

氏 名	Emi Do
学位 (専攻分野の名称)	博 士 (農業経済学)
学 位 記 番 号	甲 第 793 号
学位授与の日付	令和 2 年 3 月 20 日
学位論文題目	Engaging Members of Multi-stakeholder, Multi-Purpose Agricultural Co-operatives in Japan: A Case Study of Three Co-operatives in Urbanizing Regions
論文審査委員	主査 教 授 ・ 博 士 (農業経済学) 高 柳 長 直 教 授 ・ 博 士 (農学) 原 珠 里 教 授 ・ 博 士 (農学) 吉 野 馨 子 准 教 授 ・ 博 士 (農業経済学) 野 口 敬 夫 名 誉 教 授 ・ 博 士 (農学) 白 石 正 彦

論文内容の要旨

Co-operatives differ from investor owned firms (IOFs) through their ownership structure and adherence to a set of co-operative values and principles (Novkovic, 2008). Whereas IOFs are owned by their shareholders based on the amount of shares purchased, co-operatives are owned by their member-users equally. Furthermore, decision making at IOFs prioritize profit maximizing behavior, while co-operatives must balance economic and social goals (Novkovic, 2012). Most co-operatives formalize their accountability to its membership through their organizational structure by giving each of its members a right to vote (one member, one vote). However, due to legislative or bureaucratic constraints, in some instances co-operatives are not able to formally incorporate using these voting terms. In such cases, it is necessary for the co-operative to demonstrate their commitment to the democratic and member-participation principles through other means.

Co-operatives have a long history in the agricultural sector, where primary food producers have utilized the business model to aggregate and bring their product to market (Gray, 2014). In Japan, agricultural co-operatives diverged from manufacturing co-operatives after World War II, when the Agricultural Co-operative Law was first introduced into legislation (Tashiro, 2019). The law enabled agricultural co-operatives to offer a diverse array of services such as credit, insurance, procurement and agricultural extension. Currently, there are over 650 of these types of primary agricultural co-operatives (hereafter to be referred to as Local JAs) that are multi-purpose (offer a diverse array of services) and multi-stakeholder (have Farmer and Associate Members). These Local JAs are members of an apex organization called the Japan Agricultural Co-operative Group (JA Group), which is said to be one of the largest agricultural co-operatives in the world (Yukimoto, 2018). At the time the Agricultural Co-operative Law was adopted, the centrality of the agricultural co-operative in

the economy of rural communities meant that non-farmer residents also sought to utilize its services. These non-farmers were permitted to join the co-operative as Associate Members, however, legislation prohibited these members from having the right to vote. As agricultural activity decreases in regions across Japan, Local JAs merged to form larger co-operatives and the number of associate members started to exceed that of farmer members (Shiraishi, 2017). At Local JA's this issue is referred to as the "Associate Member Problem." Though Associate Members do not have the right to vote, a study of 716 Local JAs in 2011 found that a majority were actively attempting to engage Associate Members in the co-operative governance process (Koyama, 2019). Typically, both Farmer Members and Associate Members have three main modes through which they can exercise governance: 1) structured (formal setting such as the Annual General Meeting, Feedback Forums) 2) unstructured (activity based) and 3) semi-structured (employee driven initiatives where employees seek feedback from members) (Nishii, 2013; Fukuda, 2016; Masuda, 2019). Therefore, with Associate Members able to participate in governance processes, and taken in context with the Japanese cultural context where it has been shown that societally consensus decision processes that seek input from the bottom-up (Witt & Redding, 2013 ; Meyers, 2014), Local JAs should be considered Multi-Stakeholder co-operatives with two member classes that have ownership and can exercise control over the management direction.

In recent years, the 'multi-stakeholder' model has been gaining international recognition as a means to introduce equity and accountability in local food systems. In a 2012 paper entitled "Multi-stakeholder Co-operatives: Engines of Innovation for Building a Healthier Local Food System and a Healthier Economy" Lund proposes that the multi-stakeholder model provides opportunities for communities to pursue joint economic and social goals that promote environmental stewardship and human relations. Similarly, Gray (2014) also argues that agricultural co-operatives should seek to adapt to the changing economic climate by adopting the multi-stakeholder model. Though examples of multi-stakeholder co-operatives in Canada, the US and Europe are cited in these papers as evidence for the potentiality of this model, there is no mention of the Japanese context. The history and longevity of Local JAs', in addition to their unique challenge of engaging a member class that does not have formal voting rights, provide a unique opportunity to study issues related to governance strategies and co-operative policies of future co-operatives contemplating adopting this innovative organizational structure. In 2015, the JA Group launched an 'Active Membership' campaign aimed at fostering membership engagement and increasing participation among both farmer and associate members of the co-operative. This campaign uses a pyramid to visually depict a strategy starting with 1) becoming a member, 2) demonstrating understanding of co-operative values, 3) participating in co-operative activities (member programs), 4) giving feedback and expressing

opinions to the co-operative and 5) becoming a board member. These ‘actions’ targeted by the campaign have been demonstrated to be effective in various studies of co-operative membership engagement practices (Hakelius, 1999; Jiménez et al, 2010; Feng et al, 2011; Novkovic, 2006).

This dissertation seeks to answer three main questions:

- Can Local JAs be considered multi-stakeholder co-operatives when one member class does not have the right to vote?
- Assuming Local JAs are multi-stakeholder co-operatives, what are the variables at the co-operative level that affect membership engagement?
- Can Local JAs provide a blueprint for democratizing local food systems for communities adopting the multi-stakeholder co-operative model?

This dissertation builds on the work of the Active Membership Study, through closer examination of three co-operatives that have undertaken initiatives reflective of the vision of the Active Membership Campaign and address the main three mechanisms for governance (structured, unstructured and semi-structured) utilized by Local JAs. The study aims to elucidate the relationship between the Active Membership initiatives at each co-operative and membership engagement. These initiatives studied are 1) providing equal access to membership education opportunities (JA-A), 2) creating an inclusive environment for membership programs (JA-B) and 3) introducing Associate Member forums for feedback (JA-C).

Methodology:

To address the core areas of interest regarding governance, case studies were selected based on 1) their proximity to one of Japan’s three large metropolitan cities (Tokyo, Nagoya and Kyoto) 2) heterogeneous membership (having a diversity in the types of agriculture that their members are engaged in) 3) utilization of a strategy to enhance membership engagement. Further interviews with staff and management at these co-operatives determined that a questionnaire survey would be logistically feasible and capture results from a representative sample of members.

The questionnaire was designed to include questions from the Active Membership Study pertaining to Membership Awareness and Participatory Behavior (Nishii, 2019). This would enable results to be compared with national data. In addition to these, questions designed to address each of the targeted initiatives were designed with the assistance of staff and management at each of the case study locations. These questions were aimed at determining the relationship between the different types of initiatives taking place at each co-operative and the level of engagement of its members in governance behavior. This study also addresses the role that the voting structure of the

co-operative plays and questions whether or not this hinders participation and engagement by non-voting members in the governance processes of the co-operative.

Results from each survey were tabulated using statistical tests of significance. Paired t-tests assuming unequal variances were conducted to determine the statistical significance of differences found in the means of samples within each co-operative. These results were compared with national averages from the Active Membership Survey.

Case study 1: Membership Education Program (JA-A)

JA-A was established in 1966 when it underwent its last merger with two other co-operatives in the region. Since then it has operated in its current jurisdiction, experiencing a sharp rise in associate members in the early 2000s. Currently, there are almost four associate members to every one farmer member and this trend does not look to be abating due to the declining agricultural activity in the region. JA-A recognized early on that they would be dealing with a change in the demographics of their membership and in the late 1980's launched a three-fold plan for membership inclusion. This plan involved ongoing membership education courses, monthly home visits to every member (both farmer and associate) and an annual general assembly that is not comprised of representatives, but allows every member to participate. More recently, in line with the national campaign to increase Active Membership, JA-A released documentation pertaining to their co-operative's plan for self-reform. Much of the materials reflect the longevity of such initiatives at the co-operative and reinforce the language utilized by staff and management during the preliminary interview conducted for this study. In particular the co-operative emphasizes that there is no differentiation between the two member classes in terms of the services and programs that they are able to access. This extends to services such as the farmers market storefront, where both associate and farmer members are permitted to sell their wares. The study at JA-A used two surveys, one conducted in 2016 and the other in 2018. Semi-structured interviews were conducted to reaffirm findings after the 2016 study.

The Member Education courses offered at JA-A provided an opportunity to study the relationship between a co-operative initiative targeting member understanding of co-operative values, the second lowest rung of the Active Membership Pyramid, and membership engagement. There are two main categories of education courses that are offered at JA-A: one addresses the development of technical skills through hands on practical education, while the other is more theory based and are offered in a more traditional lecture format. Of the numerous theory based education courses, the co-operative membership education courses have an expressed objective "to return to the foundation of co-operatives and promote co-operative renewal through training members to become leaders with a

broad perspective of the co-operative philosophy, to deepen the understanding of the co-operative spirit among associate members and to encourage participation in co-operative activities.” Because of this explicit objective of fostering participation, governance and knowledge of co-operative philosophy, the co-operative membership education courses were selected for further study.

The survey conducted in 2016 focused on parameters of social capital and questions were based on previous studies investigating this relationship (Liang et al , 2015; Osterberg & Nilsson, 2012). These questions address three aspects of organizational social capital: structural, relationship and cognitive social capital. The questionnaire distribution period took place over two weeks. JA-A also hosted an information session about best practices regarding pest management during the same period where the author of this study was permitted to do a short presentation as to the objective of the study and disseminate questionnaires. Follow up interviews with members were conducted to re-affirm findings based on analysis of the questionnaire results.

214 of the 300 questionnaires that were distributed were returned, 27 questionnaires were excluded from analysis as more than 75% of the questions were left blank or had markings that were illegible. Of the remaining 187 questionnaires, 53 were from farmer members, 23 were from associate members and 110 respondents did not identify their membership type. Based on previous research, certain membership demographic variables were hypothesized to be influential in membership attitudes and behavior. These include age, farming experience (number of years farming) and area under cultivation. Additionally, member type and whether or not the member had participated in a membership education course were analyzed. Unpaired sample t-tests for unequal variances were utilized to determine if there was a statistically significant difference between member type and those who had participated in a membership education course. For variables where there were more than two sub-categories (age, farming experience and area under cultivation), ANOVA was used to determine if there were any statistically significant differences between the groups. The null hypothesis was rejected for any aspect where the p-value was less than 0.05. The tests revealed that among those surveyed, participation in the co-operative education courses proved to be statistically significant in predicting higher social capital scores in 8 of the 14 questions compared with other demographic control variables.

Follow up interviews were conducted with nine members who had completed at least one of the membership education courses. When asked directly, all members said their behavior before participating in the course, and after completing the course had not changed. All, however, claimed to having a greater sense of community and sense of belonging within the co-operative after learning more about the services being offered by the co-operative. Each interviewee, used the word “kaomishiri” (whose literal translation is “recognition by face” however culturally refers to a sense

of familiarity) at least once when describing if their relationship with other members or co-op staff had changed after participating in the education program. This familiarity can be heard in comments such as “I no longer hesitate to say ‘hello’ to other members when I drop off my produce” from one of the farmer members interviewed, or an associate member that commented “I like being able to recognize staff members that I met during the program when I come to the co-op.” All interviewees stated satisfaction in the content of the course and indicated interest in participating in other courses offered by the co-operative. However, several members felt as though they were missing a fundamental piece of the debate about co-operative reform that is currently quite topical and prevalent in national media. Members expressed that they felt the course only covered the strengths of the agricultural co-operative system, but they lacked an understanding as to the critical arguments against the co-operative. Thus, they felt that they hadn’t grasped the entirety of the controversy and felt no better informed or able to form their own opinions or suggestions for how the co-operative could be reformed.

The survey conducted in 2018 was primarily based on the ‘Active Membership Survey (AMS)’ in addition to several questions specific to JA-A’s membership education program. It was disseminated in person by JA-A staff members. In total, 757 questionnaires were returned for a response rate of 75%. Overall, members of JA-A had higher average scores for membership awareness and participatory behavior than the other two case studies and the national averages. With regards to the membership education course, analysis revealed that in comparison to non-participants, participants scored higher for all three aspects of membership awareness: had greater familiarity towards the co-op, need for co-operative services and understanding of the difference between co-operatives and IOFs. However, of these three measures of membership awareness, participants scored the lowest in ‘understanding.’ This supports findings from the interviews conducted with participants where some participants stated that they felt they did not fully understand how the co-operative functioned.

Case Study 2: Activity Based Membership Programs (JA-B)

JA-B has the largest membership of three case study sites. It is also the youngest, having been established in 1999 through a merger of six co-operatives. Like JA-A, at JA-B, the number of associate members outnumbers farmer members by almost a factor of four. At JA-B, the focus of the self-reform policy has been to increase agricultural productivity. In interviews with staff and management, the issue of engaging associate members in co-operative management centered around increasing food literacy and fostering interest in the local food system. In particular, the member programs that attracted associate member participation were highlighted.

Member programs featured in the study of JA-B are facilitated by the co-operative and run by

either members or co-operative staff with the intention to foster greater member engagement. Financial compensation for participation is solicited to cover costs of the program, rather than to solicit an additional revenue stream for the co-operative. For the purpose of this study, the member programs offered at JA-B were categorized into eleven groups by co-operative staff: agricultural festival, branch activities, health and policy discussion groups, parent and child hands on farming programs, community garden, “Petite Bell” young women’s activities, cooking classes, activities inspired by articles from the JA lifestyle magazine “Ie no Hikari”, cooking festivals, quality of life seminars and member training. JA-B has taken an approach to promote inclusive participation in membership programs regardless of membership class: both farmer and associate members are able to participate.

At JA-B, questionnaires were disseminated by mail to 10% of the membership, randomly selected with an equal number of farmer and association members. The survey was mailed in conjunction with an anniversary gift commemorating the foundation of the co-operative. In total, 3,000 surveys were distributed and 1,389 surveys were returned for a response rate of 46.3%.

Analysis of survey data indicated that farmer averages across all aspects of active membership were significantly higher than associate member as determined through paired t-tests assuming unequal variances. This indicates that there is a fundamental difference among farmer and associate members with regards to engagement with the co-operative. Comparisons between gender groups, age groups and by location, did not yield any statistically significant differences, nor did a member’s affiliation to agriculture.

There are similar levels of participation of most member programs by both farmer and associate members, with more associate members participating in the community garden and ‘Petite Belle’ Woman’s activities. To determine if there was a relationship between participation in member programs and active membership, active membership scores of members who had participated in at least one member program were compared with that of those that did not. Results showed that Associate Members that participated in at least one member program had higher scores for all aspects of membership awareness (familiarity, need, understanding) and certain aspects of participatory behavior (use of lifestyle services and participation in membership associations). Furthermore, participating associate members were also more likely to indicate that they had given feedback or expressed their opinion to the co-operative regarding some aspect of co-operative management. Interestingly, these participating members were also more likely to indicate that they did not know of a method to communicate feedback to the co-operative.

This survey attempted to address whether or not a member program resulted in any change in awareness or behavior by asking members who had participated in a program to choose three areas

of change that they observed post-participation. Interestingly, with the exception of ‘Ie no Hikari inspired activities’, over 75% of co-operative members that participated in a member program reported that they experienced some change in feelings or behavior after participating. Furthermore, member programs that required regular attendance resulted in a greater number of reported changes in behavior than those that were one-off events, indicating that the repeated exposure to other co-operative members and staff resulted in greater change.

Giving feedback to a co-operative is one method of contributing to the decision making process that informs how a co-operative is managed. Results from the survey show that some member programs led to a greater self-reported change in the frequency with which they offered feedback to the co-operative. There were more farmer members that reported a positive change towards giving feedback after participating than associate members, supporting that differences in behavior continue to reflect the imbalance in ownership rights between the member classes. However, associate members that had directly contributed feedback were found to be more likely than the general membership to have also participated in a member program. Interestingly, the percentages of members that reported a change in their frequency of giving feedback to the co-operative differed between the various member program types. Member programs that required ongoing or regular participation (ex. participating in the community garden) resulted in a greater percentage of participants who reported a positive change than those that participated in a one-off experience (ex. cooking classes). This was found to be especially true for associate members.

Case Study 3: Inclusion of New Forums for Membership Feedback (JA-C)

JA-C was selected to be a case study for the innovative approach it initiated to address concerns regarding the engagement of associate members. JA-C took on its current form in 1997 when 9 co-operatives in the region merged. Though it is located less than 1.5 hours away by train to Kyoto, a large metropolitan city, farmer members still outnumber associate members at the co-operative. Despite current numbers, the co-operative expects the number of farmers to continue to decrease in the coming years as the region follows similar trends across Japan where the agricultural population is aging and there is a lack of successors to their operations. In 2015, as a response to the initiative launched by the JA Group to increase ‘active membership’, JA-C changed its policy to allow associate members to attend the annual general meeting. This significant change in policy demonstrates a divergence from common practice and commitment to instigating associate member inclusion in the governance process at the co-operative.

Questionnaires at JA-C was disseminated by mail by each regional office proportionally to the number of members who were registered there. In total, 900 questionnaires were disseminated and

275 questionnaires were returned for a response rate of 30.5%.

Results indicated that farmer member averages across all aspects of active membership at JA-C are higher than associate members, however, t-tests conducted for the different aspects show that the differences in averages were not significant for any of the awareness aspects (familiarity, need, understanding), for financial and lifestyle service use, participation in membership activities, participation in membership and participation in membership associations. The areas where the two populations differed significantly was in their use of agricultural extension services where farmer members used these services more than associate members. This is to be expected as farmer members are by definition, farming, and have more use for this type of service. Average scores for both farmer and associate member participants were higher than members that did not participate in any of the governance meetings. Interestingly, participating associate members had higher active membership scores than participating farmer members, though the difference was not statistically significant.

To determine the role of voting rights in membership awareness and behavior, two population groups within the survey respondents were isolated. The first group, farmer members that did not participate in governance, was used as the control. This sample was compared to the group of associate members who participated in co-operative governance. Results show that associate members that participate in governance meetings demonstrate a significantly higher level of understanding of the difference between a co-operative and IOF than farmer members who did not participate in governance meeting. Participating associate members were also significantly more likely to have expressed an opinion or given feedback to the co-operative than non-participating farmer members.

Another noteworthy finding from this study was that many of the associate members that participated in governance meetings originally became members of the co-operative on the recommendation of a staff member. A comparison between associate members that joined based on the recommendation of a staff member that participated in governance meetings and those that did not participate, showed a significant difference in the aspect of 'understanding.' This indicates that among associate members that joined for similar motivations, there is a relationship between participation in governance practices and a member's understanding of the co-operative difference.

Comparative Analysis

When comparing the three case studies, the average scores for all aspects of Active Membership of the respondents at JA-A were significantly higher than that of JA-B or JA-C for both farmer and associate members. Furthermore, for most aspects, JA-A respondents scored higher than the national

average. The history of the initiatives to be inclusive of associate members along with the longevity of the co-operative in its current form having not undergone any mergers since 1966, may be factors that could lead to these types of results. Furthermore, the language used in promotional materials for self-reform published by each of the co-operatives as well as the sentiments expressed by staff and management during preliminary interviews for this study, provide insight into how high membership engagement places on the priorities for the co-operative. Conversely, the promotional materials for self-reform for JA-B do not mention any initiatives targeting associate members, while interviews, emphasis for the member programs at JA-B was placed in increasing food literacy. Though respondents at JA-B scored quite highly feeling familiarity for the co-op and need for co-operative services, they scored the lowest among all three case studies in understanding the co-operative difference. Lastly, at JA-C a formal approach to addressing associate member participation in governance was taken by introducing associate member discussion forums and facilitating the inclusion of associate members at formal governance meetings such as the Annual General Meeting. Emphasis at preliminary interviews with staff and management reiterated this commitment to be fully inclusive of associate members. At the same time, the majority of the membership continue to be farmer members and much of the self-reform promotional material stresses how their Geographic Indication strategy for agricultural products and their partnership with high end retailers will enhance agricultural income for their farmer members. This program was launched in 2015 and had only been in operation for three years at the time of study which may be one of the factors contributing to having lower scores than at a co-operative like JA-A whose initiatives have been implemented for longer. One notable result from JA-C was that the difference between Farmer and Associate member scores for Membership Awareness was the smallest amongst the three case study sites, with Associate Members out-scoring farmer member in their understanding the co-operative difference. This shows that indeed, the members are more similar in how they relate to the co-operative.

Two other variables that could have contributed to the differing results between the co-operatives relate to the size of the membership, with JA-B having the largest membership followed by JA-C and JA-A, which is consistent with other case studies which have shown that co-operatives with larger members also have less engagement (Nilsson et al, 2009; Nilsson et al, 2012). Another variable is the length of time that the co-operative has existed in its current configuration (time since the latest merger) which also falls in the same order of JA-A, JA-C and JA-B, albeit with only two years separating JA-C and JA-B. Though it can be argued that these variables could influence the outcome of membership engagement, these are not of practical consequence since these variables are not mutable.

One finding that was especially notable when comparing results from the three co-operatives was

the difference in how members rated whether they ‘understood the difference between a co-operative and an IOF’. In all three case studies, members that were assertive had scores that fell within a higher range than non-assertive members. This is particularly significant when considering differences between non-participating members, members that had participated in a co-operative initiative and assertive members. Though members that had participated in co-operatives initiatives rated their understanding of the co-operative difference within a higher range than non-participants, it was the assertive members that rated themselves within the highest ranges. This shows that there is potential for more members to be assertive should they gain understanding of the co-operative difference.

Conclusion and Opportunities for Further Research

The three case studies featured in this dissertation revealed that regardless of member type, gender, age or affiliation to agriculture, all members were able to participate in co-operative governance. In all three case studies, there were Associate Members that were demonstrated assertiveness and indicated that they felt familiar with the co-operative, express a need for co-operative services and understood the difference between co-operatives and IOFs despite not having the right to vote. This demonstrates that Local JAs are indeed multi-stakeholder co-operatives, where two different stakeholder groups- producers and consumers- are actively participating in the governance of the co-operative. Furthermore, results from this study found that there is a relationship between participation in co-operative initiatives and how members rated on Membership Awareness and Participatory Behavior. Results also revealed differences between the case studies regarding the aspect of Active Membership targeted by the co-operative along with the stated objectives of these initiatives and big picture goals outlined in the self-reform promotional materials of the co-operative. These differences coincided with differences on how members at each co-operative rated on Membership Awareness and Participatory Behavior. Moreover, results indicated that ‘understanding the co-operative difference’ impacts whether or not a member will actively engage in governance or offering feedback to the co-operative. This implies that for co-operatives seeking greater engagement from their membership, they should communicate their values to reflect inclusion and member participation in addition to providing opportunities for members to learn and understand their role in shaping how the co-operative operates.

The implications from this study show that a wide variety of co-operative approaches can have an effect on member engagement, even in co-operatives with heterogenous member interests and voting rights. This is particularly relevant as co-operatives continue to grapple with how to demonstrate accountability to its member-owners and define the co-operative difference as they adopt new

structural forms, increase in scale and offer a diversity of services to its membership. Future areas of study include the types of feedback that are communicated through these informal governance mechanisms and how they are incorporated into decision making at the co-operative. Another important area that requires further exploration is that of cultural decision making practices. Lastly, a longitudinal study that includes both pre and post intervention data would clarify if different initiatives have a causal relationship with enhancing membership engagement and participatory behavior.

There is a growing need in communities and in existing agricultural co-operatives around the world to seek new and innovative solutions to meet complex economic and social goals. The multi-stakeholder co-operative model is currently gaining in popularity as one of the proposed organizational forms that can create a counter-veiling force to the multi-national corporations that are beginning to monopolize food value chains (Lund, 2012). Particularly at this time, when Local JAs are undergoing a process of self-reform, Local JAs can bring important insights and lessons to the global stage in effective governance practices and means of stimulating membership engagement. This dissertation illustrates the ways in which co-operatives can change and initiate practices to ensure greater engagement by their members. Without member engagement, the co-operative model does not provide any advantage over the diverse organizational models, many of which are exploitative of the very stakeholders whose patronage they are dependent on. Indeed it is through this engagement that the co-operative is able to empower members to shape the services that a co-operative provides.

The multi-stakeholder and multi-purpose structure of Local JAs allows for democratic governance by all parties within the food system in an organization that performs functions across the entire food chain- from the capitalization of farms, to the aggregation, marketing and distribution of food products, to increasing food literacy and consumer engagement. Organizations often point to the formal governance structure, namely that all members have one vote, to demonstrate democratic decision making. However, as argued by many scholars of solidarity economy, having the right to vote is not sufficient in true membership ownership- other forms of participation by the membership is crucial for the organization to reflect the values and needs of the workers, users and other stakeholders. Participation in a co-operative can take many forms, and results outlined in this dissertation demonstrate the diverse ways in which members can engage within a co-operative. It is only through the execution of this type of co-operation and inclusion of the two member types that the true advantages that can be gained from the multi-stakeholder model of the co-operative can be expressed.

1. はじめに

日本の農業協同組合（以下では農協，JA と略す）は，長い歴史をもち，国際的にみて先進的であるが，地域経済やフードシステムにおける役割について協同組合論からの研究が求められている。とくに，農協（JA）の正・准組合員の形態とその構造は，近年注目されているマルチステークホルダー・システムと捉えることができ，将来の農業協同組合のガバナンス戦略や協同組合政策と深く関わると考えられる。このガバナンスの大きな課題は，都市部・都市近郊の農協で，みることができる。

協同組合の特質はガバナンス構造にあり，一般企業・株式会社（IOF）との差異が大きなポイントである。基本的に，協同組合の「一人一票」は，組合員が組織に対する所有権を保持することを保証し，協同組合の運営や事業経営に組合員のニーズを反映する重要な手段である（福田，2016）。しかし，日本の農協，とくに都市部の農協では，議決権のない准組合員数が正組合員数を大きく上回っているため，農協の組合員のガバナンスに関して准組合員の役割を見直す必要がある。この点に関してさまざまな視点から研究されているが，ガバナンスの視点からは十分に解明されていない。すなわち，准組合員の議決権が協同組合の統治の基本であるのかは議論が尽くされていない。

現在，マルチステークホルダーの協同組合が世界的に注目されている。とくに，フードシステムにおける多様なステークホルダーを取り込むことで，地域の公益性に基づいて組織がより民主的に運営できると述べられている（Lund,2012; Gray,2014）。事例として取り上げられている協同組合は歴史が浅く，現在カナダのケベック州やイタリア，アメリカに設立されている。しかし，日本の総合農協は，マルチステークホルダーの協同組合として位置づけた研究はみられない。実際，総合農協をマルチステークホルダーの協同組合として取り上げるためには，議決権のない准組合員も主権者であること，すなわちガバナンスに参加する権利をもっていることを明確にする必要がある。

2015年にJAは，このガバナンス・プロセスをより高める方法とした「アクティブメンバーシップ」を開始した。これは五段階のピラミッドで表現し，最初の段階は組合員加入，次に協同組合の理念の理解，組織活動への参加，組織・相談会などにおける意見反映と続き，最終的には理事・経営管理委員等としての運営で，組合員の積極的な参画を目的としている。「アクティブメンバーシップ」でターゲットしている組合員の活動は，協同組合に関する研究で議論されてきた。例えば，スウェーデンの農業協同組合では組合員が協同組合理念の理解をすることが協同組合の成功にかかっていることが Hakelius（1999）の研究で述べられている。

JAの准組合員がガバナンス・プロセスと議決権にどの範囲で参加するのが妥当かは，集落組織や支所・支店の活動，総会・総代会への組合員参加など多様な運営参画・事業利用やその意向を統計的分析による実態を踏まえた考察が効果的であると考えられる。とくに都市部・

都市近郊の農協の戦略やインフォーマルなガバナンス活動が、どのように組合員意識・行動に影響しているかにも注目したい。

2. 研究目的

この論文では、アクティブメンバーシップ活動が行われている三つの農協を対象として、組合員の活動とガバナンス行動の関係性を明らかにすることを目的にした。調査したアクティブメンバーシップ活動は① 組合員教育 (A 農協), ② 准組合員を取り組む組合員活動 (B 農協), ③ 准組合員総代制度 (C 農協) である。具体的には、准組合員問題を抱えている農協は、マルチステークホルダー型の協同組合として捉えられるのか。そうであれば、組合員対応の戦略は組合員の運営参画とどのように関係しているのか。そして、上記二つのことを踏まえ、日本の農協の取り組みから、世界で立ち上げられているマルチステークホルダー型の協同組合に対する示唆を得ることを研究の目的としている。

3. 研究方法

どのような組合員活動が組合員の意識・行動と関係性があるのかを把握するために、農協の役職者に聞き取り調査を行ったうえで、総合農協における正組合員・准組合員に注目し、両種の組合員が取り組んでいるガバナンスを考察するために、三つの単協を選択し、アンケート調査を行った。その事例は1) 日本の大都市圏にあること、2) 正組合員と准組合員がフードシステムのなかで多様な関わりをもつこと、3) アクティブメンバーシップ関連の活動が行われていることである。この三つの農協で、どのような組合員がガバナンスと関係性があるのかを把握することで、議決権の有無による組合員の参画への影響を明らかにする。事例農協の特徴として、A 農協では正・准組合員の組合員教育を主軸に行われていること、B 農協では、正・准組合員が取り組む組合員活動が主軸に行われていること、C 農協では組合員教育や組合員活動に加えて、准組合員総代制度が導入されていることがあげられる。

A 農協は組織ソーシャルキャピタル論の項目をもとにしたアンケート項目を利用した。B 農協と C 農協は「AMS アンケート」の、質問項目を考慮してアンケートを設計した。なお比較調査を行うために、A 農協でも「AMS アンケート」と同様の質問項目を含めた。

AMS アンケートは、全国農業協同組合中央会がアクティブメンバーシップ方針を具体化するために、2016年から2018年にかけて全国88の単協を調査したものである。AMS アンケートの基準である「意識と行動の評価」を考慮して本研究の評価基準を決定した。意識は三つの項目(理解10点、必要性10点、親しみ10点)で計30点、行動は七つの項目(事業利用30点、活動参加10点、組織加入10点、意思反映10点、運営参画10点)で計70点、合計100点満点で評価した。A 農協では、直売所を利用している組合員と直売所の学習会に参加した組合員に調査票を配布した。B 農協と C 農協では組合員約5%に調査票を郵送し、

支店で回収した。アンケートは農協ごとに、性別・年齢・組合員種等を踏まえて無作為抽出を行って実施した。

アンケートの分析は主に t 検定を利用し、「アクティブメンバーシップ」に従っている准組合員とそうではない正組合員の意識・行動を比較した。

4. 事例農協における組合員の意識と行動

1) A 農協：組合員教育講座

A 農協は、本店が東京・新宿駅から電車で 1.5 時間の位置にあり、正組合員 2,980 人、准組合員 11,419 人である。A 農協では、組合員のための教育講座としては二つあげられる。一つは協同組合の理念重視の講座で、もう一つは実践的な講座である。協同組合の理念を重視した講座の目的は組合員の協同意識を高めることであり、本研究との関連が強い。以上の二つを結びつけた教育講座は、組合員基礎講座、組合員講座（農政講座・生活講座）、専修講座の三つから構成されている。これらの講座は、正・准の資格に関わりなく参加でき、座学だけではなく、職員と営農に関する相談や市場の見学などのフィールド研修も含まれている。准組合員対象の基礎講座では農業体験も行われる。このように、これらはフードシステムのさまざまなアクターと出会いながら学ぶ講座といえる。協同組合理念の理解を深めるために組合員教育を重視するという考えは、A 農協に固有のものではない。国際協同組合同盟（ICA）は、協同組合教育を組合員の間でアイデンティティと価値についての理解を構築できる手段として位置づけている（ICA, 2012）。1995 年に ICA が採択した七つの協同組合原則の一つに「組合員教育」があげられており、現在もその重要性に変わりはない（International Co-operative Alliance, n.d.）。

A 農協のアンケート項目は、協同組合のソーシャルキャピタルに関する先行研究（Liang et al, 2015; Osterberg & Nilsson, 2012）をもとに、組織的なソーシャルキャピタルの三つの側面（構造的、关系的、認知的）が把握できるように設計した。アンケートでは、対象者の属性のほかに、これら三つの側面を具体化した 14 の質問を行い、A 農協の直売所の店頭や組合員向けの説明会で調査票を配布した。アンケート結果の分析に基づいて調査結果を再確認するために、組合員に対して聞き取り調査も行った。

アンケートの有効回収率は 62.3%であった。従来の研究に基づいて、協同組合員の意識・行動は組合員の属性と関連すると推察されるので、組合員の種別、年齢、農業との関係（農業経験・耕地面積）、教育講座の参加有無との関係を T 検定と分散分析を利用して検証した。その結果、協同教育講座への参加は、14 問中 8 問で統計的に有意であることが判明し、教育講座はソーシャルキャピタルを高めていることが示唆される。

次に、14 のソーシャルキャピタル関連の質問に関して、それぞれの関係を示す相関行列を作成した。それに対し因子分析を適用して、組合員が質問にどのように回答したかを示す

潜在的な要因を分析した。分散の 53%を説明する三つの要因で、主成分分析を実施し、三つの因子が抽出された。第 1 因子(個人的なコミュニケーションに基づくガバナンスの形態、以下、個人的ガバナンス形態)には、職員や役員に直接フィードバックや意見を伝えることや、協同組合は理念に基づいて運営していることに信頼をもっているという個人的なガバナンスの側面が含まれている。第 2 因子(構造化されたコミュニケーションに基づくガバナンスの形態、以下、構造的ガバナンス形態)には、総会や相談会という協同組合の組織による決まったガバナンスの側面が含まれている。第 3 因子(共同利用)は、直売所の店舗に対する信頼とその利用に関連している。

教育講座の参加有無によって組合員はガバナンスに参画する方法が異なっていることが明らかになった。回答者は、因子分析を通じて抽出された二つのガバナンス要因(個人的ガバナンス形態、構造的ガバナンス形態)の因子得点は、教育講座に参加した組合員のほうが、参加しなかった人よりも高く、T 検定によって、統計的に有意であることが確認された。参加していない組合員も、協同組合の職員や経営陣に直接フィードバックを与えるなど、個人的ガバナンスに参画する可能性があるが、この分析結果は教育講座に参加した組合員ほど構造的ガバナンスには参画することを示している。つまり、組合員が教育講座に参加することにより、協同組合内でソーシャルキャピタルが醸成され、組合員のガバナンスへの参画がより高まることが示唆される。

補足調査のため、教育講座に参加したことのある組合員 9 人に聞き取りを行った。教育講座に参加した後、協同組合での行動は変わらなかったが、協同組合内でコミュニティ意識が強くなったと 9 人すべてが話した。それは被調査者が「顔見知り」という言葉を使用していることからわかり、教育講座に参加すると、協同組合に対して親しみが増すと理解できる。講座の内容を事前に把握していたのは 1 人にすぎず、大半の参加者は職員からすすめられたり、知り合いからの口コミによって講座の存在を知るようになった。彼らは教育講座を、協同組合のさまざまなサービスを知る場、地域社会の人々と一緒に学んで知り合う機会と理解していた。参加者は講座内容に満足し、協同組合が提供する他の講座に関心を示した。しかし、一部の参加者は、マスメディアで報道されている農協改革に関する議論は、なかったように感じていた。組合員は、講座は農業協同組合の強みのみを教えていると感じて、協同組合に対する批判的な議論については理解していないと述べた。したがって、彼らは論争の全体を把握しておらず、協同組合の改革の方向性について、自分自身の意見をもつことができないと感じていた。

2) B 農協：組合員活動

B 農協では組合員のための組合員活動が行われている。この調査では、B 農協で提供されている組合員活動は職員によって 11 の種類に分類した。すなわち、農業祭・産業祭、支店活動、各種相談会、親子で学ぶ農業、家庭菜園、プチベル活動、親子料理教室、JA 家の光

記事活用グループ、クッキングフェスタ、組合員セミナー、組合員研修である。B 農協では、種別に関係なく組合員を活動に促がす手法を取っていて、正・准組合員ともにいずれの活動にも参加できる。ただし、一部は准組合員向けで、農家出身でない組合員にとってこのような活動は、食べ物に関する理解を深めるとともに、ソーシャルキャピタルを醸成するものとなっている。B 農協でのアンケートは、JA 全中の AMS アンケートの基準である「意識と行動の評価」を重視して調査を設計した。アンケートは無作為抽出した 10%の組合員に郵送で配布した。正・准組合員同数で、合計 3,000 枚を配布し、1,389 枚 (46.3%) を回収した。回答者は、正組合員よりも准組合員が多く、正組合員では男性、准組合員では女性の回答者数が多かった。

t 検定の結果、B 農協ではアクティブメンバーシップのすべての項目における正組合員平均は准組合員よりも 99%の信頼度で有意に高く、正組合員が准組合員よりも協同組合に関与していることを示唆している。これは、協同組合との関わりに関して、正組合員と准組合員の間に根本的な違いがあることを示している。しかし、性別、年齢、居住地、農業の従事による比較では、統計的に有意な差はみられなかった。

正組合員と准組合員はほとんどの組合員活動で参加率はほぼ同じだが、各種相談会と組合員研修では正組合員は准組合員より参加が多い。組合員活動とアクティブメンバーシップの関係性をみるために、1つ以上の活動に参加した組合員のアクティブメンバーシップ評価点を、参加していない組合員の評価と比較した。正組合員と准組合員とでアクティブメンバーシップ評価が異なっているため、種別ごとに比較した。t 検定の結果、組合員活動に参加した正組合員は、参加していない正組合員よりもアクティブメンバーシップ評価が明らかに有意に高かった。同様に、組合員活動に参加した准組合員は、参加していない准組合員よりも有意なアクティブメンバーシップ評価を有している。組合員の種別の影響を把握するために、組合員活動に参加した准組合員を組合員活動に参加しなかった正組合員のアクティブメンバーシップ評価を比較した。参加した准組合員は非参加の正組合員よりも協同組合に親しみを感じている。同じく、参加した准組合員は非参加の正組合員より協同組合の必要性を感じている。さらに、参加した准組合員は生活事業を非参加の正組合員よりも利用している。加えて、参加した准組合員は非参加の正組合員よりも組合員組織にも積極的に加入している。この調査だけでは組合員活動が組合員のアクティブメンバーシップを醸成するとは言い切れないが、調査結果は、さまざまな要因と組合員の意識と行動のレベルとさまざまな項目とに関係があることを示している。また、組合員活動に参加する組合員は、さまざまなアクティブメンバーシップ項目にわたって「アクティブ」になる傾向があることを示している。

組合員活動に参加した組合員は、参加後に意識や行動に変化があるかどうかを分析した。農業祭と支店活動に参加した組合員は、非参加者より協同組合に関しての親しみが高まった。各種相談会と組合員セミナーに参加した組合員は、非参加者よりも生活に関する知識が高

まった。家の光の活動以外では 75%の参加者は、何かしらの意識・行動が変わったと評価した。また、組合員活動のうち、継続して参加する活動のほうが、1 回限りのイベントよりも意識や行動が変化したことが明かとなった。

組合員が協同組合に意見を述べることは、協同組合の運営に関する意思決定に影響を与える一つの方法である。調査結果は、一部の組合員活動が協同組合の管理に関する意識と行動に大きな変化をもたらしたことを示している。正組合員は、准組合員よりも活動に参加すると積極的に意見を述べるようになり、このことは組合員の種別によって権利の相違に合理性があることを示している。ただし、協同組合の管理に関して、協同組合に直接意見を述べたり、フィードバックを伝える手段を有している准組合員は、組合員活動に積極的である。また、組合員活動に参加した准組合員は、参加していない正組合員よりも、協同組合に意見を表明していないし、フィードバックも与えることが少ない。協同組合の管理に対する意識の変化や、協同組合へのフィードバックの伝達の増加を回答した会員の割合は、組合員活動によって異なっている。定期的な参加が必要な組合員活動（例：コミュニティガーデンへの参加）は、1 回限りの経験（例：料理教室）に参加した参加者よりも、参加後意識・行動変更を報告した参加者の割合が高い。これはとくに准組合員に当てはまることが明かとなった。

3) C 農協：総代制度の変化

C 農協は、正・准組合員で議決権に差異がみられるものの、それ以外は可能な限り平等で、2015 年に准組合員対象の総代制度を開始した。その制度の下で、農協と地域農業の理解を深めるために、毎年研修会を実施し、准組合員は正組合員とともにそのプロセスで運営参加が可能になるような取り組みを行っている。

C 農協は B 農協と同様に、「AMS アンケート」の基準である「意識と行動の評価」を重視して本研究の評価の基準を決定した。調査票は組合員の 5%に郵送で配布し、回収率は 30.5%であった。正組合員と准組合員はほぼ同数で、正組合員は男性の回答者のほうが多く、准組合員は女性のほうが多かった。

C 農協での准組合員対象の総代制度の効果を把握するため、意識・行動を総代会に参加している准組合員と参加していない正組合員とで比較した。まず総代会に参加している准組合員の意識の項目では、親しみと必要性の平均評価値は、全組合員および非参加の正組合員より高いが、有意性はみられなかった。一方、協同組合と企業との違いの理解に関しては、意思反映の場に参加している准組合員のほうが正組合員より高かった。組織加入とその活動への参加状況は、准組合員が、正組合員よりも有意差が大きかった。意思反映の場に参加した准組合員では、「意見がない」「意見を伝える方法を知らない」と回答した人は、意思反映の場に参加していない正組合員より、有意差が小さかった。

准組合員が総代会・相談会に参加した理由では、「職員や他の組合員から頼まれた」と「JA についてもっと知りたい」が選択されている。この結果は、参加した組合員は個人的な利益

のためではなく、職員から提示された価値観と一致するか、少なくとも関心があることを示している。さらに言えば、参加した准組合員がそもそも農協に加入した理由も、職員から勧められたことをあげている。

5. 事例調査の比較

本研究では、各農協の「アクティブメンバーシップ」活動により、活動に参加した組合員の行動・要因を把握することができた。その結果、アクティブメンバーシップと組合員の活動参加への有無によっての関係性は明らかでありながら、他の要因、例えば組合員種（議決権の有無）、年齢、農業経営等での関係性はみられなかった。

A 農協は准組合員の意思反映や運営参画に関わる活動を行ってきており、とくに組合員対象の教育講座は歴史の長い活動である。このような活動は、役職員の力で組合員の協同意識を高め、役職員が先導するガバナンスのインフォーマルな取り組みと理解できる。B 農協は准組合員対象の生活文化活動が行われていることで、活動を中心とするガバナンス活動を生かしていると理解できる。この活動に参加している准組合員と参加していない正組合員を比較すると、協同組合の理解には有意な違いはみられなかったが、親しみと必要性に関しては、参加していない正組合員より高いことは重要な意味をもっている。親しみと必要性は、協同組合の意識の醸成に欠かせない要素だからである。しかし、協同組合と企業との違いがわからないと、協同組合の重要なメリットを見逃すことになるうえ、准組合員はガバナンスに取り込めていないことを示すのではないだろうか。C 農協では、准組合員は農協に対する理解が深く、意見を農協に伝える方法を知っていて、実際に意見を出したことがある人が相対的に多い。このことは准組合員総代制度が農協のガバナンスの問題に重要な役割を果たしている証左であると思われる。この制度の歴史が浅いため、参加している准組合員の親しみ・必要性は他の組合員とあまり変わらないが、このような組合員としての役割は、協同組合にとって重要であることを看過すべきではない。制度が始まって間もないため、総代会に参加している准組合員は必ずしもアクティブではないが、この制度が次第に浸透するにしたがって、参加している組合員の意識や行動に変化がみられるかが今後の課題である。

6. 結論と今後の研究

本論文では多様な協同組合の活動は、組合員の年齢・性別・関心や投票権の有無にかかわらず、組合員の参画を高める可能性がある。三つの事例調査において、積極性を示したり組合に親しみを感じる准組合員は、組合サービスの必要性を感じており、企業との違いも理解している。このことは、単協はまさに生産者と消費者を包含し、両者がガバナンスに関与するマルチステークホルダーの協同組合であることを示している。また、本論文では准組合員を取り込む活動への参加と、組合員意識・組合員行動の程度との間に関係性がみられること

を示した。さらに、各 JA における組合改革の方向性やそのアクティブメンバーシップのあり方の相違について明らかにした。こうした相違は、各組合における組合員意識・組合員行動の程度の相違に対応している。さらに、協同組合と企業との違いを理解していることは、組合員が意見を伝えて組合のガバナンスに関与するかどうかに影響を与えていることを明らかにした。したがって、協同組合が多様なステークホルダーをより取り込んで行くには、コミュニケーションを密にして価値観を共有することが重要だと考えられる。

このことは、新たな組織再編や規模拡大、提供サービスの拡大などに関して、組合員に対して説明責任を果たすうえで、重要な意味をもっている。また、この研究は、活動の積極性と継続性が、組合員を協同組合に取り込むうえで重要なことを示している。しかも取り組みの成果は、組合員どうしや職員・役員との関係性に左右される。すなわち信頼感が重要であり、それは協同組合内での円滑なコミュニケーションの支えとなり、インフォーマルなガバナンスをとることが可能となる。今後の研究課題として、どのような意見がインフォーマルな方法で伝わっており、どのような意思決定につながっているのかを把握する必要がある。また、活動の前・後で、関係性の変化を把握することで、活動の効果をより明確にすることも必要であろう。

現在、世界のさまざまな地域では異なるフードシステムの課題に新たな戦略で臨むことが求められている。そこで、マルチステークホルダーの協同組合が民主的な組織形態として注目されている(Lund, 2012)。とくに、自己改革が行われている日本の農協は、このマルチステークホルダー型の農業協同組合として、ガバナンスのあり方を考えるうえで重要な事例である。その際、組合員の参画が重要である。組合員参画は、一般企業・株式会社と協同組合の違いの根幹であり、協同組合の民主主義原則に直接関わっている部分だからである。

正・准組合員を含めて運営している農協は、地域で食と農に関わる消費者・農業者に、民主的な組織の理念・事業・活動を実現する可能性がある。ガバナンスで重要なことは、組織の主権者の明確化、組織における経営上の意思決定の仕組み、そして組織の主権者による経営者に対するチェックの仕組みである(Masuda,2013)。そこで、協同組合は主権者が組合員であり、議決権がこのすべてのガバナンスの役割とされることが多い。しかし実際には、経営者に対するチェック、意思決定、組合員の役割等は、組合員をどのように取り込んでいるのか、そしてどのように組合員が参加しているのかにかかっている。本研究は、組合員参加はさまざまな方法で行われていることを把握した。日本の農協には歴史があり、組織改革を急激に行うことは困難である。しかし、このような組合員が積極的に取り組みを行い、正・准組合員の運営参画を高めることで、現在世界中で注目されているマルチステークホルダーの協同組合の可能性を生かすことができると考えられる。

References

- Birchall, J., & Simmons, R. (2004). What motivates members to participate in co-operative and mutual businesses?. *Annals of Public and Cooperative Economics*, 75(3), 465-495.
- Cechin, A., Bijman, J., Pascucci, S., & Omta, O. (2013). Decomposing the member relationship in agricultural cooperatives: Implications for commitment. *Agribusiness*, 29(1), 39-61.
- Feng, L., Nilsson, J., Ollila, P., & Karantininis, K. (2011). The human values behind farmers' loyalty to their cooperatives. In *5th international conference on economics and management of networks, Limassol*, 1-3.
- Fukuda, J. (2016), *Agricultural Cooperative (JA) Organization Reform Consideration*, 20th Conference of Progressive Economics (in Japanese).
- Gray, T. (2014) Historical tensions, institutionalization, and the need for multi-stakeholder cooperatives. *Journal of Agriculture, Food Systems, and Community Development* 4(3) 23-28.
- Girard, J-P (2009) Solidarity Co-operatives (Quebec, Canada):How Social Enterprises can Combine Social and Economic Goals. In Noya, A (Ed) *The Changing Boundaries of Social Enterprises, Local Economic and Employment Development (LEED)*, OECD Publishing, Paris, 229-267.
- Hakelius, K. (1999). Farmer cooperatives in the 21st century: young and old farmers in Sweden. *Journal of Rural Cooperation*, 27(886-2016-64611), 31-54.
- Hansmann, H. (2000) *The ownership of enterprise*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Iliopoulos, C., & Valentinov, V. (2017). Member preference heterogeneity and system-lifeworld dichotomy in cooperatives: An exploratory case study. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 30(7), 1063-1080.
- Jiménez, M. C. R., Martí, E. G., & Ortiz, M. J. H. (2010). Member commitment in olive oil co-operatives: Cause and consequences. *Journal of Co-operative Studies*, 43(2), 24-35.
- Katz, J. P., & Boland, M. A. (2002). One for all and all for one? A new generation of co-operatives emerges. *Long Range Planning*, 35(1), 73-89.
- Kobayashi, G (2019). The State of Agricultural Co-operative Members within Agricultural Co-operative Policy. In Motozumi, K. (Ed). *Topics pertaining to Agricultural Co-operative Issues and Policy: A Report of Agricultural Co-operative Research on the state of agricultural co-operatives*, Japanese Agricultural Co-operative Research Series (25), 85-108.

(In Japanese)

- Koyama, R (2019). Organizational Foundations in Japanese Agricultural Co-operatives: Organization Structures for Diversifying Members. In Motozumi, K. (Ed). *Topics pertaining to Agricultural Co-operative Issues and Policy: A Report of Agricultural Co-operative Research on the state of agricultural co-operatives*, Japanese Agricultural Co-operative Research Series (25), 85-108. (In Japanese)
- Leviten-Reid, C. & Fairbairn, B. (2011) Multi-stakeholder governance in cooperative organizations: toward a new framework for research? *Canadian Journal of Nonprofit and Social Economy Research* 2(2), 25-36.
- Lund, M. (2012). Multi-stakeholder Co-operatives: engines of innovation for building a healthier local food system and a healthier economy. *Journal of Co-operative Studies*, 45(1), 32-45.
- Masuda Y. (2019) *The Future of JA Agricultural co-operative in a changing political landscape*. Japan, Showado, 152-175. (In Japanese)
- Münkner H. (2004). Multi-stakeholder co-operatives and their legal framework. In C. Borzaga & R. Spear (Eds.), *Trends and challenges for co-operatives and social enterprises in developed and transition countries*. Trento, Italy (31) 49-82.
- Nishii, K (2013), Diversification of Associate Members and Mechanisms for Feedback, In Masuda, Y (Ed) *Who does JA belong to: Governance in an era of change*, Japan, Ie no Hikari Kyoukai. (In Japanese)
- Nishii, K (2019), Observed trends and Distinctive Characteristics of Associate Members, In Masuda, Y (Ed) *The Future of JA Agricultural co-operative in a changing political landscape*. Japan, Showado, 152-175. (In Japanese)
- Novkovic, S. (2008) Defining the co-operative difference. *The Journal of Socio-Economics*, 37 (6), 2168-2177.
- Novkovic, S. (2012). The balancing act: Reconciling the economic and social goals of co-operatives. *The Amazing Power of Cooperatives*, Quebec, 289-299.
- Shiraishi, M. (2017). Evolutional Trends and Present Characteristics of New Diverse Models of the Multi-purpose Agricultural and Rural Co-operatives in Japan. *The International Journal of Agricultural and Rural Co-operative Studies*, 1(1), 34-47.
- Tashiro, Y (2019). *The Future of JA Agricultural co-operative in a changing political landscape*. Japan, Showado, 152-175. (In Japanese)

Yukimoto, W. (2018). *Japan's Agricultural Cooperatives Challenging Regional Revitalization: Aiming at Reconstruction of "Solidarity"*. Norinchukin Research Institute Co., Ltd.

審査報告概要

異なった主体から構成されるマルチステークホルダー型の協同組合が、新たなフードシステムを構築する上で、世界的に注目されている。本論文は、日本の農業協同組合（JA）をマルチステークホルダー型協同組合に位置づけて、そのガバナンスの現状とあり方を究明した。そのため、東京・名古屋・京都の郊外にある三つの JA を事例に、正・准組合員にアンケート調査を行い、組合員の意識・行動・ガバナンスに対する態度について分析した。活動に積極的な准組合員は非積極的な正組合員よりも、JA に意見を伝えていること、意識が高い組合員はそうではない人よりも、協同組合活動に積極的で意見をもっていることなどを実証的に示した。その結果、投票権の有無はあまり重要ではなく、むしろ組合員に対する職員による働きかけや協同組合教育が重要であり、JA の取り組みは世界の協同組合の師範になりうることを指摘した。本論文のオリジナリティは十分あり、高い学術的価値を有していると判断できる。よって、審査員一同は、博士（農業経済学）の学位を授与する価値があると判断した。