	12,098,902	78.47
Romania		1,688 (18)	0.76	674,500 (21)	0.41	29,325 (24)	0.19
Other countries		25,209	11.36	29,489,269	18.12	3,290,381	21.34

Source: authors' calculations based on "Cooperatives and employment. Contribution of cooperatives to decent work in the changing world of work – Second global report 2017" data

1.5 Oceania

Crt. No.	Country	Cooperatives		Members		Employment	
		Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
1	Australia	1,765	73.82	29,000,000	94.02	26,038	11.70
2	Vanuatu	340	14.22	404	0.00	404	0.18
3	Kiribati	163	6.82	184	0.00	0	0
4	New Zealand	63	2.63	1,407,507	4.56	195,526	87.87
Total top 4 (out of 12)		2,331	97.49	30,408,095	98.59	221,968	99.76
Other countries		60	2.51	435,120	1.41	541	0.24

Source: authors' calculations based on "Cooperatives and employment. Contribution of cooperatives to decent work in the changing world of work – Second global report 2017" data