KRIEZACADEMY
ISSNN:3031-8025

MAKING MEMBER VOICE ACTIONABLE: AN ACCOUNTABILITY FRAMEWORK FOR COMMUNITY COOPERATIVES

Arif Budi Raharja[1], Kosasih[2]

[1]Management Study Program, Universitas Mathla'ul Anwar, Pandeglang, Banten, Indonesia

[2]Universitas Sangga Buana YPKP, Bandung, Indonesia

Correspondence: budiraharja1970@gmail.com

Abstract

Background: Member attendance and document disclosure do not establish that cooperative members can influence decisions or obtain a reasoned response. **Aims:** To develop a decision-level accountability framework connecting information, questioning, reasons, and follow-through. **Review Method:** Three official resources on cooperatives, participation, and enterprise digitalisation inform a purposive conceptual synthesis. No cooperative audit, interview, or financial dataset is reported. **Results and Conclusion:** The proposed design combines intelligible decision briefs, accessible questioning, traceable records, and review of implementation. Its value depends on safe challenge, clear authority, and proportionate disclosure. **Contribution:** The article provides operational definitions, a hypothetical decision example, a record structure, and an evaluation approach. It does not establish effectiveness or certify compliance.

Keywords: cooperative governance; member voice; accountability; community development; decision transparency.

1 INTRODUCTION

A cooperative meeting may be well attended while leaving members unable to understand how a significant decision was reached. Attendance establishes presence, but it does not show whether members received usable information, could ask questions, or obtained a reasoned response. Conversely, publishing extensive records may create an appearance of openness without improving members' practical influence.

The ILO's cooperative recommendation provides an institutional anchor for democratic member control and member education (ILO, 2002). Mansuri and Rao (2013) examine participation in development and the importance of context and implementation. These sources motivate an analytical question: what observable links connect formal voice to an accountable organisational response? The framework developed here addresses this question through decision-level routines.

2 CONCEPTUAL FOUNDATION

Member voice is defined here as an opportunity to raise a question, receive consideration through a recognised process, and understand the resulting decision. It does not mean that every preference must prevail. Accountability requires an explanation of what was decided, by whom, for what reason, and with what follow-through. A decision can be accountable despite disagreement, while an apparently popular decision can remain opaque if reasons and responsibility are absent.

The ILO (2002) supplies the cooperative governance anchor, and Mansuri and Rao (2013) place participation within wider institutional conditions. The analytical contribution here is to connect formal opportunity with an observable response at the level of a particular decision. Digital tools may support retrieval, but they do not create authority to challenge. Keeping these concepts separate helps avoid using meeting attendance or dashboard activity as a substitute for evidence of influence.

Table 1. Proposed operational definitions

Construct	Meaning in this article	Observable example
Intelligibility	Members can explain the options and important consequences.	A brief explanation using a fictional decision.
Safe questioning	Questions can be raised through an accessible route without improper consequences.	Members know the channel and its confidentiality limits.
Traceability	Reasons, authority, and implementation responsibility can be linked.	A decision identifier connects records and updates.
Follow-through	Promised actions are reviewed and changes explained.	Status linked to a reason and review date.

The definitions in Table 1 specify the analytical objects for this framework. They are proposed working definitions rather than established measurement scales. A future study should examine whether participants and assessors interpret them consistently before combining them into a score.

3 REVIEW APPROACH

Three official publications were selected purposively for their relevance to cooperative organisation, participation, and the role of digital tools (ILO, 2002; Mansuri & Rao, 2013; OECD, 2021). Source metadata and available official material were inspected online. The analysis separated participation opportunities from response obligations and then specified what a member would need to follow one decision from proposal to implementation.

This is a conceptual synthesis, not an audit of an actual cooperative or a systematic assessment of the participation literature. No claims are made about misconduct, member satisfaction, financial performance, or existing procedures in any named organisation. The proposed instruments are analytical suggestions requiring local adaptation and testing.

Table 2. Documentary corpus and analytical role

Source	Type	Role in the synthesis	Inference limit
ILO 2002	Cooperative recommendation	Institutional anchor for member control and education.	Not a jurisdiction-specific compliance assessment.
Mansuri and Rao 2013	Participatory development report	Context for institutional and implementation conditions.	Not evidence about the named cooperative authors.
OECD 2021	Digital transformation report	Context for separating digital tools from organisational capability.	Not proof that a dashboard improves governance.

The analysis proceeds from construct definition to a proposed sequence, followed by consideration of failure conditions and measurement choices. Source statements supply context; the sequence, tables, examples, and propositions are analytical proposals developed in this manuscript. No search-completeness count, independent coding agreement, or causal estimate is reported. References should be checked against the full original documents during author review.

4 INTEGRATED CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

The first component is a short decision brief describing the issue, available options, important costs, and the authority responsible. Members need sufficient time to read or hear the explanation before the decision point. A brief should identify what remains uncertain, rather than presenting an option as inevitable.

Intelligibility can be assessed through a fictional example: a member explains the practical difference between two options and identifies where a question can be raised. Publishing a document is not equivalent to establishing comprehension. The proposed check tests whether information is usable without assuming that every member has the same financial or digital literacy.

Table 3. Proposed sequence and responsibilities

Stage	Task	Responsible role	Expected evidence
Inform	Describe the issue, options, costs, and uncertainty.	Responsible decision sponsor	A concise member-facing brief.
Question	Provide accessible and proportionate routes for member input.	Designated recipient; independent route for concerns	An acknowledged question record.
Decide	State authority, reason, and responsibility.	The legitimately authorised body	A decision record linked to input.
Review	Check implementation and explain revisions.	Named implementation owner and oversight role	An update that preserves the earlier decision history.

Table 3 links each stage to a responsibility and an observable record. The sequence is intended to expose a missing connection, rather than imply that completing a form guarantees an outcome. Movement between stages may be iterative. Where an essential condition is absent, the appropriate decision is to repair that condition or narrow the scope before expansion.

5 OPERATING MECHANISMS

The second component provides more than one route for questions. Members might submit a written question, speak at a scheduled session, or obtain assistance from an independent facilitator. A channel should state who receives a question and how a response will be communicated. Confidential concerns require a different route from ordinary agenda questions.

The framework treats non-participation as ambiguous. It may reflect agreement, lack of time, inaccessible materials, or fear of consequences. Therefore, low question volume should not be used as a stand-alone indicator of satisfaction. A future assessment should examine whether different member groups understand and can use the available routes.

Table 4. Mechanisms proposed for examination

Mechanism	Analytical function	Required condition
Usable disclosure	Allows members to understand the practical decision.	Explanation of alternatives accompanies records.
Answerable voice	Connects a question to a responsible recipient.	Channels include response expectations and appropriate escalation.
Visible revision	Allows members to distinguish changed circumstances from unexplained non-delivery.	Earlier reasons and later updates remain linked.

Consider a fictional cooperative deciding whether to change the opening hours of a member service. A decision brief presents the alternatives, staffing implications, and expected effects on members who work at different times. Members can ask questions before the authorised body decides. A high attendance count alone does not reveal whether those affected understood the proposal or could raise concerns.

The decision record then explains the chosen hours, who approved them, and when the arrangement will be reviewed. If staffing constraints prevent implementation, the update preserves the original commitment and explains the change. A member can follow the sequence even when dissatisfied with the result. The example illustrates traceable accountability; it does not describe an actual cooperative or certify that a particular decision procedure meets applicable law.

6 PROPOSITIONS FOR EMPIRICAL TESTING

The propositions below describe relationships that a future study could examine. Their numbering supports discussion and does not indicate a hierarchy of importance. They are not hypotheses tested by this manuscript, and no effect size or statistical significance is implied.

P1. Decision transparency is more likely to support meaningful member participation when understandable reasons are paired with accessible questioning and recorded follow-up.

P2. Digital disclosure alone is unlikely to improve accountability where members cannot challenge a decision without adverse consequences.

Table 5. Additional propositions and possible tests

ID	Proposed relationship	Possible observation
P3	Attendance will be a weaker indicator of influence where members cannot explain the alternatives.	Compare meeting presence with comprehension and question use.
P4	Response traceability will improve perceived answerability only when members can safely raise concerns.	Examine records alongside confidential member accounts.
P5	Disclosure burden will reduce record quality when every minor transaction is treated as a material governance decision.	Compare record completeness across decision types.

A useful test would specify a plausible competing explanation and seek evidence that could weaken the proposed relationship. Comparison conditions, timing, and assistance received should be described before interpreting an observed difference. A finding inconsistent with a proposition would require revision of the framework, not reinterpretation of every outcome as support.

The appropriate unit of analysis may be a task episode, a decision, or a programme cycle. Future researchers should choose that unit explicitly and keep it consistent across measurement and interpretation. Repeated observations from the same person or organisation should not automatically be treated as independent evidence.

7 IMPLEMENTATION PATHWAY

The pathway in Table 6 is a proposed pilot design rather than a record of completed implementation. It identifies who would perform each task and what evidence should be available before proceeding. Local organisers should adapt the sequence to their authority, resources, participant needs, and responsibilities.

Table 6. Staged implementation proposal

Stage	Proposed task	Responsible role	Evidence before proceeding
Scope	Select a material and understandable decision.	Authorised governance role	Decision scope and limits of delegated authority.
Brief	Summarise options, uncertainty, and important consequences.	Decision sponsor	Member-facing document in usable formats.
Consult	Receive questions through accessible routes.	Designated recipient	Questions acknowledged without unnecessary personal disclosure.
Record	Explain the decision and implementation responsibility.	Authorised decision body	Reason, owner, and review date linked by identifier.
Follow up	Report progress or explain a revision.	Implementation owner and oversight role	Members can locate the decision history and unresolved issues.

A pilot should begin with a bounded scope that can be reviewed without unnecessary cost or disruption. The coordinator should record deviations from the plan, including inaccessible activities, unavailable resources, and support that exceeded expectations. These records help explain why an apparently suitable design may work differently across settings.

Expansion should depend on a reasoned review of evidence and unresolved barriers. Completion of the pathway does not itself establish effectiveness. Stopping or revising a pilot can be appropriate when its objective cannot be reached under the available conditions.

8 EVALUATION AND MEASUREMENT

Decision sampling should be specified before inspecting results so that only successful decisions are not selected. Member interviews should not be collected in a setting where leaders can observe individual answers. A complete response may explain why a request cannot be granted; coding should distinguish reasoned refusal from failure to respond. The article provides a proposed assessment design, not a validated governance rating.

Table 7. Proposed indicators and interpretation limits

Dimension	Operational question	Potential evidence	Interpretation limit
Understanding	Members explain options and expected consequences.	Fictional case or consensual interview.	Document availability does not establish comprehension.
Access to voice	Members can identify and use a question route.	Channel walkthrough and confidential feedback.	Few questions may reflect barriers rather than agreement.
Answerability	A substantive response is linked to a relevant question.	Decision and response records.	Fast acknowledgement is not a reasoned answer.
Traceability	Authority, reason, owner, and review date are recoverable.	Decision-record inspection.	Completeness can conceal inaccurate records.
Follow-through	Completed, revised, and unresolved commitments distinguished.	Status history and supporting explanation.	A status label alone does not establish delivery.

Any evaluation involving people or identifiable records needs an appropriate protocol, permissions, and a locally relevant ethics determination before collection. This article reports no such collection. A future report should describe missing observations, participation barriers, and the conditions of assessment, rather than presenting completed cases as if they represented everyone intended to benefit.

9 DISCUSSION AND LIMITATIONS

The framework offers a narrow but useful interpretation of cooperative accountability: a member should be able to follow an issue from understandable information to an explained response and subsequent action. This does not require unrestricted disclosure of private transactions or the publication of personal complaints. It requires matching information access to its purpose and preserving an appropriate route for challenge.

A governance sponsor may prefer positive indicators such as meeting attendance, response speed, or dashboard visits. Each can be useful, but each can also mislead. Attendance may be compulsory or difficult to decline; a fast response may be dismissive; repeated visits may indicate difficulty finding an answer. A future study should therefore examine records together with member explanations and confidential accounts of barriers. Oversight independence is particularly important where leaders commission the evaluation.

The proposed design has not been examined against the legal requirements or financial condition of any cooperative. It cannot substitute for a qualified compliance review. Resources, membership size, literacy, and local expectations may require different procedures. An initial pilot should focus on a small set of consequential decisions and revise the record design if its burden exceeds its value. The analytical contribution is the connection among routines, not a claim that documentation alone can resolve unequal power.

GOVERNANCE IMPLICATIONS

For cooperative leaders, the design implies a division between routine communication and consequential decision accountability. The former can be frequent and informal; the latter needs a stable reason, responsible authority, and review arrangement. Member-facing information should be proportionate and intelligible. Confidential concerns need an appropriate protected route rather than general publication. A programme should also preserve the distinction between a governance improvement project and an independent assurance engagement. A well-designed record supports examination but does not replace verification of the underlying event.

The documentary basis is limited to a small purposive corpus of official resources. It supports a normative and analytical design, not an exhaustive account of the research literature. Additional peer-reviewed studies, local evidence, and critical author review are needed to assess novelty and refine the proposed constructs. Cross-setting applicability remains an open question.

10 CONCLUSION

Actionable member voice requires connected routines for information, questions, reasons, and follow-through. The framework separates these routines from attendance and technology use. It offers a basis for a future governance pilot while leaving legal compliance, effectiveness, and member experience to be established through appropriate review and evidence.

PRIORITIES FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

The next research priority is to test whether members can use a decision record to locate reasons and follow-up without organisational assistance. A feasibility study could compare a conventional meeting document with the proposed brief and linked record. A subsequent study should examine whether questioning is safe and whether different groups can access the process. Improved retrieval would establish a narrower result than improved influence. Both leader accounts and independent member accounts would be needed before making wider claims about accountability or trust.

DECLARATIONS

Data and ethics: This conceptual article reports no primary participant data. No ethics approval or exemption is claimed. Funding, competing interests, acknowledgements, and author contributions must be completed by the authors before submission.

AI assistance: ChatGPT assisted with conceptual development, drafting, language preparation, and formatting. No empirical data were generated. The listed authors must verify and revise the manuscript and accept responsibility before submission. AI is not an author.

REFERENCES

International Labour Organization. (2002). Promotion of cooperatives recommendation, 2002 (No. 193). https://www.ilo.org/resource/other/r193-promotion-cooperatives-recommendation-2002

Mansuri, G., & Rao, V. (2013). Localizing development: Does participation work? World Bank. https://www.worldbank.org/en/research/publication/localizing-development-does-participation-work

OECD. (2021). The digital transformation of SMEs. OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/bdb9256a-en