

**SUSTAINABLE LEADERSHIP PRACTICES IN THE TUNA
CANNING INDUSTRY IN GENERAL SANTOS CITY
PHILIPPINES**

GENEVIEVE CATACTE FERNANDO

**A THEMATIC PAPER SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL
FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF MANAGEMENT
COLLEGE OF MANAGEMENT
MAHIDOL UNIVERSITY
2017**

COPYRIGHT OF MAHIDOL UNIVERSITY

Thematic paper
entitled
**SUSTAINABLE LEADERSHIP PRACTICES IN THE TUNA
CANNING INDUSTRY IN GENERAL SANTOS CITY
PHILIPPINES**

was submitted to the College of Management, Mahidol University
for the degree of Master of Management

on
January 7, 2017



.....
Mrs. Genevieve Fernando
Candidate

.....
Asst. Prof. Randall Shannon,
Ph.D.
Advisor

.....
Assoc. Prof. Vichita Ractham,
Ph.D.
Chairperson

.....
Duangporn Arbhasil,
Ph.D.
Dean
College of Management
Mahidol University

.....
Worapong Janyangyuen,
D.B.A.
Committee member

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my sincere gratitude and appreciation to my advisor, Dr. Randall Shannon, Ph.D. who gave me valuable consultation, kind attention and encouragement while instructing me throughout the course of writing this thematic paper. I am most grateful for his teachings and advising and the support which I always received from him.

I am also deeply grateful for my friends in the tuna industry for their various inputs, the fourteen participants or the interviewees representing six of the seven tuna canning organizations of the Philippines for the precious time allotted and valuable information without which this paper will not have been complete.

Finally, I would like to pay sincere gratitude to my family in the Philippines who cheer, encourage and support me wholeheartedly throughout the two years that I have been working and studying in Thailand and away from them physically.

Genevieve Catacte Fernando

SUSTAINABLE LEADERSHIP PRACTICES IN THE TUNA CANNING INDUSTRY IN GENERAL SANTOS CITY PHILIPPINES

GENEVIEVE CATACTE FERNANDO 5849040

M.M. (GENERAL MANAGEMENT)

THEMATIC PAPER ADVISORY COMMITTEE: ASST. PROF. RANDALL SHANNON, Ph.D., ASSOC. PROF. VICHITA RACTHAM, Ph.D., ASSOC. PROF. WORAPONG JANYANGYUEN, Ph.D.

ABSTRACT

The study would like to find out if the level at which the organizations have implemented or applied the 23 Honeybee leadership elements are the reasons these individual companies have sustained for 35 years.

Data and information were obtained by depth interview of selected employees from six organizations. The result of the study is that the organizations are practicing at least 19 of the 23 Honeybee leadership elements however, another revelation was found out in the course of the study that the organizations need to immediately address and this is discussed in the recommendation part.

The relevance of knowing this is to provide guidance to the Tuna Canner's Association of the Philippines (TCAP) to ensure that the industry will go a long way, even prepare itself for the inevitable change impacting the industry either from internal (within the Philippines) or external forces coming to the region by way of ASEAN integration.

KEY WORDS: Sustainable leadership practices, Honeybee and Locust leadership practices, Tuna Canner's Association of the Philippines

26 pages

CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ii
ABSTRACT	iii
LIST OF TABLES	v
CHAPTER I INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER II LITERATURE REVIEW	4
CHAPTER III RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	7
CHAPTER IV RESEARCH FINDINGS	9
CHAPTER V INTERPRETATION AND DISCUSSION	12
CHAPTER VI RECOMMENDATION	16
CHAPTER VII RECOMMENDATION FOR FUTURE RESEARCH	18
REFERENCES	19
APPENDICES	21
Appendix A	22
Appendix B	24
BIOGRAPHY	26

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Result of survey showing practices in the three levels of Leadership Elements	10
2.	Comparison of interviewees' rating of leadership elements by level of practice	12



CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

General Santos City Fish Port Complex (GSCFPC) topped all other fish ports in the entire Philippines in total fish landing last year with a total of 139,613 metric tons (MT) maintaining the status as the country's premier fish producer. In the most recent Tuna Congress held in the city last August 31–Sept 2, 2016, the Chair of the Tuna Cannors' Association of the Philippines (TCAP), Mr. Marfenio Y. Tan reported that for the past ten years, tuna landings in the city have been consistent in the levels of 131,127 MT in 2009 as the minimum and 143,139 MT as the highest so far recorded in 2010. Being a consistent leader in fish landing volume more specifically of tuna and tuna-like species and being the home to six (6) of the country's seven (7) tuna canning plants, General Santos has sustained and upheld the title "Tuna Capital of the Philippines".

The Tuna Canning Industry in General Santos was started by PureFoods Corporation which opened in 1982 and the industry has been around since then, having seen better days in the years 1990-2000. Two years later in 1984, Santa Monica Canning Corporation followed suit and four (4) more canneries opened during the 1990s. The six (6) tuna canneries operating in the city include the following: General Tuna Corporation (200 MT/day); Mer-Alliance Tuna Corporation (180 MT/day); Philippines' Best Canning Corporation (160 MT/ day), Ocean Canning Corporation (100MT/day); Seatrade Canning Corporation (100 MT/ day) and Celebes Canning Corporation (75 MT/day) overall combined estimated capacity to produce 815 metric tons of tuna per day.

The Philippines is currently ranked 2nd largest canned and processed tuna manufacturer in Asia, next only to Thailand. The country is also strategically located along the tuna migration highway which runs through the Indian Ocean down to the Western and Central Pacific Ocean. More than 90% of the country's tuna catches are landed in General Santos City because of competitive price commended by the canning

factories. All six of the canneries are categorized as large scale enterprise in the Philippines in terms of structure and performance.

Close to 50,000 people are working in the tuna-canning industry of General Santos where ninety percent of that population are women, and it is noted as the biggest private-sector employer of the city. Indirectly, there are 200,000 people who are dependent to the fate of the industry. Working in the factory has been a source of livelihood for many women who otherwise would have stayed at home unable to augment the income for the family. Current issues such as sustainability of the tuna resource, climate change (El Nino and La Nina effects on tuna production), integration of the ASEAN communities and tightening world economic trade barriers on tuna export are posing as threats and are becoming the most talked about topics of discussion among members of the Tuna Canners' Association of the Philippines and even in the recently concluded Tuna Congress held in September 2016 that could disrupt the upward trend or consistent growth of the industry. But really, could they be just the only threats?

Thirty five years is relatively not timeworn compared to some big industries in the Philippines which are more than a hundred years old. However, having contributed much to the economic wellbeing of the city, thirty five years is considered longstanding and deeply rooted. The industry has been very much a part of the settlers' search for the "Land of Promise" which is Mindanao. In this line of thinking, a question is formed whether the six tuna canning companies could be practicing the concept of "Honeybee" leadership which is referring to a resilient and humanistic approach to corporate sustainability as defined by Avery and Bergsteiner (2010) in their book, *Honeybees & Locusts: The Business Case for Sustainable Leadership*.

There is not much literature published about the performance of the tuna canning industry in General Santos save for the capacities and revenues generated. This could be partly because they are all private owned companies therefore access to data is limited and also it could be that nobody has yet done a profile of leadership style study on Philippine businesses most particularly the tuna canning industry. This study will pick up from the works of Kantabutra and Avery (2013), in the journal entitled *Sustainable Leadership: honeybee practices at a leading Asian industrial conglomerate* regarding sustainability of organizations being directly linked to their level of practicing

the honeybee elements. The question that this study will try to answer is: Are Honeybee Leadership elements being practiced by the six (6) Tuna Canneries in General Santos City? The hypothesis being that, the closer the organization is in practicing each of the 23 Honeybee Leadership elements, the more sustainable it is. According to Kantabutra and Avery, practice of the 23 Honeybee Leadership elements drive a firm's brand and reputation, customer satisfaction, operational finances, shareholder value over the long term, ultimately provide long-term value for a range of stakeholders" Avery, (2010). The study would like to find out if the level at which the company has applied; or indeed practice or non- practice of the mentioned leadership elements are the reasons these individual companies comprising the Canned Tuna Industry in the city of General Santos, Philippines have sustained for 35 years.

The desired result is that the study will reveal the practices of the organizations to support or contradict the hypothesis. If possible to rank the industry's level of exercise or application according to their practices with respect to the Honeybee Philosophy as predictor of the industry's sustainability. The relevance of knowing this is to provide guidance to the Tuna Canner's Association of the Philippines on how they conduct business to ensure that the industry will go a long way, maybe prepare itself to the inevitable change impacting the industry either from internal (within the Philippines) or external forces coming to the region by way of ASEAN integration.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

“What and who is the business here for?” This is the most popular question guiding entrepreneurs to their vision. Money may be the reason why people or organizations go to business. Creating jobs could also be good reason to go into business, there is nothing like the satisfaction of knowing the business is responsible for the success of its employees, providing them the opportunity to earn a living, provide for their families, and fulfill their own dreams. Another good reason who and why the business exists may be because it can be a vehicle to change the world (maybe one small step at a time). Whatever the reason, everyone wants to have a business that is sustainable. But what does sustainable mean?

Scholars from different countries are trying to identify a practical approach to corporate sustainability. A study has been conducted by Avery and Bergsteiner (2011) and they were able to draw up a Sustainable leadership “honeybee” philosophy versus shareholder-first “locust” philosophy. They have identified and investigated these principles, showing how they differ in practice. Using a sample of 14 European organizations operating on principles diametrically opposed to the shareholder-first philosophy. Avery (in 2005) first identified 19 leadership practices, distinguishing what she then referred to as the Rhineland and Anglo/US approaches. She found that these two approaches comprise two diametrically opposed sets of practices that form self-reinforcing systems. She demonstrated that enterprises led this way can flourish in diverse industries and locations, ranging from the developed world of the US, UK, Australia, Europe, and Scandinavia to emerging economies in the South Africa and Thailand. Avery and Bergsteiner (2011) expanded the list to 23 by adding four elements.

In a more familiar setting, considering that Thailand and Philippines have more or less the same Asian culture and background, the above sustainability leadership principles were also tested to be applicable in a conglomerate and even in a small enterprise in Thailand. Several studies have been conducted by Kantabutra reinforcing

that the 23 leadership principles is not limited to location, nor it is limited by specific industry. In their study of a well-known and successful Thai conglomerate; *Sustainable leadership: honeybee practices at a leading Asian industrial conglomerate*, Kantabutra and Avery (2013) found that the conglomerate's practices were consistent to nearly all Honeybee leadership elements. Based on the data collected, the extent to which each of the 23 elements was evident at the conglomerate for the "Honeybee" and "Locust" leadership approaches were categorized from "least evident", "moderately evident" and "most evident".

In a smaller Thai enterprise, the same pattern was derived as mentioned from the study of Kantabutra and Suriyankietkaew (2013) in a journal, *Sustainable leadership: Rhineland practices a Thai small enterprise*. The business which is involved in papermaking from mulberry fiber was found to be practicing 14 of Avery's 19 elements characterizing Rhineland enterprises. The company has endured numerous economic and social difficulties but remained strong and even garnered several prestigious national awards and international recognition.

Are there other possible approaches to corporate sustainability? In Europe, Rhineland capitalism is seen as an alternative philosophy to promote corporate sustainability, being concerned about the long-term sustainability of an enterprise and its relationships with many interest groups, not just shareholders. The quest to ensure corporate sustainability appears similar in Asia. One alternative is Japanese human capitalism with its strong employee focus places Japan at the most advanced stage of capitalism. Other variations comes from Southeast Asia, where governments take an active role in creating, shaping and guiding markets. Singapore is a highly successful example of this business model, their government require firms to take considerable responsibility for the social welfare of employees. In Thailand, the 'Sufficiency Economy Philosophy' which aims at creating balance and sustainability for the society, has been widely acclaimed as an approach to corporate sustainability.

Accordingly, sustainability in business refers to meeting the needs of the organization's wide range of stakeholders such as employees, clients, pressure groups or NGOs and the community without compromising its ability to meet financial success. Sustainability means going beyond the traditional view of adding "green" and "socially responsible" to business-as-usual. Sustainable businesses need to do more than just

comply with internationally accepted ratings systems such as ISO 9001, ISO 22000, ISO 14001, the Global Reporting Initiative, and Leadership in Energy & Environmental Design (LEED) plaque or the Triple Bottom Line. Instead, sustainability needs to be fully integrated and embedded in every aspect of the organization. Certainly, sustainability is not achieved at the expense of business performance, rather, research suggests that adopting management practices aimed at promoting sustainability can enhance a firm's performance.

The distinguishing criteria for typical Honeybee and Locust perspectives (see a table in the appendix) are as follows: developing people continuously not selectively, seeking cooperation with labor relations not acting antagonistically with them, values long term tenure or retaining staff at all levels, succession planning by promoting from within wherever possible, concern about employees' welfare, the CEO works as top team member or speaker not solely as decision maker or hero, "doing the right thing" as an explicit core value, prefers long term over the short term perspective, sees organization change as an evolving and considered process, seeks maximum independence from others with respect to financial markets orientation, shows responsibility by protecting the environment, values people and the community, every stakeholder matters, and shared view of the company's future is essential strategic tool; all fourteen leadership elements as being the foundation practices which means they can be implemented at any time the organization wishes to do so.

The higher level practices consist of six leadership elements that rely on the existence of some or all of the foundation practices for their successful implementation and they are: consensual and devolved decision making not primarily manager-centered, staff are mostly self-managing, teams are extensive and empowered, fosters an enabling and widely shared culture, knowledge sharing and retention spreads throughout the organization not limited only to a few "gatekeepers" and having high trust through relationships and goodwill.

The last group are three leadership elements, they are the key drivers which emerge from various combinations of the other twenty practices and they shape the customer's experience. Practice of strong, systemic, strategic innovation that is evident at all levels, values emotionally committed staff, and most all, quality is embedded in the culture not as a result or a matter of control.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

The research methodology is qualitative by use of in depth interview of members of the three groups in the organization namely; executive, middle management and rank and file. At least three to not more than five representative from each group of the mentioned organizations will represent a cross section of hierarchal levels, plus another three representing members of the community surrounding each location of the cannery. There will be about 16 people in total to be selected for the interview.

Since the interviewees are distant from the interviewer, the interview was not a physical “live” face to face but using the Internet via Skype or Facebook messenger. However, prior introduction and explanation was sent through email to the selected participants to seek for their support and arrangement for their availability for interview at their convenience. For facilitation, a list of the 23 elements of Honeybee philosophy practices with corresponding Locust philosophy practices was sent out in advance and the list was used as a cue during the actual interview. The interviewee was then asked about his opinion of each of the elements whether he feels that they are practiced in his company or not? Of whether they are evident but not clear? Of whether or not the interviewee understands any of the elements at all? The questions were uniform for all interviewees but if they had another views, these were noted down for synthesizing. The interview time was managed not to exceed forty five minutes per interviewee if possible. However, when the interviewee had a need for extended time to express his opinion, then time was negotiable.

The six organizations vary in their performance and they have different business strategies. But as much as possible, it is desired to get an interview of the top executives of the best performer and the one that seemed least, also from the one that has the most number of employees and the one that has the least. To confirm if the 23 sustainable leadership elements are understood by top, middle and bottom of the organization ranks, middle managers and members of rank and file are also chosen for

interview. And to check whether the organization cared about its environment and community, a sample of members of the community were also interviewed.

During the interview, only note-taking was done to record responses to the interview questions. Findings (the answers chosen by each interviewee) were tabulated and matched to Avery's (2005) research framework and discussed in the next chapter.



CHAPTER IV

RESEARCH FINDINGS

A copy of the list of leadership elements similar to the one shown in the appendix was sent via email to all target respondents in advance with a request for a short interview via Facebook Messenger or Skype. After receiving back the ticked list of elements from the interviewees, a quick review ensued. Preliminary answers that seemed uncertain or not convincing were marked as cue for the interview questions. The questions were only to make sure the answers were well understood, otherwise explanation and discussion over each element was the topic of the interview. Some answers were changed after hearing the explanation and discussion or when points were clarified. Data gathering started in October 10 and had to end on November 2, 2016. The targeted number of 16 interviewees to represent all levels of the organization and the community was not reached until November 2 due to the fact that target respondents cannot be contacted until deadline. There was however a good number reached, fourteen interviews out of target sixteen at the end of November 2, 2016. The results are shown in Table 1 below.

As planned, there were four groups of interviewees representing all levels of the organization. Four interviewees belonging to the top management from four out of six organizations namely; Executive Director, Vice President for export sales and marketing, Assistant Vice President/Plant Manager and Assistant Vice President for Logistics and Purchasing. The Middle Manager level was represented by five interviewees from four out of the six organizations namely: Human Resource Manager, Operations Manager, Product Development Manager, Quality Assurance Manager and Business Development Manager. The Rank and File level was represented by three Supervisors from three organizations namely: Technical Services Supervisor, Laboratory In-charge and Production Supervisor.

Table 1: Result of survey by interview showing all three levels of Leadership Elements

Leadership Elements	Group 1 Top Management (Four Interviewees)			Group 2 Line Managers (Five Interviewees)			Group 3 Rank and File (Three Interviewees)			Group 4 Community Representative (Two Interviewees)			
	Honey Bee	Locust	Mid HL	Honey Bee	Locust	Mid HL	Honey Bee	Locust	Mid HL	Honey Bee	Locust	Mid HL	No Answer
Foundation Practices													
1. Developing People	3		1	1		4	2	1		1	1		
2. Labor Relations	4			3	1	1	2		1		2		
3. Retaining Staff	4			1	1	3	1	2			1	1	
4. Succession Planning	4			2	2	1	3				1	1	
5. Valuing Staff	3		1	1		4	2		1		1	1	
6. CEO and Top Team	4			4	1		2		1		1		1
7. Ethical Behavior	4			3	1	1	2		1		1		1
8. Long Term-Short Term perspective	4			4		1	2		1		1	1	
9. Organizational Change	4			2	1	2	2	1					2
10. Financial Markets	3	1			1	4	2	1					2
11. Responsibility for Environment	4			2		3	2		1		2		
12. Social Responsibility	3		1	2		3	2		1			2	
13. Stakeholders	3		1	1	1	3	2	1			2		
14. Vision's Role in the Business	4			3	0	2	3						2
Higher Level Practices													
15. Decision Making	3		1			5	1	1	1				2
16. Self-management	4			1		4	1	2					2
17. Team orientation	4			2		3	1	1	1				2
18. Culture	4			2		3	1	2					2
19. Knowledge sharing and retention	3		1	1	1	3	2	1			1		1
20. Trust	4			1	1	3	2	1			1		1
Key Performance Drivers													
21. Innovation	3		1	1		4	1	2			2		
22. Staff engagement	3		1	2	1	2	3				2		
23. Quality	3		1	2		3	1	1	1		2		
	82	1	9	41	12	62	42	17	10	1	21	6	18
Total Possible answer per group	92	92	92	115	115	115	69	69	69	46	46	46	46
Overall score	Honey Bee 166	Locust 51	Mid HL 87										

Note: refer to distinguishing criteria in Appendix A and see same table for clearer presentation in Appendix B

The overall resulting number shows that the Tuna Canning Industry in General Santos City, Philippines are already practicing leadership elements consistent to the Honeybee philosophy at least at the foundation level. However, there is a disparity in how one group in the organization interpreted each leadership element from the other groups. Unexpectedly there is a new revelation in the answers of each group that needs to be given attention. Secondly, there are answers that cannot be categorically counted as either Honeybee or Locust so another column is added which is labeled Mid H L as the uncertain or unclear answer to hold the category of a leadership element which is either being practiced but inconsistent or the particular leadership element of both philosophies are interchangeably practiced in the organization.

Although the data was obtained by interview, converting the answers into a rating form helps to explain the result as can be seen in Table 2. Across all three groups or levels of the organization, Honeybee practices scored the highest particularly in the foundation level. For both top management and middle managers, the middle or uncertain category scored the second and the Locust practices having the least score.

For the rank and file group, they tend not to divide their choice or judgement in between Honeybee or Locust by being uncertain. They mostly choose the element based on how they feel or judge the element. Top management consistently answered Honey Bee philosophy elements in all three levels are practiced more in their organization, rank & file consistently answered Locust philosophy elements in all levels are practiced more in their organization and lastly, middle managers or the line managers answered consistently that they are uncertain or that the mode of practice is unclear in all in all three levels in their organization.

For group 4, representing the community had only two interviewees, their residence is situated at the opposite ends of the industrial stretch where the six tuna factories are located. A no answer was allowed for them since they were not really expected to know the leadership practices of the organization. What was important to know was their views of the organization as part of the community, and how the organization behaves or interacts within the community? This group generally describes the organization in their community as practicing the Locust elements. But one interviewee felt uncertain on how the organization behaves in six elements under the fundamental practices.

CHAPTER V

INTERPRETATION AND DISCUSSION

Taking a long hard look at Table 2 showing the results of the responses from the interviewees, emerged three patterns. As mentioned earlier, Honeybee philosophy is already considerably practiced by the Tuna Canning Industry in General Santos. However, we cannot discount the fact that the rank and file group in the organizations was consistent that their organization practiced Locust philosophy and the fact that the middle managers are consistent in being unclear or perceived as that Honeybee and Locust elements in all three levels of practices are either unclear or interchangeably exercised by their organization cannot be overlooked.

Table 2. Comparing result of Interviewees' rating each element by level of Practice

Leadership Philosophy	(1) Foundation Level Practices			(2) Higher Level Practices			(3) Key Performance Drivers		
	Top Man	Mid Man	Rank & File	Top Man	Mid Man	Rank & File	Top Man	Mid Man	Rank & File
Honeybee	51/56	29/70	29/42	22/24	7/30	8/18	9/12	5/15	5/9
Rating	89%	36%	61%	92%	23%	44.5%	75%	33%	56%
Locust	1/56	9/70	6/42	0/24	2/30	8/18	0/12	1/15	3/9
Rating	1%	10%	25%	0	7%	44.5%	0	7%	33%
Mid HL Uncertain/ Unclear	4/56	32/70	7/42	2/24	21/30	2/18	3/12	9/15	1/9
Rating	10%	54%	14%	8%	70%	11%	25%	60%	11%

1. Top Management consistently answered HB elements in all levels are practiced more in their organization
2. Rank & File consistently answered Locust elements in all levels are practiced more in their organization
3. Middle Managers or the Line Managers answered consistently that they are Uncertain HB elements or Locust elements in all levels are practiced in their organization
4. Rank & File disagree the most from the Top Management on the Higher Level practices than in Foundation Level

Like using a magnifying glass, a closer or a more deeper look into the responses revealed that: First, that the rank & file group disagrees the most from the top management group on the higher level practices and this can be inferred as miscommunication by top management thinking they have planned out and

communicated the vision clearly down the line but in fact may not be the case. On elements such as decision making, self- management, team orientation, culture, knowledge sharing and trust:

Top Management say... *“The staff are trained first, then they are empowered to deliver results”* Top Management say... *“Yes without trust, it is impossible to gel, trust is important for cohesiveness”* but Rank & File feels the opposite, they say... *“Control and monitoring is very much stressed and well emphasized”* and... *“Managers managed and need to be hands-on”*.

Secondly, that at the foundation level of Honey Bee philosophy, the Middle Managers although not clear and uncertain, highly disagrees with Top Management. Elements such as HR Issues on (1) developing people, (2) retaining staff, (3) succession planning and (4) valuing staff do not have agreement at all.

Top Management say... *“Our aim is to develop everyone continuously so that we can have a wider scope of people to move around and to choose from”*, *“We value retaining staff and long tenure at all levels to have lesser tuition fees, more reaping and less planting”*. Line Managers felt they are unequipped, needs more outside exposure or wants to *“See what the others are doing”* and... *“The Company values the employees, but when it comes to welfare this is not so, like the staff are required very long working hours, and the lack of financial support in training our people, I think negate the thought or the idea of valuing people”* says the HR Manager. *“Training is always the first to go when we hear the sound of the trumpet declaring belt tightening. This normally spurs the vicious cycle of low morale, low motivation, and high employee turn-over rate. How are we going to implement the plan or retaining staff let alone succession planning?”*

Thirdly, when asked why they feel they are uncertain or unclear whether the leadership elements are practiced in their organization, the Line or Middle Managers

said: *“In principle our organization is expected to practice the mentioned elements because we are supposed to be following or conforming to the published standard that we are required and are in fact certified to have been practicing but then, they are not practiced as a way of life in the factory. They are practiced to obtain a certification, not for or not with sustainability in mind”*.

Fourthly, as an observation, it is important to note that across the board, all responses to the elements Organization Change in the Foundation Level and Innovation in the Key Performance Driver Level respectively are not at all well understood. Responses are expressing a different meaning from how Avery (2005) meant them to be.

Top Management says: *“Yes change is always for the better and therefore continuous, it encourages innovation”*.

Middle Management says: *“It is required by the organization but not practiced in actual. And that change is ad hoc, fast and radical”*.

Rank and file says: *“Yes, there is always change in the organization, people and policies”*.

Organizational change is supposedly an evolving and considered, well planned process rather than a fast, volatile and an *Ad hoc* or unplanned process. While innovation is a major source of technological progress and growth. Honeybee Philosophy takes a much broader view than simply R&D investment. Innovation involve turning inventions into customer solutions according to Avery (2005).

This is taken to mean that Top management, middle management and even the rank and file need to be exposed to how organizations change and that innovation should be in the business and corporate context with company longevity and sustainability in the forefront rather than changing for the sake of fulfilling a procedure in the standard without consideration to planning. A uniform understanding of calibrated vis-à-vis accepted management practices worldwide will close the communication gaps between all three levels.

And lastly, the response from the representatives of the community. Table 1 shows their views on how the organization (at least the one nearest their residence) behaves in the community contradicts to the claims of top management. Considering

only the elements pointing to responsibility for environment and Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) in the foundation level, the community representative's response were pointing to Locust philosophy which means the organization is ready to exploit the environment and does not really value much the people in the community.

As what has been observed from the data gathered, that the Canned Tuna Industry in General Santos City Philippines is practicing the Honeybee Philosophy of Sustainable Leadership is not acceptable as fact point blank. All three groups of respondents in the organization may seem to lean towards a response that of practicing the Honeybee philosophy, yet a deeper look into the actual happening at the factory floor or within the community point to practices short of it and maybe far from it. Add to the fact that the representatives of the community corroborate that the organization is actually practicing Locust philosophy.

The implication to this is that if there is denial or continuous belief by top management that there is no disparity in what they believe to what is actually happening will not only stunt the growth but could in the long run cripple the organization in particular and the industry as a whole. Moving from denial to acceptance is important, otherwise, the tuna companies will continue to use conventional practices and just stay at business as usual. Relying on those certificates hanging on the wall is false confidence and shows immaturity at looking at business with all stakeholders in mind. Like the Locusts, when all green is gone, so it will die.

CHAPTER VI

RECOMMENDATION

The corporate leaders' answer to the question: "what and who is the business here for?" will define their visions for their companies and chart the course on how they move their businesses forward. In the first world, or the developed economies they have already moved ahead in implementing true sustainable leadership practices and may have been struggling with obstacles and challenges all the way. If that is the case for the first world, in the third world we can expect that many are still in denial. This study at the least revealed that this is the truth for the canned tuna industry in General Santos City in the Philippines. When Top management confidently favored Honeybee philosophy in contrast to the line managers who thought otherwise can mean disagreement of issues, miss-understanding the elements, concealing blind spots, holding on to biases and miscommunication. For how long can we go on without changing? What are the costs of not doing so?

Immediate interventions are called for. Recognition of the problem partly solves it, denial must end and the urgency at working on making change happen is imperative. A good start is closing the gap between denial and truth. Then we can work on ensuring change to begin by making sure all levels of Honeybee leadership practices are first understood and address the dysfunctional foundation level first. Next, the company leadership can promote the advantages of the higher level practices and key performance drivers.

The first motivation for this study is to find if the Tuna Canning Industry in General Santos City, Philippines will be able to sustain as the first employment provider of women and the poor in the city and nearby provinces. Given that there are changes in both internal and external forces influencing the growth of business, for example the sustainability and resource management issues of tuna that will definitely affect in the way business is conducted at present. Further implication of the results or findings of this study is to make this as a benchmark for the Tuna Cannery Association of the

Philippines (TCAP) to provide avenues for learning and improvement by way of awareness, training for the application of best practices to prepare the organizations in particular and the industry as a whole for the inevitable tightening of the competition due to the forthcoming ASEAN communities integration. Failing to satisfy all stakeholders of the business will mean slow death rather than its contrary, sustainability of business or of the industry.



CHAPTER VII

RECOMMENDATION FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

This study may be considered as preliminary and a forerunner of future business management and leadership studies in the tuna canning industry of the Philippines. There are other similar industries in Asia like Indonesia, Thailand and Papua New Guinea that can be looked at. Future studies may fully expand the methodology by using a wider scope and a larger number of respondents. The method of gathering data may also use both semi-structured depth interview and observation which was the limitation to this study because of the physical distance between the researcher and the respondents. It is deemed necessary to have a real observation of how each elements are actually performed by the organization across all levels as well as physically observe and verify at how each organization deals with its surrounding community and its environment.

Another recommendation aside from improving the methodology is for the researcher to have an actual audit of the organization to find the gaps and confirm these vis-à-vis documented procedures of the organization to confirm the views of the respondents. Not just on a two to three days of audit but on a longer length of time to establish that day to day management practices are genuine and according to both the organization's own documented management policies and standards.

Lastly, the 23 Honeybee elements are applicable to any industry so similar study can also be conducted to examine the tuna fishing industry. The purpose being is to enhance if not help the Philippine Tuna industries on how to better face future business environmental changes.

REFERENCES

- Albert, M. (1992). “*The Rhineland model of capitalism: and investigation*’, European Business Journal, Vol.4, No.3, pp 8-22
- Avery, G.C. and Bergsteiner, H., (2010). *Honeybees & Locusts: The Business Case of Sustainable Leadership*, Allen & Unwin, Sydney (Republished 2011) as Avery, G.C. and Bergsteiner, H., *Sustainable Leadership: Honeybee and Locust Approaches*, International Version, Routledge)
- Avery, G.C. and Bergsteiner, H., (2016). “*Practices for enhancing resilience and performance*”. Sufficiency Thinking: Thailand’s gift to an unsustainable world. Allen & Unwin, Australia; pp 235-247.
- Avery, G.C., (2005). “*Leadership for Sustainable Futures: Achieving Success in a Competitive World*”, Edward Elgar, Cheltenham, and United Kingdom & Northampton, MA.
- Cummings, T.G. and Worley, C.G. “*Strategic Change Interventions*” Organization Development & Change (9th ed). OH, USA: South Western, Chapter 11 page 635
- Kantabutra, Sooksan and Gayle Avery, (2013). “*Sustainable Leadership: honeybee practices at a leading Asian industrial conglomerate*”. Asia Pacific Journal of Business Administration Vol 5 No. 1, 2013 pp.35-56, Emerald Group Publishing Limited 1757-4323.
- Kantabutra, Sooksan and Suparak Suriyankeitkeaw, (2013). “*Sustainable Leadership: Rhineland practices at a Thai small enterprise*”. Inderscience Enterprises Ltd. Entrepreneurship and Small Businesses, Vol. 19, No. 1, 2013.
- Kantabutra, S. and Siebenhuner, T. (2011). ‘*Predicting corporate sustainability: a Thai approach*’, Journal of Applied Business Research, Vol.27, No. 6, pp.123-124.
- Kantabutra, S. (2011). “*Sustainable Leadership in a Thai healthcare service provider*”, International Journal of Healthcare Quality Assurance, Vol. 24 No. 1, pp.67-80.

Kotter, John P. “Leading Change”, Harvard Business School Press.

Miles, Matthews B. and A. Michael Huberman, (1994). *Qualitative Data Analysis* 2nd Edition

Tan, Marfenio Y., (2015). “*The Making of the Philippine Tuna Capital*”. A presentation during the 17th National Tuna Congress, General Santos City, Philippines.

Vera, Cezar Allan and Hipolito, Zarina, (2005). “*The Philippine Tuna Industry: A Profile*”, The International Collective in Support of Fish workers, page 40.





APPENDIX A:

The distinguishing criteria for typical Honeybee and Locust perspectives.

Source: Avery and Bergsteiner 2010, pp 36-37

Leadership Element	Sustainable leadership “Honeybee” philosophy Sophisticated, stakeholder, social sharing	Shareholder-first “Locust” Philosophy Tough, ruthless, asocial, profit-at-any-cost
Foundation practices		
1. Developing People	Develops everyone continuously	Develops people selectively
2. Labor relations	Seeks cooperation	Acts antagonistically
3. Retaining staff	Values long tenure at all levels	Accepts high staff turnover
4. Succession planning	Promotes from within whenever possible	Appoints from outside whenever possible
5. Valuing staff	Is concerned about employees welfare	Treats people as interchangeable and a cost
6. CEO and top team	CEO works as top team member or speaker	CEO is decision maker, hero
7. Ethical behavior	“Doing the right thing” as an explicit core value	Ambivalent, negotiable, an assessable risk
8. Long or short term perspective	Prefers the long-term over the short-term	Short-term profits prevail
9. Organizational change	Change is an evolving and considered process	Change is fast adjustment, volatile, can be <i>ad hoc</i>
10. Financial markets orientation	Seeks maximum independence from others	Follows its master’s will, often slavishly
11. Responsibility for environment	Protects the environment	Is prepared to exploit the environment
12. Social responsibility (CSR)	Values people and the community	Exploits people and the community
13. Stakeholders	Everyone matters	Only shareholders matter
14. Vision’s role in the business	Shared view of the future is essential strategic tool	The future does not necessarily drive the business

Leadership Element	Sustainable leadership “Honeybee” philosophy Sophisticated, stakeholder, social sharing	Shareholder-first “Locust” Philosophy Tough, ruthless, asocial, profit-at-any-cost
Higher level practices		
15. Decision making	Is consensual and devolved	Is primarily manager-centered
16. Self-management	Staff are mostly self-managing	Managers manage
17. Team orientation	Teams are extensive and empowered	Teams are limited and manager-centered
18. Culture	Fosters an enabling, widely-shared culture	Culture is weak except for a focus on short-term results that may or may not be shared
19. Knowledge sharing and retention	Spreads throughout the organization	Limits knowledge to a few “gatekeepers”
20. Trust	High trust through relationships and goodwill	Control and Monitoring compensate for low trust
Key performance drivers		
21. Innovation	Strong, systemic, strategic innovation evident at all levels	Innovation is limited and selective; buys in expertise
22. Staff engagement	Values emotionally-committed staff and the resulting commitment	Financial rewards suffice as motivators, no emotional commitment expected
23. Quality	Is embedded in the culture	Is a matter of control

APPENDIX B:

The level of Sustainable leadership practices across different levels of management in the organization by level of practice.

Leadership Elements	Group 1 Top Management (Four Interviewees)			Group 2 Line Managers (Five Interviewees)			Rank and File Group 3 (Three Interviewees)			Community Representative Group 4 (Two Interviewees)			
	Honey bee	Locust	Mid H L	Honey bee	Locust	Mid H L	Honey bee	Locust	Mid H L	Honey bee	Locust	Mid H L	NO Answer
Foundation Practices													
1. Developing People	3		1	1		4	2	1		1	1		
2. Labor Relations	4			3	1	1	2		1		2		
3. Retaining Staff	4			1	1	3	1	2			1	1	
4. Succession Planning	4			2	2	1	3				1	1	
5. Valuing Staff	3		1	1		4	2		1		1	1	
6. CEO and Top Team	4			4	1		2		1		1		1
7. Ethical Behavior	4			3	1	1	2		1		1		1
8. Long Term-Short Term perspective	4			4		1	2		1		1	1	
9. Organizational Change	4			2	1	2	2	1					2
10. Financial Markets	3	1			1	4	2	1					2
11. Responsibility for Environment	4			2		3	2		1		2		
12. Social Responsibility	3		1	2		3	2		1			2	
13. Stakeholders	3		1	1	1	3	2	1			2		
14. Vision's Role in the Business	4			3		2	3						2
Higher Level Practices													
15. Decision Making	3		1			5	1	1	1				2

