

Stakeholder Management in Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation for Organization Sustainability. An Empirical Study

Authors:

Anna Elsie Luyiggo¹

Uganda Technology And Management University (UTAMU)

Email: annelsie26@gmail.com

Telephone: +256771998236

Dr. Wilfred Kokas Aupal (PhD)²

Uganda Technology And Management University (UTAMU)

Email: kwaupal@yahoo.com

ABSTRACT:

This paper examines the linkage between stakeholder management in Participatory M&E and Organizational sustainability in the Uganda National Teachers' Union (UNATU) Savings and Credit Cooperative (SACCO). The objective was to understand how effectively engaging and managing stakeholders contributes to the SACCO's long-term viability. The research employed a mixed-methods approach, combining quantitative and qualitative techniques. Data was collected using structured questionnaires, interviews, and documentary reviews. Statistical analyses, including descriptive statistics, correlation and regression, were performed using SPSS software. The findings suggested a positive association between stakeholder management and Organizational sustainability. The study highlights the critical role of effective stakeholder management in realizing sustainability objectives for SACCOs and organizations at large. To enhance sustainability efforts, the study recommends a focus on stakeholder management strategies and incorporation of stakeholder perspectives in growth planning and monitoring activities. This means that with consistent motivation, proper involvement and management of stakeholders and their interests, increased levels of Organizational sustainability will be realized.

Key Words: Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation (PME), Organizational Sustainability, Stakeholders, Stakeholder Management, UNATU SACCO.

INTRODUCTION

In the dynamic landscape of cooperative societies, the relationship between participatory monitoring and evaluation (PM&E) and organizational sustainability has gained increasing attention. This study sought to delve into the intricate interplay between these variables within the context of Uganda National Teachers' Union (UNATU) Sacco. By examining how stakeholder management influences organizational sustainability, this study aimed to contribute to the enhancement of cooperative society practices.

Rooted in addressing the limitations of conventional monitoring and evaluation methods, PM&E has emerged as a collaborative approach engaging primary stakeholders in tracking and rectifying outcomes (Guijt & Gaventa, 1998). Furthermore, the concept of organizational sustainability has taken center stage in contemporary organizations, driven by pressures from clients, economic factors, and government regulations (Cella-De-Oliveira, 2013).

Central to this study was the stakeholder theory, as proposed by Freeman (1984), which underscores the equal importance of all parties affected by interventions. This theory offers valuable insights into effective stakeholder management, advocating for holistic engagement with entities ranging from government bodies and customers to local communities (McAbee, et.,al. 2021). By aligning management practices and ethical considerations with stakeholder interests, organizations strive for sustained success.

Within this framework, the study centers on UNATU SACCO, the apex cooperative society for Ugandan teachers on government payroll. As a vital contributor to the nation's economic and social fabric, UNATU Sacco's sustainability is of paramount importance (Sejjaaka, Mindra, & Nsereko, 2015). The cooperative movement, notably marked by the emergence of SACCOs in Uganda in 1913, has evolved into a significant force for financial assistance and employment generation.

The ability to "meet the demands of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to satisfy their needs" is the definition of sustainability. (Brundtland, 1987) The three basic tenets of sustainable development are social equality, environmental integrity, and economic prosperity (Elkington, 1998). "One that contributes to sustainable development by generating concurrently economic, social, and environmental benefits—the so-called triple bottom line" is what is referred to as a sustainable enterprise (Hart & Milstein, 2003: 56). As a result, in order to remain sustainable, an Organization must consider much more than just increasing its bottom line. UNATU SACCO, changed names three times in three weeks of existence as leaders battled for control of billions of shillings with Walimu Teachers' SACCO. Trouble started when Ministry of Education called for bidders to manage the teachers' money and Microfinance Support Centre – (MSC) emerged as the best. MSC was given 9.3 billion Shillings to distribute to teachers' SACCOs. However, it was later established that the money was instead allegedly lent out to financial institutions such as Finance Trust Bank which was allegedly given a 6 billion Shillings loan and Hofokamu microfinance which allegedly acquired a 3 billion Shillings loan.

The Uganda National Teachers Union (UNATU) then organized protests demanding for the money to be given to them so that they could manage it. President Museveni ordered the Ministry of Finance to give the remaining balance of over 15 billion Shillings to UNATU. However, UNATU could not be in a position to distribute the money to SACCOs because it is at the level of an association. A decision was made to create an account under Walimu Teacher's Union which could rely on District Chief Administrative Officers - CAOs to verify whether the applicants were indeed on the government payroll and never had running loans. UNATU, which is the pioneer professional body bringing together all teachers on Government payroll, was not content with the idea of not having control of teachers' money, and yet they already had an existing SACCO. This caused a big drift amongst the leaders, a portion of whom decided to break-away and concentrate on UNATU SACCO.

The catfights between UNATU SACCO and Walimu SACCO left Shs.7 billion frozen in a bank account that could have been lent to teachers. The dispute for control of money provided by President Museveni to teachers to be distributed through SACCOs reached a fever pitch, with the Financial Intelligence Authority (FIA) freezing a portion of the Shs. 25 billion (Daily Monitor, 2021)

UNATU SACCO which was formulated as a strategy to provide extra financial assistance to teachers on government payroll, to support their already low salaries. (UNATU Report, 2019) However, it has not worked credibly well, and thus has not played the anticipated crucial and vibrant role in providing financial help to teachers as stakeholder management is still lacking, hence slowing the continuity of services and calling UNATU SACCO's sustainability into question.

The paper aimed to assess the relationship between Stakeholder management and Organizational Sustainability in UNATU SACCO. This was guided by the research question, what is the relationship between stakeholder management and Organizational sustainability in UNATU SACCO? It was hypothesized that, there is no relationship between stakeholder management and Organizational sustainability in UNATU SACCO.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation (PM&E) refers to a variety of methods "... in which primary stakeholders - those who are affected by the intervention under consideration - are active participants, [taking] the lead in monitoring and attempting to make sense of accomplishment toward attainment of results at the community scale, and drawing admissible inferences" (Hilhorst and Guijt, 2006: 4).

Participatory M&E entails including a wide range of stakeholders, especially intended beneficiaries, in M&E procedures. It is done to generate more M&E data and/or to empower stakeholders. It is accelerated using two basic methods. The primary source might be a collection of tools and methods for facilitating effective M&E. The second point is that the attitudes and behaviours necessary to facilitate constructive involvement are essential. (Napier, Simister & Jain, 2020)

PM&E approaches have emerged over the last three decades as part of a broader use of participatory methods in development practice, such as participatory action research, participatory learning and action, agricultural systems research, and farming participatory research (Estrella & Gaventa 1998; Parks et al. 2005). They have also been linked to a greater appreciation for individual and organizational learning in the business sector (Estrella 2000). Hilhorst and Guijt (2006) describe three patterns that have bolstered PM&E's growth: (a) discontentment with other approaches' restricted ability to capture local knowledge, ambitions, and views; (b) the need to constantly adapt work to ensure it remains appropriate to different people's preferences; and (c) pressure to improve accountability to local people, implementing staff, partner organizations, and donors.

Stakeholders' theory, which was fathered in 1984 by R. Edward Freeman, originally elaborated structure management and business ethics that addresses morals and values in managing a corporation that have an effect on designing and management of establishments. It identifies stakeholders of a corporation and recommends the ways that management provides due relation to the views, demands and interests of these stakeholders. This tries to handle the "Principle of Whom or What Very Counts" (Miles, Samantha 2017). According to Friedman, (2006) perspective, all stakeholders have selections to form in sustaining a corporation which most of those organizations carries with it stakeholders and beneficiaries with totally different interests and demands, thus this

makes structure property troublesome to manage as a result of the necessity for negotiations views that square measure concerned (Yescombe, 2007).

Stakeholders, according to Brzezinski et al. (2010), are members of a specific group who have a personal stake in the outcome. They used Olson (1965) to argue that increasing these members' personal stake in regulatory procedures will increase their engagement in regulatory procedures. Stakeholders, according to Haapasaari et al. (2013), are a group of people who have an interest in fisheries management and contribute to a knowledge base. Kinds et al. (2016), on the other hand, defined stakeholders as all individuals and organizations (here producer organizations) involved in the fishing industry.

According to Schwermer, Barz, and Zablotsk (2020), while the term "stakeholder participation" is widely used, there is a wide range of meanings available, which frequently leads to confusion. Stakeholder involvement is frequently used in research on stakeholders, but not in the context of resource management participation. According to Durham et al. (2014), the selection of stakeholders has a significant impact on the outcome of the involvement process. As a result, they advocated for methodically identifying stakeholders based on the research's purpose and impact. (Schwermer et al., 2020)

Distinct stakeholder groups have different interests, and there is frequently a lot of variety within each group. Particularly distinct characteristics of community stakeholders include their extremely diverse interests (Kassinis and Vafeas, 2006). It might be challenging to ascertain what stakeholders desire as a result, yet firm responsiveness is necessary due to these diverse interests' enormous capacity to affect the achievement of corporate objectives. Stakeholder theorists contend that managers should "manage for stakeholders," which can be a more effective strategy to generate competitive advantage for the organization. Financial theorists contend that managers should always act in ways that maximize shareholder value (Jensen, 2002). Through stakeholder management, businesses can access information from benevolent stakeholders that will help them innovate and adjust to a changing environment (Harrison, Bosse & Phillips, 2010).

Management is the essential effort made by employees to use tools and processes to find, improve, transfer, and apply the organization's knowledge and expertise. (Kavali'c, Nikoli'c, Radosav, Stanisavljev, & Pecujlija, 2021). Organizations can effectively prepare for transitory and tumultuous business conditions by using the notion of management. The requirement to master common knowledge through continual learning and improvement underpins management implementation. This enhancement affects both the organization as a whole and the people who work there. (Kavalic et al., 2021) Numerous studies have looked at the impact of management on various organizational outcomes and financial performance. Organizational development and competitiveness are aided by high levels of management. It also adds to economic growth at the macro level. Different management approaches, elements, and processes all contribute to bettering overall business results. The adoption of effective and efficient knowledge management can immediately improve financial performance. Furthermore, human resource development, pronounced learning ability, and quality intellectual capital management have a favorable impact, resulting in organizational sustainability. (Kavalic et al., 2021)

Organizational sustainability (OS) has become a popular issue in recent years, according to Cella-De-Oliveira (2013), which has led companies to come back under significant pressure from

markets and legislation, and to desire to align them with property, resulting in the term OS. By moving in the direction of sustainability, businesses gain legitimacy in the eyes of the market, broadening their scope and securing higher financial returns.

Many organizations (Hahn & Scheermesser, 2006) have been forced to hunt alignment with sustainability as a result of continual environmental changes and demand from legislation and society. One of the most significant challenges for the OS is the clash with the economic pillar, because, in the classic view, organizations' main purpose is to maximize stakeholder value.

In this new conceptual paradigm, development will be more equitable and socially inclusive, human in scale and form, participatory and empowering, and environmentally and livelihoods sustainable, according to Veltmeyer (2007). According to the author, development should begin from inside (civil society) and below (the grassroots) rather than from without (foreign development assistance) and above (at the agency level) (the government or state). According to Skouloudis and Evangelinos (2009), sustainability reporting combines data on an entity's economic, environmental, and social performance into a single publication.

A study conducted by Kananura et al., (2017) further noted that, the Participatory M&E methods facilitated interactive processes that promoted interaction and dialogue between the stakeholders. The dialogue enhanced the ability of stakeholders to hold each other accountable, which was an unanticipated positive outcome.

In 2011, researchers from the Harvard grad school and London grad school revealed the Impact of a company Culture of sustainability on company Behaviour and Performance (Eccles, Ioannou and Serafeim, 2011). This study tracked monetary metrics for matched pairs of corporations over associate degree 18-year amount. The performance of high sustainability corporations, outlined as having enforced a spread of environmental and social policies, were compared with corporations that were similar however that had not adopted such practices. The results were found to be important. A £1 investment in a very cluster of high-sustainability companies in 1993 multiplied to a price of £22.60 by the tip of 2010, compared to a rise to simply £15.40 from the low-sustainability cluster. The high-sustainability companies conjointly performed higher on metrics like come back on assets and come back on equity. (Hornsby & Wales, et. Al. 2013)

In a study on PM&E and water management conducted by Vernooy, Qiu, and Jianchu (2006) in Guizhou, China, it was discovered that PM&E enhances villagers' ability to self-manage, and officers felt that their work was made easier. Authorities have important responsibilities, including improving rural livelihoods by boosting economic processes, welfare, and environmental protection. Villagers were then actively cooperating in these duties through PM&E, sharing responsibility for a few of the chores with government employees, according to the report. On the other side, PM&E expanded the ability of villages to participate in decision-making processes. Villagers used to negotiate with officials, which bothered them because they were unfamiliar with villagers having equal rights in a decision-making process. Officers gradually became more aware of the necessity of people's engagement in development projects, and it is such talks between stakeholders that drive a corporation's long-term viability. (Vernooy and et al., 2006).

A close scrutiny of the literature review shows that little has been done to determine the relationship between various aspects of Participatory M&E and sustainability of organizations and then, this study has aimed at diving into stakeholder management, Participatory planning and Implementation and the depth of Participation of the stakeholders as aspects of PM&E, and how they competently drive Organizational Sustainability in UNATU SACCO. The study has bridged the gap of stakeholder management in Monitoring and Evaluation and Organizational sustainability.

METHODOLOGY

The paper was based on the Pragmatic approach that called for collection of both qualitative and quantitative data. A detailed review and analysis of literature and documents on Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation and Organizational sustainability was also undertaken. The study came up with a sample of 79 participants who responded quantitatively hence generating 79 responses which was a 100% response rate. Qualitatively, the study selected a sample of 9 participants and acquired 7 responses hence generating a 77.7% response rate. SPSS version 22 software was used to code and analyse quantitative data whereas Content analysis technique was used for qualitative data analysis, where the data was coded and categorized depending on arguments of different scholars and authorities (Hsieh and Shannon, 2005). This allowed identification of different patterns of arguments which informed interpretation and thus, deriving understanding of the phenomenon of interest. Conclusions on how Stakeholder management in Participatory M&E approach may affect Organizational sustainability in UNATU SACCO, were then made from the analysis of the qualitative data that was generated.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The study was purposely carried out to assess the relationship between stakeholder management and Organizational sustainability in UNATU SACCO. A self-administered questionnaire used to obtain the quantitative data used a five-point Likert scale with the following ordinal responses: 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Neither Disagree nor Agree, 4 = Agree, and 5 = Strongly Agree (Sullivan 2013:542).

From the 7 measurement items, using the Mean for statistical interpretation majority respondents represented by (86.1%) agreed with a mean of 4.063 that UNATU SACCO truly has Operational management systems in place that are responsible for the day-to-day running of SACCO activities concerned implying that, Management is truly tasked with the operational activities of the SACCO. *In an interview with one of the key informants, IR1 stated that "Our staff is trained in financial management and all other key informants agreed that for one to be a staff of UNATU SACCO, they should have a minimum qualification of a Bachelor's degree in either Business administration or Accounting.*

With a mean of 3.304, slightly less than half (48.1%) of the respondents further agreed that UNATU SACCO's M&E plan was developed in a participatory manner considering all stakeholders. Whereas 24.1 % of them were not sure, 27.8% of the respondents clearly disagreed to that statement that the SACCO's M&E plan was developed in a participatory manner. Majority respondents (78.5%) further agreed with a mean of 3.911 that the management plan meets the needs of stakeholders. As 13.9% of the respondents were not sure, minority 7.6% of the respondents disagreed to the statement. *In an interview, IR1 clearly stated, "...because it is*

teachers' money we are dealing with here, and it comes from Government, we are fully obliged to make sure that the Management plan of the SACCO is purely tailed to meet the needs of the main stakeholders who are, SACCO members and the Government”.

In regards to the Management Team being directly involved in the planning and setting targets and objectives of the Organization, more than half of the respondents 83.5% agreed that the Management team is closely and directly involved in the planning and setting of targets and objectives of the Organization and the results from the data collected generated a mean of 4.076. While 10.1% of the respondents were not sure about this, the minority 6.4% disagreed to the statement. *During interviews, key informants shared that Management team is the soul body tasked to run the day to day activities and programs of the SACCO, so they have to plan on meeting the targets that are set by the Executive Board. And that Management was answerable to the Executive Board.*

Majority of the respondents represented by 88.6% agreed that the Management team and M&E team have the required technical skills to execute their duties despite being understaffed. Whereas 3.8% of the respondents were not sure if the SACCO Management and M&E team have the technical skills required, the minority 7.6% disagreed that management and M&E team having the technical required skills. These results generated a mean of 4.228. *In an interview with IR₁ and IR₇ the key informants shared that although the SACCO is understaffed, the few staff that is there has all the technical skills required to execute their duties. “...For example, the SACCO Manager has education and training in Business Administration with vast experience in financial and Operational management, the Accountants and Credit Officers also have education and training in Accounting and Credit management.”*

Majority respondents represented by 57% were not sure that the SACCO even has a budget allocated towards M&E. Those who agreed that there is a budget, represented by 29.1% clearly put it that the budget allocated towards M&E is below 10% of their annual financial budget, which is clearly inadequate to facilitate the M&E departmental activities, whilst the minority 13.9% disagreed to having a budget allocated to participatory M&E and these results generated a mean of 3.228. *During interview, one key informant disclosed that, “...I am not even sure if we have a designated budget towards M&E but if it's there, then it is less than 10% of our annual budget. We don't have an appropriate budget for monitoring and evaluation because the money given to us is inadequate, we only pick a few sums of money from the profits made from interests on loans and we do simple monitoring, but we haven't heavily invested in M&E because it is a new phenomenon and majority of the SACCO members don't even understand the whole concept of M&E.”* IR₁ further stated, *“....you see, Government gives us money, but that money comes in bits and it is not disbursed directly to our SACCO, it is disbursed through WALIMU SACCO and yet WALIMU is very secondary to us as UNATU SACCO. We are then put in a position where UNATU SACCO has to borrow money from WALIMU SACCO which we have to pay back at an interest and so, these funds are not adequate for us to fully support M&E throughout the year.”*

Majority respondents represented by 73.4% further agreed that the Senior Management for M&E had the leadership commitment required to carry out M&E activities and that they are competent enough. 15.2% were not sure whether or not, there is adequate leadership commitment from the Senior Management towards M&E, whereas the minority 11.4% of the respondents clearly

disagreed in regards to leadership commitment from senior management for M&E. These results generated a mean of 3.886. *During an interview with one of the key informants, IR₄ stated that, "...I am the Head of the M&E department here at the SACCO. We are very committed as a department to carry out M&E activities and we have the required skills and competences. The only thing that fails us is that we are not well facilitated as a department. The money allocated to us is not enough so we cannot afford to do adequate M&E of all SACCO programs at all times."*

The correlation analysis results showed a positive relationship between Stakeholder management and Organizational sustainability in UNATU SACCO. This was explained by the positive relationship (Spearman's Rank Correlation Coefficient) at $r = 0.520$ that was statistically significant at 99% level of confidence as is $p < .001$. This means that with consistent motivation, proper involvement and management of stakeholders, increased levels of organizational social sustainability will be realized. This correlation implies that a positive change in a stakeholder management is likely to cause a positive change in Organizational sustainability in UNATU SACCO. And with this, the study rejected the null (H_0) Hypothesis. The study established a strong positive relationship between stakeholders Management and Organizational Sustainability in UNATU SACCO. Regression analysis revealed that Stakeholder Management is a predictor of Organizational Sustainability. According to the findings of the study, stakeholders were given with the essential communication and actively participated in the SACCO's program operations. Members are also given the opportunity for self-development, with an emphasis on mobilizing members, recognizing their accomplishments, and setting clear goals for them to attain. The management was also seen to be visionary in that; the staff asserted that their superiors were always interested in others and their personal and organizational growth; that their supervisors strategically planned for activities; that their supervisors had in-depth knowledge of their work; and that there was always command of attention from all employees and that supervisors provided direction for the station. Respondents also agreed that Senior Management for M&E had the leadership commitment and competence required for carrying out M&E activities. Because Senior Management has the necessary willingness, technical skills, and competences, they can effectively motivate members and make strategic decisions that will successfully drive them towards Organizational Sustainability. The study also revealed that the Management Team is directly involved in the planning and setting targets and objectives of the Organization and that there was leadership commitment for M&E in the SACCO.

The F statistic which is a test of significance for the entire regression shows that this regression is statistically significant because the p-value < 0.05 . The findings of the regression analysis in Table 3 show the Adjusted R Square (R^2) of 0.456 shows the percentage of variance explained in the dependent variable (Organizational Sustainability) by the predictor which is Stakeholder management. The F statistic ($F = 22.824$) which is a test of significance for the entire regression shows that this Regression is statistically significant because the p-value < 0.05 . At $\alpha = 0.05$, the t-values of SHM (Stakeholder Management) are statistically significant because their corresponding p-values < 0.05 . This means SHM ($\beta = 0.223$, $P < 0.05$) is individually paramount in the prediction of Organizational Sustainability.

Organizational Sustainability through Stakeholder Management: Is it possible?

Even if it still has supporters, the idea that a firm should be run only to maximize shareholder wealth has come under intense examination recently and has even been called "the dumbest theory

in the world" by some of the most esteemed management experts (Denning, 2015). Stakeholder management has since "infiltrated the academic discussion in management" in its place (Harrison & Wicks, 2013: 97). A firm that practices proper stakeholder management allocates more resources to meet the needs and demands of its legitimate stakeholders than would be necessary to simply maintain their willful participation in the firm's productive activities. Instead of merely entering into contracts with stakeholders, firms seek to develop and strengthen mutually beneficial relationships with them. But do businesses succeed in promoting sustainability at the same time they meet the requirements and aspirations of its rightful stakeholders?

In line with stakeholder management, a sustainable company must go beyond maximizing shareholder returns and instead target a triple bottom line that focuses on social and environmental as well as financial rewards (Hart & Milstein, 2003). The social and environmental activities of businesses have garnered significantly more interest from stakeholders in recent years. As Dawkins and Lewis (2003: 185) discovered, for instance: "Historically, the criteria that mattered most to consumers when creating an opinion of a company were product quality, value for money, and financial performance. Now, among a global sample of the general public, corporate responsibility is the most frequently listed factor (e.g. treatment of employees, community involvement, ethical and environmental issues)." Therefore, it surely seems conceivable that enterprises will become viable as a result of meeting stakeholder expectations.

However, if we take a global view, even in the absence of powerful rocketry, we can observe that businesses continue to overuse natural resources, and sustainability is still an elusive aim, despite the widespread adoption of stakeholder management in theory and practice. How come? Stakeholders must expect sustainability from a company's genuine stakeholders and the company must be able to deliver on these demands for stakeholder management to promote sustainability.

Stakeholder demand for sustainability.

Despite the fact that stakeholders increasingly express more concern for social and environmental performance (Dawkins and Lewis, 2003), their words frequently have more bite than substance. Think of the consumers. Many consumers express a strong preference for businesses to use sustainable business methods, but the vast majority won't act on their preference if it costs a lot of money to do so (Vogel, 2005). According to Fating (2019) customers will only pay a price premium of up to 20% for sustainable products. Some academics regard consumer activism to advance corporate social and environmental responsibility as fictional due to the gap between consumer claims and actions (Devinney, Auger & Eckhardt, 2010). More broadly, Harrison and Wicks (2013: 111) contend that "although stakeholders will wish to help society and not harm the environment through their cooperation in enterprises, it isn't obvious to what extent they will do so in their position as stakeholders." There is little concrete information regarding the proportion of the labor pool that is willing to do this, even if new hires may be more drawn to and accept lower compensation from a company with a solid reputation for CSR (Turban & Greening, 1997). Sustainability concerns "are not clearly or directly related to value creation for stakeholders and the utility they seek in the organization" in many circumstances, according to this statement (Harrison & Wicks, 2013: 111).

Even failing to demand sustainability or choosing to support unsustainable options are stakeholder choices. Industries that manufacture goods farther up the value chain may be shielded from

stakeholder criticism if their negative actions are hidden from the final consumer. Doonan and Laplante (2005: 82) found that government was the most significant source of pressure in their study of the Canadian pulp and paper industry and that "capital markets and consumer markets did not appear as statistically significant sources of pressure" in terms of environmental performance. Additionally, union and employee concerns that environmental measures may have a detrimental impact on competitiveness and consequently risk their jobs can serve to strengthen industrial resistance to proposals for improved environmental policies (Räthzel & Uzzell, 2011).

However, at least some stakeholders, including those whose demands may be strong, valid, and urgent, have a stake in sustainability that can be addressed. But even for these stakeholders, cognitive limitations create a disconnect between their calls for businesses to take action and the reality of sustainability issues. No matter how concerned a stakeholder is with sustainability issues, they will unavoidably overlook a sizable portion of the socially and environmentally harmful business practices, as noted by Barnett (2014: 695): "Whether primary or secondary, legitimate or illegitimate, powerful or weak, a stakeholder is constrained by limited attention." This gap is further widened by Gao and Bansal's (2013) assertion that "in most issue domains, stakeholders are unaware of relatively small improvements in a firm's social and environmental management, in part because the firm's operations are not fully transparent and in part because such small improvements are difficult to measure." The effectiveness of sustainability programs within businesses can be inconsistent. Businesses may be less willing to take on the expensive and time-consuming burden if the little adjustments made along the road are unlikely to be seen and acknowledged by stakeholders. Many stakeholders are myopic, prioritizing short-term profits over long-term potential, just like many managers and their organizations are (Lavery, 1996).

The SACCO's capacity to meet requirements for sustainability.

Firms often face a fairly restricted set of demands to engage in sustainable business practices, relative to the totality of demands that stakeholders impose upon them, because stakeholders are self-interested, shortsighted, and varied. However, businesses could still be unable to abide with legitimate stakeholders' strong and urgent requests for them to become sustainable. Many sustainability issues are wicked, involving ambiguity and contention over the size, scope, and timeline for solving them. Managers may not prioritize such issues because of their propensity to avoid risks (Pitelis, 2007) believing that their failure to show rapid and direct improvements will not satisfy stakeholder demands.

Whatever steps businesses take to satisfy stakeholder demands for sustainability, they might not be sufficient to address such intractable issues. Stakeholder management also doesn't offer a way to coordinate actions amongst unconnected companies. (Barnett *et. al.*, 2018) Consider the idea that in markets where businesses compete, there is a motivation to perform less work and, as a result, to outperform businesses that perform more work. The firm, which "has tremendous power to sway public debate that is marked by low scientific literacy, expanding sources of information, and a fractured and conflicted world of 24-hour news cycles," further distorts the firm's capacity to reason when faced with self-interested, myopic, and heterogeneous demands (Hoffman, 2015: 47).

Furthermore, time is not on the side of sustainability. Sustainability is a problem that affects all generations. Decisions involving a trade-off between one's own self-interest in the present and the

interests of other people in the future are referred to as intergenerational dilemmas (Wade-Benzoni & Tost, 2009: 365). For instance, decisions to disregard climate change have an impact on future generations. The concept of economic interests is widened by an intergenerational approach to encompass numerous stakeholders across time (Wade-Benzoni, 1999). Intergenerational reciprocity, uncertainty, and legacy building, according to Wade-Benzoni and Tost (2009), can assist lessen the intertemporal and interpersonal distances that tend to exacerbate intertemporal and social discounting of the future. More specifically, there will be greater intergenerational beneficence or generosity where previous generations have passed on benefits to future generations based on how well they were treated by previous generations, when outcome uncertainty suggests that future generations may receive nothing, and where the legacy of the generation is one of great burdens for future generations (Wade-Benzoni, Sondak & Galinsky, 2010). Who has the wisdom and insight to undertake this cross-generational study is still an open topic. It is unlikely that businesses, clients, staff, investors, communities, or suppliers will be able to handle an intergenerational problem like climate change because stakeholders frequently have self-interested, narrow viewpoints.

Overall, while managing stakeholders, firms are likely to experience minimal sustainability demand compared to the many other demands stakeholders impose upon them, and firms are likely to supply even less given limited ability to meet the sustainability needs that do exist.

Conclusion and Recommendations

Overall, both the quantitative and qualitative findings point to the fact that there is significant relationship between Stakeholder management and organizational sustainability. The study established a strong positive relationship between stakeholder Management and Organizational Sustainability in UNATU SACCO. Regression analysis revealed that Stakeholder Management is a predictor of Organizational Sustainability. According to the findings of the study, stakeholders were given with the essential communication and actively participated in the SACCO's program operations. Members are also given the opportunity for self-development, with an emphasis on mobilizing members, recognizing their accomplishments, and setting clear goals for them to attain. The management was also seen to be visionary in that; the staff asserted that their superiors were always interested in others and their personal and organizational growth; that their supervisors strategically planned for activities; that their supervisors had in-depth knowledge of their work; and that there was always command of attention from all employees and that supervisors provided direction for the station. Respondents also agreed that Senior Management for M&E had the leadership commitment and competence required for carrying out M&E activities. Because Senior Management has the necessary willingness, technical skills, and competences, they can effectively motivate members and make strategic decisions that will successfully drive them towards Organizational Sustainability. The study also revealed that the Management Team is directly involved in the planning and setting targets and objectives of the Organization and that there was leadership commitment for M&E in the SACCO. A null hypothesis was tested in the study: (There is no relationship between stakeholder management and Organizational Sustainability in UNATU SACCO). This null hypothesis was rejected by the study, which concluded that there is a strong positive relationship between stakeholder management and organizational sustainability. This was proven by a correlation coefficient of ($r = 0.520^{**}$) and ($P < 0.05$) The respondents also agreed that management makes independent decisions; that management unilaterally establishes policies and procedures; that there is a belief in one-way communication; that the Executive Board is always

correct regardless of the decision; and that there is always time for group discussions among subordinates.

Our analysis shows that, despite assertions to the contrary, the SACCO's economic model has not significantly changed despite the transformation to sustainable development. Financial efforts were invariably assessed using conventional standards like consumer preferences, efficiency benefits, and cost reductions. Our results are in accordance with prior empirical research conducted in other businesses, where the size and scope of environmental and social efforts are ultimately determined by the business's financial performance (Banerjee, 2001; Banerjee, Iyer & Kashyap, 2003; Margolis & Walsh, 2003). Due to growing worries over who takes what decisions, in this case, strategic engagement with supportive stakeholders involved showcasing the business and growth prospects of the SACCO. The SACCO attempted to reassure the passive stakeholders of their financial security while also underlining the benefits of the SACCO.

Some of the Strategies for managing stakeholders include; Stakeholders' Sustainable development strategy, Preserve and uphold Promote the concept of sustainable development, Reduce views of the risks associated with financial dependence, and Sustainable expansion reporting on the triple bottom line. But in this instance, the concept of sustainability was mostly limited to a "win-win" discourse. Win-win circumstances linking the economy and SACCOs are less evident and common (Banerjee, 2007). Companies and firms commit to environmental strategy attracted by cost reduction, production efficiency, and new markets but are soon faced with problems.

According to our analysis, the SACCO we looked at is dedicated to addressing both social and financial challenges in order to take advantage of the commercial potential presented by sustainable development. In the scenario we analyzed, the sustainable growth plan was actually a sustaining growth strategy. By evaluating environmental activities according to economic and technological standards and only permitting those projects that do not increase expenses to be executed, the growth strategy was further strengthened.

The study does highlight the limitations of the enlightened self-interest view of sustainable development by demonstrating that business interests are the primary driver of financial strategies and that there is no fundamental change in the traditional business model when it comes to addressing sustainability challenges, despite the study's obvious limitations regarding the generalizability of findings from a single case study. The research has extensively emphasized business potential connected to organizational sustainability (Porter et al., 2001; Wiedemann-goiran, Perier, & Lépineux, 2003).

Numerous articles in the business and academic press urge all companies to adopt sustainable development because it not only helps the environment but also strengthens the financial and economic position of the company. For the promotional effort for sustainability in commercial firms, however, some caution must be advised. Our analysis demonstrates that self-regulation based on commercial interests may fall short of achieving sustainability. Corporations will use the same business strategies for sustainability and will not defy economic logic.

Future studies can look at new types of legislation that combine "hard" regulations that businesses must abide by with "soft" laws or codes of behavior. Therefore, in order to ensure that corporations

do not deviate from the path towards sustainability, it is necessary to implement sustainable governance that involves the active participation of market, state, and civil society players. According to the study, cooperation between business, the government, and stakeholders is required to find solutions to the complex issues related to sustainability. We cannot be satisfied with that alone. The management literature has successfully moved beyond sole shareholder concern. The low-hanging fruit has been picked up thanks to changes in stakeholder management and industry self-regulation, but the complex issues of sustainability are still out of our reach. 2018 (Barnett et al.) We must accept that stakeholder pressures are supported, strengthened, increased, and given force by the government. Despite the fact that stakeholder demands can highlight sustainability challenges, government engagement is required to create the conditions for meaningful action and to ensure that it is carried out. Without government, vested interests can push businesses to avoid the difficult, protracted difficulties of wicked problems, and without stakeholder pressure, industries may self-regulate in ways that amount to nothing more than "the fox guarding the hen house."

If such approaches are to fulfill their primary goal, which is typically efficiency and effectiveness, the complexity of such Participatory M&E tools and techniques may lead to difficulty in use and, as a result, the need for capacity enhancement of participants in monitoring and evaluation activities. Organizations should concentrate on making sure that participants possess the necessary skills for efficient engagement in PME activities. If learning from performance is to be accomplished, organizations may also emphasize reference to data from Participatory M&E activities during the decision-making process.

The Government of Uganda must make sure that the National Policy on Public Sector Monitoring and Evaluation of 2011 is extensively communicated among important stakeholders and extended to the public sector in the economy in order to address concerns with policy enforcement, participant capacity, and incentives for Participatory M&E method.

If there are incentives and disincentives, stakeholders' participation during monitoring and evaluation may also be improved. For instance, by providing prompt feedback on their suggestions from the PME activities, being as flexible as feasible with the tasks, and enhancing participant capacity in PME. Accounting Officers who disobey their individual supervisors' instructions to implement the PME technique risk being disciplined. To spread awareness of the technique, incentives should be introduced, such as mentioning performance of the PME strategy when considering promotions in the public sector. The performance of public authorities in relation to PME undertakings may be taken into account by rewards and recognition programs.

In order to determine stakeholder participation and involvement in the Monitoring and Evaluation activities, the Program Budgeting System (PBS) should also measure the process of obtaining performance data at the outcome and output levels. The data collected in the PBS may be more accurately as a result of this.

If we can't find solutions to a variety of sustainability issues in the very near future, it appears that our options will be to leave one economy or even one country for another or to develop as a species in order to cope with the impending dramatic changes in our global community. After years of stakeholder management, we have learned that free market strategies are insufficient to persuade businesses to tackle anything except the most minor sustainability issues. Simply put, voluntary

efforts are insufficient to address evil situations. Instead, to deal with the serious issues that endanger our survival, government involvement is required.

References

- Abbot, J. and I. Guijt. (1998). Changing Views on Change: Participatory Approaches to Monitoring the Environment. Sustainable Agriculture and Rural Livelihoods Discussion Paper Number 2 IIED, UK.
- Barnett M.L, Henriques I. & Husted B. W. (2018) Governing the void between stakeholder management and sustainability.
- Barnett, M. L. & King, A. A. (2008). Good fences make good neighbors: A longitudinal analysis of an industry self-regulatory institution. *Academy of Management Journal*, 51(6), 1150-1170.
- Barnett, M. L. (2007). Stakeholder influence capacity and the variability of financial returns to corporate social responsibility. *Academy of Management Review*, 32, 794-816.
- Barnett, M. L. (2014). Why stakeholders ignore firm misconduct: A cognitive view. *Journal of Management*, 40(3), 676–702.
- Barnett, M.L. (forth). The business case for corporate social responsibility: A critique and an indirect path forward. *Business & Society*. doi:10.1177/0007650316660044
- Brundtland, G.H. (1987) Our Common Future: Report of the World Commission on Environment and Development. Geneva, UN-Dokument A/42/427.
- Brzezinski DT, Wilson J, Chen Y (2010) Voluntary participation in regional sheries management council meetings. *Ecol Soc* 15(3):2
- Cella-De-Oliveira F. A (2013): Indicators of Organizational Sustainability: A Proposition from Organizational Competences.
- Dawkins, Jenny & Lewis, Stewart. (2003). CSR in Stakeholder Expectations: And Their Implication for Company Strategy. *Journal of Business Ethics*. 44. 185-193. 10.1023/A:1023399732720.
- Denning, Stephen. (2015). Agile: It's time to put it to use to manage business complexity. *Strategy & Leadership*. 43. 10-17. 10.1108/SL-07-2015-0057.
- Devinney, Timothy & Auger, P & Eckhardt, Giana. (2010). The Myth of the Ethical Consumer.
- Durham E, Baker H, Smith M et al (2014) The BiodivERsA stakeholder engagement handbook. BiodivERsA, Paris
- Eccles, Robert G. and Ioannou, Ioannis and Serafeim, George, (2014). The Impact of Corporate Sustainability on Organizational Processes and Performance Management Science, Volume 60, Issue 11, pp. 2835-2857, February 2014, Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=1964011> or <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.1964011>
- Elkington J. (1999). Cannibals with forks: the triple bottom line of 21st century business. Capstone Publishing Limited: Oxford.
- Estrella M. and Gaventa J. 1997. Who Counts Reality? Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation: A Literature Review. Working draft. IDS, UK.
- Evangelinos, Konstantinos & Skouloudis, Antonis & Nikolaou, Ioannis & Filho, Walter. (2010). An Analysis of Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) and Sustainability Reporting Assessment in the Greek Banking Sector. 10.1007/978-3-642-02630-0_9.
- Fating V. (2019) Marketing Strategies For Sustainable Development Of Businesses
- Freeman R. E. (2010) Stakeholder Theory: The State of the Art.

- Freeman, R. E. (1984). *Strategic Management: A stakeholder approach*. Boston: Pitman. Freeman, R. E., & Phillips, R. A. (2002). Stakeholder theory: A libertarian defense. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 12(3), 331-349.
- Friedman, M. (1970, September 13). The social responsibility of business is to increase its profits. *The New York Times Magazine*, 32, 122-124. Frooman, J. (1999). Stakeholder influence strategies. *Academy of Management Review*, 24(2), 191-205.
- Gao, Jijun & Bansal, Tima. (2013). Instrumental and Integrative Logics in Business Sustainability. *Journal of Business Ethics*. 112. 10.1007/s10551-012-1245-2.
- Haapasaari P, Mäntyniemi S, Kuikka S (2013) Involving stakeholders in building integrated fisheries models using Bayesian methods. *Environ Manag* 51(6):1247–1261
- Hahn, Tobias & Scheermesser, Mandy. (2006). Approaches to Corporate Sustainability Among German Companies. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*. 13. 150 - 165. 10.1002/csr.100.
- Harrison, J. S., & Wicks, A. C. (2013). Stakeholder theory, value, and firm performance. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 23(1), 97–124.
- Harrison, J. S., Bosse, D. A., & Phillips, R. A. (2010). Managing for stakeholders, stakeholder utility functions, and competitive advantage. *Strategic Management Journal*, 31(1), 58-74.
- Hart, S. L., & Milstein, M. B. (2003). Creating sustainable value. *Academy of Management Executive*, 17(2), 56–69.
- Hart, S. L., & Sharma, S. (2004). Engaging fringe stakeholders for competitive imagination. *The Academy of Management Executive*, 18(1), 7-18.
- Hilhorst, T. & Guijt, I.M. (2006). Participatory monitoring and evaluation: a process to support governance and empowerment at the local level: a guidance paper. *BMC Infectious Diseases - BMC INFECT DIS*.
- Hoffman, L. (2015). Longitudinal analysis: Modeling within-person fluctuation and change.
- Hornsby, J. S., Kuratko, D. F., Holt, D. T., & Wales, W. J. (2013). Assessing a Measurement of Organizational Preparedness for Corporate Entrepreneurship. *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 5(30), 937-955.
- Hsieh, H. F., & Shannon, S. E. (2005). Three Approaches to Qualitative Content Analysis. *Qualitative Health Research*, 15, 1277-1288.
- Jenkins, C.R., & Dillman, D.A. (1995). The language of self-administered questionnaires as seen through the eyes of respondents. Volume 3, *Statistical Policy Working Paper 23: New Directions in Statistical Methodology*, 470-516. U.S. Office of Management and Budget.
- Jensen, M.C. (2002) Value Maximization, Stakeholder Theory, and the Corporate Objective Function. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 12, 235-256. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/3857812>
- Kananura, R.M., Ekirapa-Kiracho, E., Paina, L. *et al.* Participatory monitoring and evaluation approaches that influence decision-making: lessons from a maternal and newborn study in Eastern Uganda. *Health Res Policy Sys* 15, 107 (2017). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12961-017-0274-9>
- Kassinis, George & Vafeas, Nikos. (2006). Stakeholder Pressures And Environmental Performance. *Academy of Management Journal*. 49. 145-159. 10.5465/AMJ.2006.20785799.
- Kavalić, Mila, Milan Nikolić, Dragica Radosav, Sanja Stanisavljev, and Mladen Pečujlija. 2021. "Influencing Factors on Knowledge Management for Organizational Sustainability" *Sustainability* 13, no. 3: 1497. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su13031497>

- Laverty, K. J. (1996). Economic “Short-Termism”: The Debate, the Unresolved Issues, and the Implications for Management Practice and Research. *The Academy of Management Review*, 21(3), 825–860. <https://doi.org/10.2307/259003>
- McAbee, Lauren & Tapera, O. & Kanyangarara, Mufaro. (2021). Factors Associated with COVID-19 Vaccine Intentions in Eastern Zimbabwe: A Cross-Sectional Study. *Vaccines*. 9. 1109. 10.3390/vaccines9101109.
- Miles, Samantha (2017). Stakeholder Theory Classification: A Theoretical and Empirical Evaluation of Definitions. *Journal of Business Ethics* 142 (3):437-459.
- Napier A., Simister N., and Jain N. (2020) Participatory M&E
- Olson M (1965) *The logic of collective action*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge.
- Olson, M.L. 1965. *The Logic of Collective Action*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Pitelis, C. N. (2007). A Behavioral Resource-Based View of the Firm: The Synergy of Cyert and March (1963) and Penrose (1959). *Organization Science*, 18(3), 478–490. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25146113>
- Rätzzel, Nora & Uzzell, David. (2011). Trade Unions and Climate Change: The Jobs versus Environment Dilemma. *Global Environmental Change Part A*. 21. 1215-1223. 10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2011.07.010.
- Schwermer H. & Barz F. & Zablotski, Y. (2020). A Literature Review on Stakeholder Participation in Coastal and Marine Fisheries.
- Sejjaaka, Mindra &Nsereko (2015): Leadership Traits and Business Sustainability in Ugandan SMEs: A Qualitative Analysis.
- Turban, D. B., & Greening, D. W. (1997). Corporate Social Performance and Organizational Attractiveness to Prospective Employees. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 40(3), 658–672. <https://doi.org/10.2307/257057>
- UNATU SACCO Report, 2019.
- Veltmeyer, Henry. (2007). Sustainable livelihoods and local development. *Revue canadienne d'études du développement = Canadian journal of development studies*. 28. 5-8.
- Vernooy, Ronnie & Qiu, Sun & Xu, Jianchu. (2006). The power of participatory monitoring and evaluation: Insights from south-west China. *Development in Practice*. 16. 400-411. 10.1080/09614520600792275.
- Vogel, D.J. (2005) Is There a Market for Virtue? The Business Case for Corporate Social Responsibility. *California Management Review*, 47, 19-45. <https://doi.org/10.2307/41166315>
- Wade-Benzoni, Kimberly & Tost, Leigh. (2009). The Egoism and Altruism of Intergenerational Behavior. *Personality and social psychology review: an official journal of the Society for Personality and Social Psychology, Inc.* 13. 165-93. 10.1177/1088868309339317.
- Wamba, L. D. (2022). The determinants of environmental performance and its effect on the financial performance of European-listed companies. *Journal of General Management*, 47(2), 97-110. <https://doi.org/10.1177/03063070211021050>